

# JRC SCIENTIFIC AND POLICY REPORTS

# Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF)

# Evaluation of 2013 MS DCF Annual Reports & Data Transmission (STECF-14-13)

Edited by Cristina Castro Ribeiro & Arina Motova

This report was reviewed by the STECF during its 46<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting held from 07 to 11 July 2014 in Copenhagen, Denmark



European Commission

Joint Research Centre

Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

Contact information STECF secretariat

Address: Maritime Affairs Unit, Via Enrico Fermi 2749, 21027Ispra VA, Italy

E-mail: stecf-secretariat@jrc.ec.europa.eu

Tel.: 0039 0332 789343 Fax: 0039 0332 789658

https://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/home http://ipsc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/ http://www.jrc.ec.europa.eu/

### Legal Notice

Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of this publication.

This report does not necessarily reflect the view of the European Commission and in no way anticipates the Commission's future policy in this area.

Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers to your questions about the European Union Freephone number (\*):  $00\,800\,6\,7\,8\,9\,10\,11$ 

(\*) Certain mobile telephone operators do not allow access to 00 800 numbers or these calls may be billed.

A great deal of additional information on the European Union is available on the Internet. It can be accessed through the Europa server http://europa.eu/

JRC 91550

EUR 26811 EN

ISBN 978-92-79-39783-7

ISSN 1831-9424

doi:10.2788/12174

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2014

© European Union, 2014

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged

How to cite this report:

Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) – Evaluation of 2013 MS DCF Annual Reports & Data Transmission (STECF-14-13) 2014. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, EUR 26811 EN, JRC 91550, 257 pp.

Printed in Italy

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Reque	st to the STECF
STEC	F observations
STEC	F conclusions and recommendations
Expert	t Working Group EWG-14-07 report5
1	Executive summary6
2	Introduction
2.1	Terms of Reference for EWG-14-07
2.2	Pre-screening exercise 9
2.3	General overview from Pre-screening exercise
3	ToR1: Evaluation of Member States Annual Reports for 2013
3.1	Overall Evaluation
3.2	SUB GROUP 1
3.3	SUB GROUP 2
3.4	SUB GROUP 3
3.5	SUB GROUP 4
4	ToR 2: Evaluation of Member States transmission of DCF data to end users in 201323
5	ToR 3: Evaluate how the exercise of Annual Report preparation and evaluation by STECF could be simplified in future
6	EWG-14-07 List of Participants
7	List of Background Documents
	ANNEX 1 – MEETING AGENDA
	ANNEX 2 – DETAILED AR EVALUATION FORM BY MS34
	ANNEX 3 – DETAILED DT EVALUATION TABLE BY MS 156
	ANNEX 4 – TEMPLATE OF THE EVALUATION FORM FOR THE ANNUAL REPORT EVALUATION
	ANNEX 5 – EXERCISE ON THE USE OF A QUALITATIVE EVALUATION. 245
	ANNEX 6 – REPORT ON IMPROVEMENT OF EVALUATION PROCESS, STECF EWO 14-07247

# SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR FISHERIES (STECF)

**Evaluation of 2013 MS DCF Annual Reports & Data Transmission (STECF-14-13)** 

# THIS REPORT WAS REVIEWED DURING THE PLENARY MEETING HELD IN COPENHAGEN, DENMARK, 7-11 JULY 2014

# **Request to the STECF**

STECF is requested to review the report of the STECF Expert Working Group, evaluate the findings and make any appropriate comments and recommendations.

### **STECF observations**

STECF acknowledges the intensive and thorough work performed by EWG 14-07. All three Terms of Reference have been fully addressed. The Annual Reports 2013 of 22 MS, excluding the Bulgarian Annual Report (withdrawn from evaluation), were reviewed in relation to MS National Programme proposals for 2011-2013 or updates for 2013. As in previous years, the Annual Reports were prescreened by a group of experts before the meeting, which again facilitated an effective evaluation of the extensive material (report text and standard tables) provided by MS. STECF acknowledges that the EWG explored a first approach for a more quantitative evaluation of MS compliance with the DCF and the Annual Report guidelines, based on suggestions from EWG 13-07.

Additionally, the EWG 14-07 reviewed tables with information from end-users on data transmission by MS in 2013. STECF notes that the coverage of RFMOs in the end-user feedback has improved compared to previous years. In contrast to last year's evaluation of data transmission, the MS reply on end-user comments was already included in the tables. STECF acknowledges this progress, as the EWG was one step ahead in the process of communicating data transmission failures between end-users, the Commission and MS. Moreover, a complete list of MS derogations was available to the EWG, which facilitated judgements on the relevance of some end-user comments that indicated missing data from MS in cases where MS were not obliged to collect these data due to an approved derogation.

Altogether, the EWG 14-07 has reviewed more than 400 data transmission issues. STECF notes, however, that an indication of <u>severity</u> of data transmission failures or delays was not included in the

data transmission tables. This information would have allowed the EWG to appropriately comment on the likely negative effects of data transmission failures on the end-user work, which would help the Commission in applying financial sanctions to MS that are "proportionate to the degree of non-compliance" (Reg. 199/2008, Article 8.6).

STECF acknowledges that the EWG 14-07 has provided valuable input for improvements of the Annual Report evaluation process under its ToR 3, including a short-term and long-term scenario.

# **STECF conclusions**

# Annual reports

STECF concludes that the pre-screening of Member States' DCF Annual Reports and Data Transmission issues should be continued. To ensure effective quantitative evaluation of compliance as started by EWG 14-07, STECF considers that this approach is further explored and addressed by the EWG 14-17 and that objective criteria are defined to categorise MS compliance.

To continue the improvements of the Annual Report evaluation process and to assess MS compliance, STECF considers that the guidelines and table templates for submission of MS' Annual Reports and evaluation sheets be amended and guidelines for pre-screeners be established in accordance with the suggestions in the EWG 14-07 Report.

STECF concludes that the EWG 14-07 report provides sufficient information to identify cases of non-compliance and cases where additional information is needed from MS.

# Data transmission

STECF concludes that EWG 14-07 did its best in supporting the Commission in identifying relevant data transmission failures. To further improve the evaluation process, STECF urges the European Commission to seek feedback from end-users of DCF data analyses to indicate the severity of any impacts of data transmission issues on their work.

The EWG 14-07 Report identifies several issues associated with compliance of data transmission and STECF requests the Commission to provide further guidance and clarification on how to deal with such issues before next year's evaluation.

# Compilation of STECF recommendations for consideration by MS in their Annual Reports

MS are obliged to respond to STECF recommendations in their Annual Reports. The EWG is then required to evaluate whether MSs have adequately addressed these in their ARs. Given that a compiled list of STECF recommendations for action by MSs is not currently available, STECF considers that it would be beneficial if an *ad hoc* contract could be provided to compile such a list. The compiled list could then be forwarded to the European Commission for consideration and transmitted to MS and EWG. To ensure that MSs are kept fully informed of any future actions arising through the evaluation process, STECF proposes that the Commission (DG MARE) maintains and amends the compiled list and circulates to MSs annually.

# REPORT TO THE STECF

# EXPERT WORKING GROUP ON Evaluation of 2013 MS DCF Annual Reports & Data Transmission (EWG-14-07)

Oostende, Belgium, 23-27 June 2014

This report does not necessarily reflect the view of the STECF and the European Commission and in no way anticipates the Commission's future policy in this area

### 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The STECF Expert Working Group (EWG 14-07) met in Oostende, Belgium, from the 23<sup>rd</sup> to the 27<sup>th</sup> of June to assess Annual Reports (AR) of the 23 non landlocked Member States. Under the process of evaluation and approval of the outcomes of the National Programmes (NP), the European Commission is legally bound to consult STECF about the execution of the NP approved by the Commission and about the quality of the data collected by the Member States (MS) in accordance with Articles 7.1 and 7.2 of Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008. The task of assessing the Member States AR constitutes the Term of Reference 1 (ToR1) of this EWG.

In addition, annually the Commission needs to evaluate the level of compliance of the DCF Data Transmission (DT) by the Member States to the end users and its ability to meet the criteria set up by the end users. The EWG was requested to assess the feedback from seven end users on 2013 data transmission. Those end users are: ICES, GFCM, ICCAT, NAFO, STECF/DG MARE, IOTC and WCFCP. The total number of data transmission issues the group had to assess was 429, unevenly divided over the 23 MS. This task constitutes the ToR2 for this EWG.

Annual reports and Data Transmission reports were assessed by a group of pre-screeners before the EWG meeting. The pre-screening exercise took place beforehand and has proved to be an extremely important step to facilitate the EWG evaluation. However, questions on consistency and coherence across pre-screeners evaluation were raised in this meeting as they have had also been raised in the previous EWG 13-07. The need for a guiding document to support the pre-screening exercise is a major conclusion the pre-screeners group has drawn from their experience. The outcome of the pre-screening was presented to the group at the beginning of the meeting and their conclusions are included in this report under section 2.2. The results of the pre-screening were made available to the STECF EWG experts by the 17<sup>th</sup> of June.

Under the EWG, the assessment of the AR and DT issues were carried out in subgroups. The 30 experts attending the meeting were split into four subgroups and tasked with different modules from the annual report, in accordance with the expertise in the subgroup. The expertise was split into two subgroups of biologists, one subgroup of economists and a subgroup of economists and biologists. The latter subgroup, with mixed expertise, was in charge of the evaluation of transversal variables from the AR and the whole set of DT issues. This was the first time both biologists and economists worked together within a subgroup and at the end the format has proven to be effective to assess the issues related with both biological and economic data.

To thoroughly comply with ToR 1 and ToR2, the EWG was requested to produce two types of outputs, one template (excel file) for each Member State (MS) with the evaluation of their Annual Report and another template (excel file), for each MS with the evaluation of the Data Transmission exercise.

The EWG was able to thoroughly address ToR 1 and ToR2 and according to the request, two templates were produced for each MS. Those are included in the report under Annexes 2 and 3, and organized by MS in alphabetical order.

The conclusions from ToR 1 - Evaluation of the Annual reports, are:

• The annual reports from 22 MS were duly evaluated;

- Serious problems encountered in the Bulgarian Annual Report has prevented the group from evaluating the AR from this MS;
- Overall, the level of achievement of the 2013 Annual Reports shows an improvement compared with previous years; it shows an improvement in quality for both the achievements attained by MS and their reporting procedures.
- 3 MS scored with an overall evaluation of Yes (compliance level >90%), 15 MS with an overall evaluation of Mostly (50%<compliance level<90%), and 4 with Partial (10%<compliance level<50%).
- However, three MS have shown a decrease in overall compliance compared with last year's evaluation. These MS are Finland, Malta and Romania.

The conclusions from ToR 2 – evaluation of Data Transmission Issues are:

- 429 data transmission issues were evaluated;
- From these, 320 issues were judged as satisfactorily justified by MS, 79 unsatisfactorily explained or justified, and there were 40 issues, that due to their nature, were not possible to judge and therefore were identified in the judgment as NA (Not possible to Assess).
- Even though the task has been accomplished, the group concluded that the exercise on the assessment of the data transmission compliance still needs to be fine-tuned by the Commission before it's being send to the EWG for the assessment. Moreover, there are several issues for which its clarification is paramount for the good development of the work. The EWG suggest these issued to be clarified and/or solved before next year's evaluation. These issues are identified under Section 4.

Apart from the exercise on the assessment of the AR and on the data transmission compliance, the group was also tasked with a **ToR3**, request to **identify actions that could improve this exercise in the future**, either by the use of some IT tools or by identifying how the process can be simplified in the future and also taking into account the outcomes and suggestion from STECF 13-25.

This ToR 3 was firstly addressed by a subgroup of experts and afterwards discussed in plenary. The EWG has succeeded in fully addressing the ToR by producing a stand-alone document, included in Annex 6. This document tackles the ToR by first describing the current reporting and assessing process for both the MS and the STECF EWG, and then by identifying actions and the way forward by suggesting two scenarios:

- 1) a Short term scenario (thoroughly exploited) that shall be implemented prior to December 2014 and for which a complete and very comprehensive description of the actions to be taken is included; and
- 2) **a Long term scenario** that goes along with the envisaged new DCF and briefly exploits the idea of having an IT platform dealing with data provisions and IT tools for the Member States' reporting activities and for the subsequent exercises of assessment; but that needs further developments when more information on the future DCF becomes available.

The EWG considers that the document produced must be seen as starting point for future developments and that it shall be addressed to one of the next two STECF EWG's that will take place in October and November 2014 (EWG 14-17 and 14-18), as a specific ToR, for further development and/or implementation.

## 2 Introduction

The STECF Expert Working Group (EWG 14-07) met in Oostende, Belgium, from the 23rd to the 27th of June 2014 to assess Annual Reports (AR) of the 23 non landlocked Member States. Under the process of evaluation and approval of the outcomes of the National Programmes (NP), the European Commission is legally bound to consult STECF about the execution of the NP approved by the Commission and about the quality of the data collected by the Member States (MS) in accordance Articles 7.1 and 7.2 of Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008.

The work was developed by 30 independent experts; the list of participants is included in section 6. The agenda is included in Annex 1. Tasks to be addressed were split by subgroups and experts were allocated to each sub-group according to the expertise. For each sub-group, a rapporteur was identified who was in charge of the final responsibility to present the sub-group results.

# 2.1 Terms of Reference for EWG-14-07

# **Terms of Reference**

- **1.** Evaluate Member States Annual Reports for 2013 in accordance with Article 7.2 of Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008, taking into account;
  - a. The execution of the National Programmes for 2013
  - b. The quality of the data collected by the Member States
- 2. Evaluate Member States transmission of DCF data to end users in 2013 based on information from end users and Member States' clarifications & explanations in response to the end-user feedback. Particular attention will be paid to:
  - a. Response by MS to calls for data launched by the Commission in order to feed into scientific advice provided by STECF:
    - Aquaculture data call,
    - Annual Effort data call,
    - Fleet economic data call.
    - Processing industry data call,
    - Mediterranean & Black Sea data call.
  - b. Data transmission to end-users in 2013 with a focus on feedback on data availability, quality, gaps and the data used in the scientific advisory process provided by ICES, GFCM, IOTC, WPCFC and other RFMO to where scientific fishery data is mandatorily submitted by MS;

The EWG should produce for every Member State a) an evaluation of the annual report in the (excel) template provided by the Commission b) an evaluation of the data transmission to end users in the (excel) template provided by the Commission. In these two files, the EWG should identify the comments that require a reaction by the MS (resubmission of the annual report or clarification to the Commission) and those that are 'for information' only.

**3.** Evaluate how the exercise of Annual Report preparation and evaluation by STECF could be simplified in future, including through electronic filling in, and pre-screening of the Annual

Reports, simplification of the Annual Report formats taking into account the achievements and conclusions from the STECF EWG 13-25

# 2.2 Pre-screening exercise

Prior to the EWG assessment, the AR and DT issues have been evaluated by a pre-screening group that worked on an ad-hoc contract basis to DG MARE. Seven experts pre-screened the MS annual reports and the data compliance feedback from the end users. The task allocation among the seven experts was split by module as follows:

- 2 fleet economists, dealing with modules III.B and III.F; 11-12 MS each, apart from their own, plus module IV for the MS of the aqua./proc. economist below; Data calls on fleet economics and effort.
- 1 aquaculture/processing industry economist, dealing with modules IV.A and IV.B; all MS apart from his own, Data calls on aquaculture and processing industry
- 3 biologists, dealing with modules I, III.C, III.D, III.E and VI; 7-8 MS each, apart from their own, plus all other general and biological modules for the MS of the biologist below; Data calls: ICES, Med&BS, GFCM, ICCAT, IOTC and WCPFC
- 1 biologist, dealing with modules II, III.A, III.G, V, VII, VIII-XI; for all MS apart from his own; no data calls

The group started its work on 4<sup>th</sup> of June, when most Annual Reports were available and delivered its result on 17<sup>th</sup> of June. All results were available one week in advance to the meeting to all the experts through the web folder for the EWG meeting at the STECF FTP facilities.

# 2.3 General overview from Pre-screening exercise

2.3.1 Evaluation of Annual Reports with regard to fleet economic/transversal variables, guidelines and templates

Overall, it appeared that some issues from previous AR evaluations have been fixed and thus the overall compliance has further increased slightly. However, some issues are recurrent for certain MS. Apparently; some MS either do not get informed about those or ignore these hints as the issues are regarded minor. This leads to a perpetuation of minor drawbacks. In future, these issues should either be ignored during the evaluation or amendment should be enforced consequently.

Some AR tables (e.g. III.B.3, III.F.1) have become different from the NP tables – in contrast to the original intention. This makes a sound comparison almost impossible and should by all means be avoided in the future.

The evaluation of economic variables per supra-region makes little or no sense. The presentation of supra-regions should be merged in the future.

The evaluation of the fleet economic and transversal tables of the ARs has proven to be mainly a scrutiny of terminology, completeness and consistency and, moreover, a comparison with the NP. This part is a typical task for IT routines. However, currently the tables are not designed in a way that would facilitate an automatic check.

In order to simplify or even overcome the necessity for that part of the evaluation it would be helpful to have a template for the AR provided which blocks any entry which is not in line

with the guidelines/naming conventions. This approach has been successfully pursued for e.g. the fleet economic data call.

Such a table could also be easily compared with the submitted NP if the NP were in the same format. Moreover, such a setup would also facilitate a comparison between AR and data transmission results. Any approved derogations could also be incorporated.

The Spanish AR was available only in Spanish language. Thus the text could be analysed only with some uncertainty, using online translation tools.

2.3.2 Evaluation of Annual Reports with regard to economic data from the aquaculture and processing industry

Aquaculture: Data collection under DCF/EU-MAP and Eurostat Regulation 762/2008 should be somehow harmonized and organized in a way that optimizes data collection and avoids if anyhow possible double data collecting and burden for the processors.

Processing industry: Structural Business Statistics (SBS) should be adapted with the missing variables depreciation (Spain stated that they are not part of the regulation), value of assets and debt.

2.3.3 Evaluation of data transmission (data calls for fleet economics, effort):

In general, it looks like several MS are still unable to timely deliver fleet economic data which were declared to be collected in both NP and AR. As this phenomenon is ongoing and causes gross inconsistencies in all kinds of applications, the reasons for these failures should be thoroughly investigated and finally amended.

The effort data call contains some variables that are not part of the transversal variables (e.g. discards, age). These aspects should additionally be judged by biologists, as these are biological data.

The data collection on recreational catches seems to require clarification. For several MS a transmission failure was flagged, but apparently the MS had good reasons. Ideally the obligation for collection of recreational catches would be documented and data submission would be compared against that information.

Several MS were unable to deliver certain effort variables for vessels without logbook obligation. This appears to be a recurring phenomenon. For this issue, a general handling should be developed and distributed – is it justified or not?

Failure in delivering data for 2013 should generally not be regarded as shortfall, as according to the approved NPs for 2013, data were only to be collected for 2012, and transmission of 2013 data is a voluntary input from MS.

2.3.4 Evaluation of Annual Reports with regard to biological variables

In general, there has been an improvement both in the AR text and tables for most MS. In some cases, there has been a progression in improvement in the past few years; in other instances, improvements are only relative to the last year.

It often seems to be challenging for MS how to report on sampling activities in 2013 that deviate from the NP 2011-2013, which was originally submitted in March 2010 based on 2007-2008 fisheries data and sampling experiences in 2009 (or 2008). Due to this time lag between reference years and actual sampling years, changes in fleet activities, status and quota of certain stocks etc. within this period often caused amendments in sampling plans that were more severe than foreseen.

For some modules without supporting tables, such as recreational fisheries (III.D) or data management (VI), evaluation is sometimes difficult because NPs were not updated and so planned objectives not really defined for the year evaluated. Some texts are summaries over several years; some others resumed precise actions carried out in 2013. Sometimes, there is no information on requested species. For data management, some MS consider that their IT system is fully operational and have nothing to report in the AR, some others carried out actions, but without traces in the last NP approved by the Commission. It could be relevant in the future that for each section of the AR, MS shall spell out first minor or major changes relating to NP objectives and clearly note if nothing was specially planned.

Table VI.1 is very heterogeneously filled. Even the five DG MARE data calls are not always reported. It would be helpful and advisable to have a minimal reference list provided by Commission, ICES and RFMOs, sent to MS to be included in their AR, as for Table II.B.1 on eligible meetings.

In the standard tables, some MS had filters still active in some of the sheets, or hidden columns in few cases. Sometimes, tables were also modified with added columns giving details by regions or by partners (see UK).

In contrast to the guidelines, CVs are still often reported in percentages instead of absolute numbers.

The range of CVs is very different from MS to MS, especially for discards (Table III.C.5), likely due to different calculation routines. It is, therefore, still doubtful if these values are comparable between MS. Some MS even wait for new COST tools/algorithms.

The minimum number of species and specimens planned in Tables III.C.5 and III.E.3 should be deleted, as these are numbers that with the concurrent sampling has not any meaning.

The correct application of naming conventions (region, species, métiers) has improved but still is an issue.

MS should check and report only those recommendations evidently addressed to them and not to all recommendations to other recipients. This should be also reported clearly in the format of the recommendations. If it is reported "to be addressed by RCM", obviously a MS does right in reporting it, as MS representatives are participating in RCMs.

### 2.3.5 Evaluation of data transmission (data calls for fisheries/biological data)

In many cases, the listed data transmission failures and MS comments on them represent a 'ping-pong' between MS and end users, with STECF and the Commission in-between, which is often not easy to follow.

Generally, the MS answers were quite clear and detailed, while the opinion of the end-user could be completely different.

Overall, there are too many comments of end-users not taking the DCF regulation into consideration. In several cases, end-user comments not clearly define the MS to be addressed, or they are not split by provinces, regions, or islands (see UK).

### 3 TOR1: EVALUATION OF MEMBER STATES ANNUAL REPORTS FOR 2013

The experts were organised in four subgroups. AR's were split by modules and then each module/group of modules was addressed by one subgroup according to the table below.

Module	Sub-group	Expertise
Modules IIIB and IV	Sub-group 1	Economist
Modules I, II, IIIA, IIIF, VI	Sub-group 2	Economist and Biologists
Modules IIIC and IIIE	Sub-group 3	Biologists
Modules IIID, IIIG, V and VII - XI	Sub-group 4	Biologists

Table 1 – Allocation of Modules by sub-group and expertise.

This year the EWG went through all parts of the annual reports. In the past, the modules VIII to XI had only been assessed by the pre-screeners. This time, in order to have a mirror of this assessment in the EWG report, it was decided to assess the AR in its whole extension and provide the feedback in the report. However, it shall be noted that the outcome of the evaluation of these modules (VIII to XI) is not considered for final overall evaluation attributed to each MS.

To carry out the evaluation, the group had access to some supporting information:

- the complete set of evaluation forms produced by the EWG13-07;
- the list of derogations the Commission has granted to the Member States, and
- a list of RCM recommendations and ICES expert group recommendations.

The availability of this information has proven to be essential for the good development of the work.

The evaluation form used for the assessment is included under Annex 4. This is an improved version of the evaluation form used in the past. The improvements done to the form were based on the suggestions from STECF EWG 13-07 and were done by the pre-screeners prior to the pre-screening exercise.

The criteria used for the evaluation of the AR are those presented in table below.

Compliance class	Compliance level	Score
No	<10%	N
Partly	10-50%	Р
Mostly	50-90%	М
Yes	>90%	Υ
NA	not applicable	NA

Table 2 - Criteria for the assessment of Annual Reports.

Though STECF EWG 13-07 has suggested a different approach for the assessment, for reasons of comparability with previous years' assessments and because the method suggested still needs further adjustments, the EWG has decided to stick to the official outcome of the evaluation to the criteria used previously (table 2). However, the EWG, <u>as a mere exercise</u>, used the methodology proposed by STECF EWG 13-07 and has prepared a parallel evaluation of the overall compliance in the AR 2013. The outcome of this exercise is shown in Annex 5 (Annex 5 - Exercise on the use of a qualitative evaluation) along with the comments arising from the exercise.

Section 3.1 outlines the compliance of Member States with regards to their data collection activities over 2013 and their annual reporting and constitutes the outcome of the EWG evaluation of the annual reports. The overall evaluation shown in section 3.1 is the summary evaluation of each MS based on the traffic light system and on the scale provided in Table 2.

Sections 3.2 to 3.5 give a brief report of the four evaluation subgroups. Each subgroup had to prepare the answer to six standard questions that were raised at the beginning. The evaluation questions are:

- 1. Overall comments on the pre-screening exercise was it helpful? Was it thorough? How could it be improved Provide Recommendations
- 2. Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview of the 23 MS, How many were YES, Mostly, Partially, NO?

Module	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	SUM

- 3. Overall what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation across MS? How would you resolve these? Provide recommendations.
- 4. Any specific issues (max 4) that arose that you would like to highlight. How would you resolve these? Provide recommendations?
- 5. What MS would you cite as good examples of how to complete these modules?
- 6. Do you consider that the quality of the data collected has effectively been evaluated through this assessment process? If yes, how. If not, how can this be considered for the future.

The detailed spreadsheets for each Member State are presented in Annex 2 and organized in alphabetical order.

The Annual Report for Bulgaria has not been evaluated by the EWG-14-07 given that it showed to be a repetition of the 2012 Annual report and not the Annual Report for the year 2013.

# 3.1 Overall Evaluation

								2014	- OVEI	RALL C	OMPL	IANCE											
	BEL	BUL	СҮР	DEN	EST	FIN	FRA	GER		IRL	ITA	LAT	1	MAL	NLD	POL	POR	ROM	SVN	ESP	SWE	GBR	HRV
OVERALL COMPLIANCE	М	N	М	М	Р	M	М	Υ	Р	M	М	М	М	Р	М	Υ	М	Р	М	М	Υ	М	М
Module I	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	М	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ
Module II	Р	N	М	М	M	М	М	Υ	М	Υ	М	Р	Р	Р	М	Υ	М	М	Р	М	Υ	М	Р
Module III.A	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	М	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Р	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Р	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ
Module III.B	M	NA	M	Υ	Υ	Υ	М	Υ	М	Р	Υ	Υ	Υ	М	М	Υ	М	М	Υ	Υ	М	М	NA
IIIC	M	N	Υ	Υ	Р	Υ	Р	Υ	Р	M	М	Υ	Р	Р	М	М	Υ	N	Р	М	Υ	М	М
IIID	Р	NA	NA	Р	Υ	Υ	М	Р	Υ	Υ	М	Υ	М	Υ	Υ	Υ	Р	Υ	М	Υ	Υ	М	Р
IIIE	M	N	Υ	M	Р	Υ	Р	M	М	М	Υ	M	M	Υ	М	Υ	М	Р	M	М	Υ	M	М
IIIF	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Р	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	М	М	Υ	Р	Υ	Υ	Р	Υ	Υ	Υ
IIIG	M	N	Υ	М	Υ	М	Υ	Υ	Р	Υ	М	M	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	М	М	Υ	М	Υ	M	Υ
Module IV.A	NA	NA	M	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Р	M	Υ	NA	NA	N	М	Υ	М	М	Υ	М	Υ	M	Υ
Module IV.B	M	N	M	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	М	M	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	М	Υ	Υ	Р	Υ	M	N
Module V	Υ	N	М	Υ	M	Υ	Υ	Υ	Р	Υ	М	M	Υ	Υ	М	Υ	Υ	Υ	M	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ
Module VI	Υ	N	M	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Р	Υ	Υ	Υ	М	М	М	Υ	Р	Υ	M	М	Υ	Υ	Υ
Module VII	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Р	N	Υ	Υ	М	Υ	Υ	Υ	Р	Υ	М	М	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	N
	EVALUATION ON MODULES VIII-XI IS MERELY INFORMATIVE. IT WAS NOT CONSIDERED FOR THE OVERALL RESULT																						
Module VIII	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ
Module IX	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ
Module X	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	М	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ
Module XI	Υ	М	Υ	М	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	М	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ

### 3.2 SUB GROUP 1

**Subgroup participants**: Monica Gambino (rapporteur), Constantin Stroie, Edo Avdič, Irina Davidjuka, Cecile Brigaudeau, Carlos Moura, Alexandra Sintori.

**Modules dealt with:** IIIB, and IV.

# **Questions to be addressed:**

# 1. Overall comments on the pre-screening exercise – was it helpful? Was it thorough? How could it be improved – Provide Recommendations:

The Pre-screening exercise is in most cases very helpful; however the group feels that this pre-screening exercise would benefit from the definition of guidelines about the terminology and criteria to be used by the pre-screeners.

# 2. Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview - of the 23 MS, How many were YES, Mostly, Partially, NO?

Module	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	NA	SUM
Module III.B	10	10	1	0	1	22*
Module IV.A	10	7	1	1	3	22*
Module IV.B	13	6	1	2	0	22*

<sup>\*</sup>The annual report from Bulgaria was not evaluated.

# 3. Overall what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation across MS. How would you resolve these? – Provide recommendations.

As already highlighted in previous meetings one of the main general issues that arose during the evaluation regards the presentation of CV's. In some cases the CV's were not presented even if mandatory (for example when the data collection scheme was a census and the response rate was lower than 70%). Furthermore, there are indications that the CV's were wrongly estimated (for example when the response rate is 100% and the CV is not zero). One reason for this could be that the CV of the sample is calculated instead of the CV of the estimator.

Another major issue concerns Table IV.B.1. The guidelines are not clear and can be misguiding regarding the segmentation of the companies by the number of employees. The segmentation mentioned in the guidelines (Table IV.B.1) is not mentioned in the regulation.

Furthermore, it is still not clear whether the data presented in Table III.B.3 must refer to non-clustered as well as clustered segments. According to SGECA recommendation (STECF Expert Working Group EWG 11-18), Table III.B.2 should contain information on the clustering scheme. Tables III.B.1 and III.B.3 should contain information on segments which are not clustered or, in case of clustering, for clusters .In case clustering is used only for reporting purposes Tables III.B.1 and III.B3 should be filled in with non-clustered segment names."

Finally, the EWG experts are not clear on how to evaluate B3"Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations", in the cases that the MSs don't explicitly mention their recommendations of the Liaison Meeting. Specifically, when the MS states that there are no

relevant recommendations should the evaluation of the EWG be "Not applicable (NA)" or "YES".

# 4. Any specific issues (max 4) that arose that you would like to highlight. How would you resolve these? Provide recommendations?

In their annual report, MSs are required to refer separately for each of their supra regions. The EWG suggests that this should only be mandatory when the MS does not apply the same methodology for all the supra regions. In all other cases the EWG suggests that there should be one common text for all supra regions under a heading that states all the supra regions.

It is the opinion of the EWG that the guidelines should be clearer regarding the format of accuracy indicators. The format can be expressed either as a percentage or as an absolute number in all tables.

It should be clear that in Tables III.B.1., III.B.2. and III.B.3. the reference year should be the same, i.e., 2012.

Data in Table III.B.1 has to be presented separately for active and inactive vessels.

# 5. What MS would you cite as good examples of how to complete these modules?

Denmark, Germany, Slovenia, Italy be regarded as good examples for Modules III.B, IV.A and IV.B, considering the overall implementation of the AR guidelines.

6. Do you consider that the quality of the data collected has effectively been evaluated through this assessment process? If yes, how? If not, how can this be considered for the future.

In order to improve the efficiency of the evaluation process it is suggested that specific guidelines for filling the evaluation sheet have to be provided before the evaluation process begins. This will result in a more homogenous evaluation of all MS.

### 3.3 SUB GROUP 2

**Subgroup participants**: Henrik Degel (rapporteur), Paolo Carpentieri, Michael Ebeling, Jörg Berkenhagen, Tiit Raid, Edvardas Kazlauskas, Arina Motova and Armelle Jung.

**Modules dealt with:** Modules I, II, IIIA, IIIF and VI.

# Questions to be addressed:

1. Overall comments on the pre-screening exercise – was it helpful? Was it thorough? How could it be improved – Provide Recommendations

The Pre-screening was concluded to be very helpful and should be retained.

It is recommended, that explicit and clear guidelines for the pre-screeners should be provided and pre-screeners should not require anything that exceeds the requirements, provided in the guidelines or DCF legislation.

The electronic tool in order to support pre-screening process with the respect to terminologies and formats used might be helpful.

# 2. Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview - of the 23 MS, How many were YES, Mostly, Partially, NO?

Module	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	NA	SUM
Module I	18	1	0	3	0	22*
Module II	4	12	6	0	0	22*
Module III.A	19	1	2	0	0	22*
Module III.F	17	2	3	0	0	22*
Module VI	14	6	2	0	0	22*

<sup>\*</sup>The annual report from Bulgaria was not evaluated.

# 3. Overall what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation across MS. How would you resolve these? – Provide recommendations.

It is very difficult to evaluate consistency between AR and NP when there are differences between the reference years (i.e. the references years used for planning in the NP and the year of the implementation of the AR). Often there is a mismatch of several years between submission of NP and its implementation. It is advisable to submit by MS a "work plan" (may be only the tables in excel or similar....) at the beginning of each implementation year in order to make possible thereafter the comparison with the AR.

It is difficult to get a complete overview of all data calls relevant for the DCF. It is advisable to have a list of relevant data calls compiled on the basis of inputs from all end users (ICES, STECF, GFCM etc.) These lists should be available both for MS and EWG.

The results of pilot studies are often used as an argument in order do not to comply with the DCF. A proper evaluation of the results of the pilot studies (similar to the derogations process: approved or rejected) should be available, both for MS and EWG. Different RCM could provide a list of pilot studies, with the main outputs, conclusion and recommendations.

It was not clear if the complete list of STECF recommendations is available and which recommendations are either relevant and/or for which sections. Often there is an overlap and important recommendations might be missed if not allocated to a specific section. We recommend that complete list of STECF recommendations should be available both for MS and EWG.

# 4. Any specific issues (max 4) that arose that you would like to highlight. How would you resolve these? Provide recommendations?

How to deal with the reference year for transversal variables. There is no specific recommendation in the DCF regarding the reference year for transversal variables. However generally the reference year should be the same as AR in case when administrative data sources are used (e.g. logbooks, Fleet Register, sales notes etc.) and it is not clearly stated in the NP. It is recommended to define clearly the reference year for transversal variables and in particular for data coming from the administrative sources.

# 5. What MS would you cite as good examples of how to complete these modules?

Sweden, Poland, Germany.

# 6. Do you consider that the quality of the data collected has effectively been evaluated through this assessment process? If yes, how. If not, how can this be considered for the future.

As a general issue, during the evaluation process it is almost impossible to evaluate the quality of the collected data. MS are requested to report the "quantity" (e.g. number of species, number of fishing trips sampled, etc.) of the data collected in order to compare the achieved with the planned ones. The only indicator (CV) is not enough to evaluate the quality. Without any other indicators, the quality of the data could be evaluated properly only by the end-users.

On the other hand there is no target quality levels defined for some variable groups (e.g. transversal). This was intended for good reason and should be continued that way. In that case the quality of data collected cannot be quantitatively evaluated. However, in order to evaluate the data quality in these cases, some guidance should be developed (e.g. desirable coverage rates with respect to fleet segment size and importance).

# 3.4 SUB GROUP 3

**Subgroup participants**: Gráinne Ní Chonchúir (rapporteur), Christoph Stransky, Angeliki Adamidou, Angeles Armesto, Sofie Vandemaele, Marina Dias, Maria Yankova, Margaret Bell and Violin Raykov.

Modules dealt with: Modules IIIC and IIIE.

## Questions to be addressed:

1. Overall comments on the pre-screening exercise – was it helpful? Was it thorough? How could it be improved – Provide Recommendations

The pre-screening was generally very thorough and accurate and helpful. The evaluation did have to be completely re – written in just a very small number of cases. However this does raise concerns regarding the quality and the consistency of evaluations amongst pre – screeners.

- Several issues across all modules are still causing confusion for MS's so perhaps updating the guidelines with clearer directions will help
- In the end, it was agreed by all that the pre screening process does significantly speed up the evaluation process during the EWG.

# 2. Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview - of the 23 MS, How many were YES, Mostly, Partially, NO?

Overall performance per MS in Modules III.C and III.E was generally good, with a few exceptions. The performance per MS is presented below:

Module	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	NA	SUM
Module III.C	7	9	6	0	0	22*
Module III.E	6	13	3	0	0	22*

<sup>\*</sup>The annual report from Bulgaria was not evaluated.

3. Overall what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation across MS. How would you resolve these? – Provide recommendations.

- As MS are allowed to use different aggregations of sampling units (metiers, sampling frames etc.) in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4, these tables are often hard or impossible to compare, and as a result there is no value in having two tables. Suggestion: Data to be presented in one Table.
- There are different interpretations by MS how to fill in Tables III.C.5 and III.C.6 (all species or just target and major by-catch species?). Suggestion: Only one table is needed. Guidelines should clearly define which species should be included. The guidelines could be updated with a sentence to highlight what should be reported in table III.C.6, e.g. "Table III.C.6 must include all species encountered during the implementation of concurrent sampling, even those species not required under Commission Decision 93/2010."
- Many MS did not reach sampling targets, but this was justified due to a move towards "Statically Sound" sampling schemes, which we accepted as justified, e.g. Germany.
- Tuna sampled in the Mediterranean under ICCAT, should be reported under "other regions" in the DCF AR. According to decision 2010/93/UE, appendix II, other regions where fisheries are operated by EU vessels and managed by RFMOs to which the Community is a contracting party or observer; the region must be reported as "Other regions";
- Tables not completed: "Total no of trips during the sampling year", CV's not calculated or reported.

# 4. Any specific issues (max 4) that arose that you would like to highlight. How would you resolve these? Provide recommendations?

- 1. Most MS commented on their prioritisation of their sampling efforts or lab work (e.g. age readings) in order to improve data quality in the most cost-efficient way. We should acknowledge any efforts of MS to focus on those fisheries, stocks etc. where achieving good data quality is possible. However there is still a necessity to provide all the requested data.
- 2. It is a time consuming process to find in the text of the AR the explanations for each shortfall. The evaluation process could possibly be improved if an extra column with comments/explanations on shortfalls were added to tables III.C and III.E.
- 3. France is still using the old versions of the standard tables, and has copied and pasted text exactly from last year's report, just updating some numbers.
- 4. Latvia, also used an old version of the standard tables, and did additional, unnecessary work on calculating cv's for volume of discards in Table III.C.5.

### 5. What MS would you cite as good examples of how to complete these modules?

Module III.C: Cyprus, Germany, Denmark, Latvia, Finland, Portugal and Sweden.

Module III.E: Cyprus, Italy, Malta, Poland, Finland and Sweden.

# 6. Do you consider that the quality of the data collected has effectively been evaluated through this assessment process? If yes, how. If not, how can this be considered for the future.

Data quality can only be thoroughly assessed in close collaboration with end-users, with the help of statisticians and people that have in-depth knowledge on how the data have been collected.

Quality: in terms of planned sampling levels against achieved sampling levels, have been effectively evaluated. However a true evaluation of the quality of the data collected would require information such as, a detailed description of the sampling protocols/approach, e.g. random sampling, stratified sampling etc.... Are the sampling schemes in line with best practice guidelines and regionally or internationally agreed protocols? For example ICCAT have specific protocols regarding the collection of data on Large Pelagic Fish species: www.iccat.int/en/ICCATManual.asp.

Also a quality evaluation would require information on the number of sampling events, sample coverage, and an estimation of bias, which are currently not readily available in the DCF AR's.

# 3.5 SUB GROUP 4

**Subgroup participants**: Ingeborg de Boois (rapporteur), Maria Hansson, Leyla Knittweis, Tomasz Nermer, Gheorghe Radu, Jens Ulleweit and Lucia Zarauz.

**Modules dealt with:** IIID, IIIG, V, VII-XI.

Questions to be addressed:

- 1. Overall comments on the pre-screening exercise was it helpful? Was it thorough? How could it be improved Provide Recommendations
  - Pre-screening was done thoroughly and it was helpful for the screening exercise.
  - To facilitate consistency throughout the evaluations it would be helpful to give guidance for pre-screening and screening. A decision tree could support the decision when to put 'Yes', 'No', 'NA' or 'No comments', or additional text in the evaluation tables.
- 2. Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview of the 23 MS, How many were YES, Mostly, Partially, NO?

Module	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	NA	SUM
IIID-recreational fisheries	11	5	5	0	1	22*
IIIG-surveys	12	9	1	0	0	22*
V-evaluation of effects of fishing sector	15	6	1	0	0	22*
VII-STECF recommendations	15	3	2	2	0	22*
VIII-acronyms	22	0	0	0	0	22*
IX-comments	22	0	0	0	0	22*
X-references	17	1	0	4	0	22*
XI-annexes	19	3	0	0	0	22*

<sup>\*</sup>The annual report from Bulgaria was not evaluated.

- 3. Overall what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation across MS. How would you resolve these? Provide recommendations.
  - The group recommends that a reporting table for recreational fisheries achievements is incorporated in the AR tables to support consistency and transparency and to facilitate comparison with NP proposal. Possible parameters that could be included are: region, species, sampling method, derogations, number of samples planned, number of samples achieved.
  - III.D (recreational fisheries):
    - i. Data quality targets: it is not clear how relevant the current quality targets are. It is recommended that either the evaluation questions are modified, or that sensible data quality targets are being developed.
    - ii. Questions on derogations in III.D.1 and III.D.3 are confusing. It is not clear what the difference is. It is recommended that one of the questions is deleted.
  - 1. Follow-up of recommendations (also in other modules than VII): recommendations should be stored in a database to easily identify all relevant recommendations for each MS. This is something that has already been done by ICES, with very good results. There could be one European database compiling all recommendations made by STECF, JRC and RCM; and different databases compiling the recommendations made by the relevant RFMO (ICES, GFCM, ICCAT, etc). A link to where to find these databases containing the recommendations should be included in the AR guidelines.
- d. Module IX (comments, suggestions, recommendations):
  - The evaluation of Module IX cannot be done by using compliance classes. It is recommended that the comments, suggestions, recommendations from MS that need follow-up, are listed by the STECF-EWG in a format provided by the Commission, and are taken on board by STECF plenary and/or the Commission. If recommendations are stored in a database, this information can easily be imported into it.
  - Some MS write in section IX general comments which are not related to the AR (e.g. Romania). These are relevant comments but they are addressed to the wrong forum and they are likely to be lost. It seems that often MS do not know to which forum they should address their comments and suggestions. It is recommended that this communication problem is addressed, preferably by a short clarification in the AR guidelines. The current description is very broad 'Use this section to comment on general problems encountered while planning or executing the NP, to indicate inconsistencies in the DCF, to suggest improvements, etc.'.
  - Some comments have been incorporated in this document, or in the document related to ToR3. It is however recommended that the Commission reads all comments, suggestions and recommendations done by MS (BEL, ESP, NED, ROM, SWE) as some apply to general issues, the NP and/or the financial forms.
- 4. Any specific issues (max 4) that arose that you would like to highlight. How would you resolve these? Provide recommendations?
  - 1. Issues related to the AR Tables:

- i. It is recommended that the header of column L of Table IIIG ("Planned target") is changed into "Planned target according to NP" in order to be more specific and avoid misunderstandings.
- ii. (based on comment from Spain) incorporate fishing stock in Table III\_C\_5 and III\_C\_6.
- iii. (based on comment from Belgium) provide drop-down lists in the reporting tables to improve consistency throughout the tables (e.g. Table III\_E\_3).
- 2. (based on comment made by Spain) The stock area descriptions in the DCF do not always correspond with the ICES working group stock areas. At least for horse mackerel they are different. Especially for data transmission it is extremely important to compare the right stocks. It is recommended that stock description consistency between DCF/DC-MAP and ICES descriptions is checked for all stocks to prevent the same problem in DC-MAP.
- 3. (based on comment made by Spain) The recommendation by SGRN-ECA 09-01 'SGRN propose that a column indicating the length of the fishing season and the average fishing trip is included in the NP (Table III\_C\_1)' does not seem to be taken into account. It is recommended that it should be clearly explained why this has not been implemented.
- 4. It is not clear how results of pilot studies should be presented, as countries now report on the pilot studies differently (sometimes in text, sometimes in Annex). Portugal serves as a good example for a suggestion: the pilot study reporting format is along the same lines as the AR reporting format.

## 5. What MS would you cite as good examples of how to complete these modules?

- o Ireland is a good example except for the recommendation section;
- o Sweden is a good example;
- o Pilot study reporting format: Portugal (Annex II, III, IV).

# 6. Do you consider that the quality of the data collected has effectively been evaluated through this assessment process? If yes, how. If not how can this be considered for the future.

The data quality is not effectively evaluated through this process, as the questions in the evaluation sheet often refer to completeness or consistency of the tables, which is a matter of reporting skills and accuracy to put the right things in the right cells following the guidelines. Suggestions for improvement: see ToR 3.

# 4 TOR 2: EVALUATION OF MEMBER STATES TRANSMISSION OF DCF DATA TO END USERS IN 2013

Under ToR2, the EWG was requested to evaluate the compliance of the data transmission by Member States to the end users over 2013 based on information from end users and Member States' clarifications & explanations in response to the end-user feedback.

Compared with the exercises from previous years, the inclusion of MS clarification and/or explanation is an improvement of the process. Providing this information allows a more comprehensive approach for the experts.

There were 439 (see table below) issues from seven different end-users addressed to the EWG for evaluation. The EWG was requested to evaluate if it consider **satisfactory** or **unsatisfactory** the explanation/feedback provided by the MS to the issue raised by the end-users.

	Number of
End User/ Data requested	Issues to be
	assessed
GFCM	35
Task 11 Fleet and area variables	3
Task 12 Main resource and activity components variables per Operational Units	6
Task 13 Economic component variables	7
Task 14 Catch and effort variables catch effort discard bycacth	10
Task 15 Provisional biological parameters	9
ICCAT	9
Task 2	6
Task 1	3
ICES	291
Data call under Intercatch for	217
Ecoregion	84
ютс	5
Artisanal and long line fleet	1
Longliners	2
Purse seiners	2
JRC/DG MARE	83
Aquaculture	16
Effort	14
Fleet economics	22
Med and BS	9
Processing	22
NAFO	5
Biological information (Sex, Length, Age)	5
WCPFC	1
TASK II data (Aggregate catch/effort data) and TASK III (operational data)	1
Total	439

While conducting the evaluation, the group felt the need to create a third category for the evaluation: **Not possible to assess (NA).** This category was used to classify issues for which the information provided by the MS was in conflict with the information provided by the end user and for which the evaluation can only be done by accessing the supporting elements identified either by the MS or the end user. (e.g. email, official letters with DG MARE, etc)

In summary, the evaluation of the transmission issues concluded that **320** issues were satisfactory, 79 unsatisfactory and **40** as Not possible to assess (NA).

The complete list of the issues for each MS together with EWG comment and assessment is included in Annex 3, as a table for each MS organized on alphabetic order.

Even though the task was accomplished, the group concluded that the exercise on the assessment on the compliance of the data transmission still needs to be fine-tuned by the Commission. Issues that are: (1) repetition of situations already assessed in the past; (2) situation depending on administrative procedures which are out of the scope of this EWG or

(3) issues that due to its nature are out of the framework of DCF should be filtered in advance by the Commission and not addressed to this EWG for the assessment.

Moreover, there are several issues for which clear guidance and clarification is paramount for the good development of the work and which the group would suggest to be solved before next year's evaluation, these are:

- How strict should one be concerning late submission? What are the evaluation criteria? (Shall the judgment take into account only the respect or not of the deadline, or also the impact the delay of the data has on the working groups?)
- Timing of data calls often conflicts with the timing of data collection in the NP. How shall this conflict be evaluated? Is this an issue to be considered by this EWG?
- What about data not collected in the past (for which the MS presumably already has faced cuts in funding) when this issue is raised again in the following years?
- Data requested by GFCM are not always in line with the data collected under the DCF (e.g. Vessel segmentation). The same applies to the effort data call. How should these issues be evaluated?
- How to deal with data requests including data prior to 2002 (the start of the DCR)?
- Should this EWG assess the compliance of data transmission compared with what has being requested under DCF or also compared with what is being requested under the RFMO data programmes?
- What about when a MS year after year promise to fix a problem and seem to do very little about it? A way to trace the history of certain issues is needed.
- Often more than one issue is included in one end user statement. This makes it difficult to evaluate in a streamlined way.
- Data call should in general be more target specific (e.g. not requesting data to a MS which is not involved in the actual fishery).

# 5 TOR 3: EVALUATE HOW THE EXERCISE OF ANNUAL REPORT PREPARATION AND EVALUATION BY STECF COULD BE SIMPLIFIED IN FUTURE

This ToR was mainly addressed by a small subgroup of experts and then further in plenary. The experts taking part of this subgroup were requested to take into consideration the comments/issues arising in each subgroup over the evaluation of the Annual Reports (ToR1) and Data Transmission (ToR2) as starting point to feed into ToR3. Apart from that, experts were also requested to further elaborate this ToR around two main scenarios:

A short-term scenario: corresponds to what shall be implemented prior to December 2014, when the MS start to compile their ARs. The purpose is to improve the evaluation and reporting exercise, therefore the approach shouldn't be difficult to implement and should be possible to be dealt with by a sub-group over one or two EWG. Preferably, these envisaged developments must represent a step forward for the future; and

A long-term scenario: This scenario needs to go along with the envisaged new DCF and shall explore the idea of having an IT platform dealing with data provisions and IT tools for the Member States reporting activities and for the subsequent exercises of assessment.

The EWG has produced a stand-alone document, included in Annex 6, which tackles this issue by first describing the current situation for both the MS and the STECF EWG, and then by identifying actions and the way forward for the two scenarios.

For the short term scenario, a long but comprehensive list of issues to be dealt with in the short term was created, also the identification of AR standard tables that need some adjustments, the fields to be added and /or removed and list of nomenclatures that needs to be identified in order to foster an harmonized reporting across MS;

For the second scenario, given the still unclear situation on DCF, some considerations were made, but the group considers that this scenario shall be further developed when more detailed information becomes available.

The conclusions for the short-term scenario can be summarised as follow:

The outcome of current EWG shall be further developed and implemented throughout the upcoming DCF EWG meetings to be held by the end of the current year. The document produced by this STECF EWG, included in Annex 6, shall be considered as starting point for one Term of Reference. These developments shall include (see also Annex 6):

- Production of guidelines for the pre-screening and evaluation exercises. These guidelines shall include the principles to ensure a consistent, rigorous and quality-based assessment of the annual reports against the criteria set out by legal framework and best practices.
- Update the guidelines for the compilation of Annual Reports in accordance with EWG 14-07 suggestions.
- Improving the Standard tables for the annual reporting. These improvements shall be made by reviewing the usefulness of some of the tables and the needs to revise some others. The complete list of changes to be made is given in Annex 6. But also some improvements can be achieved by making use of dropdown menus to ensure the harmonization of the designation, codes, nomenclatures, etc. used by MS.

### 6 EWG-14-07 LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

1 - Information on STECF members and invited experts' affiliations is displayed for information only. In some instances the details given below for STECF members may differ from that provided in Commission COMMISSION DECISION of 27 October 2010 on the appointment of members of the STECF (2010/C 292/04) as some members' employment details may have changed or have been subject to organisational changes in their main place of employment. In any case, as outlined in Article 13 of the Commission Decision (2005/629/EU and 2010/74/EU) on STECF, Members of the STECF, invited experts, and JRC experts shall act independently of Member States or stakeholders. In the context of the STECF work, the committee members and other experts do not represent the institutions/bodies they are affiliated to in their daily jobs. STECF members and invited experts make declarations of commitment (yearly for STECF members) to act independently in the public interest of the European Union. STECF members and experts also declare at each meeting of the STECF and of its Expert Working Groups any specific interest which might be considered prejudicial to their independence in relation to specific items on the agenda. These declarations are displayed on the public meeting's website if experts explicitly authorized the JRC to do so in accordance with EU legislation on the protection of personnel data. For more information: <a href="http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/adm-declarations">http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/adm-declarations</a>

### STECF members:

Name	Address <sup>1</sup>	Tel.	<u>Email</u>
STECF members			
Abella, J. Alvaro (vice-chair)	ARPAT – AREA MARE Agenzia Regionale per la Protezione Ambientale della Toscana Articolazione Funzionale RIBM Risorse Ittiche e Biodiversità Marina Via Marradi 114, 57126 Livorno – Italia	Tel. 0039-0555- 3206956	alvarojuan.abella@arpat.tosca na.it
Andersen, Jesper Levring (vice- chair)	Department of Food and Resource Economics (IFRO) Section for Environment and Natural Resources University of Copenhagen Rolighedsvej 25 1958 Frederiksberg Denmark	Tel.dir.: +45 35 28 68 92	jla@ifro.ku.dk
Bailey, Nicholas	Fisheries Research Services Marine Laboratory, P.O Box 101 375 Victoria Road, Torry Aberdeen AB11 9DB UK	Tel: +44 (0)1224 876544 Direct: +44 (0)1224 295398 Fax: +44 (0)1224 295511	baileyn@marlab.ac.uk n.bailey@marlab.ac.uk
Bertignac, Michel	Laboratoire de Biologie Halieutique IFREMER Centre de Brest BP 70 - 29280 Plouzane, France	tel: +33 (0)2 98 22 45 25 - fax: +33 (0)2 98 22 46 53	michel.bertignac@ifremer.fr

Name	Address <sup>1</sup>	Tel.	<u>Email</u>
STECF members			
Cardinale, Massimiliano	Föreningsgatan 45, 330 Lysekil, Sweden	Tel: +46 523 18750	massimiliano.cardinale@slu.se
Curtis, Hazel	Sea Fish Industry Authority 18 Logie Mill Logie Green Road Edinburgh EH7 4HS	Tel: +44 (0)131 558 3331 Fax: +44 (0)131 558 1442	H_Curtis@seafish.co.uk
Delaney, Alyne	Innovative Fisheries Management, -an Aalborg University Research Centre, Postboks 104, 9850 Hirtshals, Denmark	Tel.: +45 9940 3694	ad@ifm.aau.dk
Daskalov, Georgi	Laboratory of Marine Ecology, Institute of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Research, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences	Tel.: +359 52 646892	gmdaskalov@yahoo.co.uk
Döring, Ralf	Thünen Bundesforschungsinstitut, für Ländliche Räume, Wald und Fischerei, Institut für Seefischerei - AG Fischereiökonomie, Palmaille 9, D-22767 Hamburg, Germany	Tel.: 040 38905-185 Fax.: 040 38905-263	ralf.doering@ti.bund.de
Gascuel, Didier	AGROCAMPUS OUEST 65 Route de Saint Brieuc, bat.4 CS 84215, F-35042 RENNES Cedex France	Tel:+33(0)2.23.48.55.3 4 Fax: +33(0)2.23.48.55.35	Didier.Gascuel@agrocampus- ouest.fr
Graham, Norman (chair)	Marine Institute, Fisheries Science Services (FSS), Rinville, Oranmore, Co. Galway, Ireland	Tel: + 353(0) 91 87200	norman.graham@marine.ie
Garcia Rodriguez, Mariano	Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Servicios Centrales, Corazón de María 8, 28002, Madrid, Spain		Mariano.Garcia@md.ieo.es
Gustavsson, Tore Karl-Erik	Independent Consultant, Göteborg, Sweden		tore.gustavsson@hotmail.com
Jennings, Simon	CEFAS Lowestoft Laboratory, Pakefield Road, Lowestoft Suffolk, UK NR33 0HT	Tel.: +44 1502562244 Fax: +44 1502513865	simon.jennings@cefas.co.uk
Kenny, Andrew	CEFAS Lowestoft Laboratory, Pakefield Road, Lowestoft Suffolk, UK NR33 0HT	Tel.: +44 1502562244 Fax: +44 1502513865	andrew.kenny@cefas.co.uk
Kraak, Sarah	University College Cork  Based at: Marine Institute, Rinville, Oranmore, Co Galway, Ireland	Tel: +353 (0)91 387392 Fax +353 (0)91 387201	Sarah.kraak@marine.ie

Name	Address <sup>1</sup>	Tel.	<u>Email</u>
STECF members			
Kuikka, Sakari	University of Helsinki, Department of Environmental Sciences, P.O. Box 65 (Viikinkaari 1), FI-00014 University of Helsinki, FINLAND	Tel.: +358 50 3309233 Fax. +358-9-191 58754	skuikka@mappi.helsinki.fi
Martin, Paloma	CSIC Instituto de Ciencias del Mar PasseigMarítim, 37-49 08003 Barcelona Spain	Tel: 34.93.2309500 direct line: 34.93.2309552 Fax: 34.93.2309555	paloma@icm.csic.es
Malvarosa, Loretta	NISEA S.c.a.r.l.		malvarosa@nisea.eu
Murua, Hilario	AZTI - Tecnalia / Unidad de Investigación Marina, Herrera kaia portualdea z/g 20110 Pasaia (Gipuzkoa), Spain	Tel: 0034 667174433 Fax: 94 6572555	hmurua@azti.es
Nord, Jenny	Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Centre SEAFDEC		jenny@seafdec.org
Nowakowski, Piotr	Maritime University of Szczecin.  - Faculty of Food Science and Fisheries, Department of Fishing Technique, Szczecin		npfgd@poczta.onet.pl
Prelezzo, Raul	AZTI - Tecnalia / Unidad de Investigación Marina Txatxarramendi Ugartea z/g 48395 Sukarrieta (Bizkaia), Spain	Tel: 94 6029400 Ext: 406- Fax: 94 6870006	rprellezo@suk.azti.es
Sala, Antonello	Fishing Technology Unit National Research Council (CNR) Institute of Marine Sciences (ISMAR) - Fisheries Section Largo Fiera della Pesca, 1 60125 Ancona - Italy	Tel: +39 071 2078841 Fax: +39 071 55313	a.sala@ismar.cnr.it
Scarcella, Giuseppe	Environmental Management Unit National Research Council (CNR) Institute of Marine Sciences (ISMAR) - Fisheries Section Largo Fiera della Pesca, 1 60125 Ancona - ITaly	Tel: +39 071 2078846 Fax: +39 071 55313	g.scarcella@ismar.cnr.it
Somarakis, Stylianos	Department of Biology University of Crete VassilikaVouton P.O. Box 2208 71409 Heraklion Crete Greece	Tel.: +30 2610 394065, +30 6936566764	somarak@biology.uoc.gr
Stransky, Christoph	Thünen Institute [TI-SF] Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, Institute of Sea Fisheries, Palmaille 9, D-22767 Hamburg, Germany	Tel. +49 40 38905-228 Fax: +49 40 38905-263	christoph.stransky@ti.bund.de
Theret, Francois	Scapêche 17 Bd Abbé Le Cam 56100 Lorient France		ftheret@comata.com

Name	Address <sup>1</sup>	Tel.	<u>Email</u>
STECF members			
Ulrich, Clara	DTU Aqua, National Institute of Aquatic Resources, Technical University of Denmark, Charlottenlund Slot, JægersborgAllé 1, 2920 Charlottenlund, Denmark		cu@aqua.dtu.dk
Vanhee, Willy	ILVO - Institute for Agricultural and Fisheries Research Unit Animal Sciences - Fisheries Ankerstraat 1, B-8400 Oostende, Belgium	Tel 00-32-59-34-22-55 Fax 00-32-59-33-06-29	willy.vanhee@ilvo.vlaanderen. be
van Oostenbrugge, Hans	LandbouwEconomishInstituut- LEI, Fisheries Section, Burg. Patijnlaan 19 P.O.Box 29703 2502 LS The Hague The Netherlands	Tel:+31 (0)70 3358239 Fax: +31 (0)70 3615624	Hans.vanOostenbrugge@wur. NI

# EWG-14-07 participants

STECF members			
Name	Address <sup>1</sup>	<u>Email</u>	
Stransky, Christoph	Hamburg, Germany	christoph.stransky@ti.bund.de	

Invited experts				
Name	Address	Email		
Adamidou, Angeliki	Kavala, Greece	adamidou@inale.gr		
Armelle, JUNG	Lampaul Plouarzel, France	armelle@desrequinsetdeshommes.org		
Armesto, Angeles	Vigo, Spain	angeles.armesto@vi.ieo.es		
Avdič, Edo	Ljubljana, Slovenia	edo.avdic@zzrs.si		
Bell, Margaret	Aberdeen, United Kingdom	m.bell@marlab.ac.uk		
Berkenhagen, Jörg	Hamburg, Germany	joerg.berkenhagen@ti.bund.de		
Brigaudeau, Cecile	lampaul-plouarzel, France	cecile@desrequinsetdeshommes.org		
Carpentieri, Paolo	Rome, Italy	paolo.carpentieri@uniroma1.it		
Davidjuka, Irina	Riga, Latvia	irina.davidjuka@bior.gov.lv		
de Boois, Ingeborg	IJmuiden, Netherlands	ingeborg.deboois@wur.nl		
Dias, Marina	Lisboa, Portugal	mdias@ipma.pt		
Ebeling, Michael	Hamburg, Germany	Michael.Ebeling@ti.bund.de		
Hansson, Maria	Lysekil, Sweden	maria.hansson@slu.se		
Kazlauskas, Edvardas	Vilnius, Lithuania	edvardas.kazlauskas@vic.lt		
Knittweis, Leyla	Msida, Malta	leyla.knittweis@um.edu.mt		
Moura, Carlos	Lisboa, Portugal	cmoura@dgrm.mamaot.pt		
Nermer, Tomasz	Gdynia, Poland	nermer@mir.gdynia.pl		
Ní Chonchúir, Gráinne	Co. Galway, Ireland	grainne.nichonchuir@marine.ie		
RADU, Gheorghe	Constanta, Romania	gpr@alpha.rmri.ro		
Raid, Tiit	Slovenia	tiit.raid@gmail.com		
Raykov, Violin	Varna, Bulgaria	vio_raykov@abv.bg		
Gambino, Monica	Salerno, Italy	e.sabatella@nisea.eu		
Sintori, Alexandra	Athens, Greece	al_sintori@yahoo.gr		

Stransky, Christoph	Hamburg, Germany christoph.stransky@ti.bund.de		
Stroie, Constantin	Bucharest, Romania	cstroie@ymail.com	
Ulleweit, Jens Hamburg, Germany		jens.ulleweit@ti.bund.de	
Vandemaele, Sofie	Oostende, Belgium	sofie.vandemaele@ilvo.vlaanderen.be	
Yankova, Maria	Varna, Bulgaria	maria_y@abv.bg	
Zarauz, Lucia	Sukarrieta (Bizkaia), Spain	lzarauz@azti.es	
Degel, Henrik	Copenhagen, Denmark	hd@aqua.dtu.dk	

JRC experts	JRC experts				
Name		Address	<u>Email</u>		
Motova, Arina		JRC, Ispra, Italy	arina.motova@jrc.ec.europa.eu		
Ribeiro, (chairperson)	Cristina	JRC, Ispra, Italy	cristina.ribeiro@jrc.ec.europa.eu		

<b>European Commission</b>		
Name	Address	<u>Email</u>
Drukker Bas	EC DG MARE, Brussels,	Bas.Drukker@ec.europa.eu
	Belgium	_
Knapp Amelie	EC DG MARE, Brussels,	Amelie.KNAPP@ec.europa.eu
	Belgium	_
Borg Greta	EC DG MARE, Brussels,	Nicolas.Sturato@ext.ec.europa.eu
	Belgium	
Motova, Arina	JRC, Ispra, Italy	stecf-secretariat@jrc.ec.europa.eu
(STECF secretariat)	-	

# 7 LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background documents are published on the meeting's web site on: http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/web/stecf/ewg1407

List of background documents:

1. EWG-14-07 – Doc 1 - Declarations of invited and JRC experts (see also section 6 of this report – List of participants)

### ANNEX 1 - MEETING AGENDA

### STECF EWG 14-07

# Evaluation of MS 2013 Annual Reports for Data Collection and data transmission to end users

## Oostende, 23-27 Jun 2014

# **Agenda**

# **Daily timetable:**

Morning: 9h00 – 12h30 (Tue, Wed, Thu and Fri)

**Afternoon:** 13h30 – 18h00

Monday, 23 June

Plenary: Welcome & Logistics

Presentation & discussion on ToR and agenda

Short presentation on the results from the pre-screening.

Agreement on subgroups Identification of rapporteurs

Sub-groups: Tor 1 & 2 in SG

Tuesday, 24 June

Plenary: Summary on work carried out by each SG.

Sub-groups: Tor 1 & 2 in SG (cont.)

• Wednesday, 25 June

Plenary: Summary on the work carried out by each SG.

Sub-groups: Tor 1 & 2 in SG (cont.)

• Thursday, 26 June

Plenary: Report by Sub-groups (expected final results to be presented by SG)

Parallel Sessions: Compilation and verification of the evaluation sheets per MS;

Sub-group working on ToR3.

Friday, 27 June

Plenary: Overview of the outcomes Tor 1 and 2.

Presentation & Discussion on the results on ToR3

**Draft Report** 

### SUBGROUPS to address ToR1 & 2

Sub-group 1 – ToR 1 Modules IIIB, and IV (Economists)

Sub-group 2 – ToR 1 Modules I, II, IIIA, IIIF, VI and ToR 2 (Economists and Biologists)

Sub-group 3 – ToR 1 Modules IIIC and IIIE (Biologists)

Sub-group 4 – ToR 1 Modules IIID, IIIG, V and VII – XI. (Biologists)

# ANNEX 2 – DETAILED AR EVALUATION FORM BY MS

	M	ember State:	Belgium	1	.lue.	dgement levels
			AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	30 May 2014 March-April 2010	No Partly	<10% 10-50%
				EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
	General frame	ework		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
			Are derogations listed?	3 derogations listed	Yes	No action needed
II			nd participating institutes			
			Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is there a national DCF website available?	Eventhough a website is given in section VII as responce for recommendation 10 Topic: MS Website :"www.smartfisheries.be" does not serves its purpose.	No	Set up of a website
			Is there a national DCP website available?  Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	There is no website meaning the necessary information are not provided	No	Fill the the website with the necessary information
			Is there an overview and description of contents of national	Only statement about informal contacts are given, no statement about content.	No	Give an overview of the national co- ordination meetings that have been held, and an outline of their main
			coordination meetings? If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?	NA .	NA	outcomes NA
	B Re B1	gional and Internationa				I
				Not completely. Some cells, which should be filled in are empty: For SGPIDS and WGRFS the reason for non-attendance is missing. Information on PGECON meeting is missing. Information regarding "Regional database		Missing information should be provided
			Is Table II.B.1 complete?	training workshops - 2013-?" is not provided in table II.B.1. A mysterious extra column is added.	Mostly	and a correct table should be resubmitted.
			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	For SGPIDS and WGRFS the reason for non-attendance is missing. Information on PGECON meeting is missing.	Mostly	MS to provide missing information
	B2	Follow-up of reg	ional and international recommendations Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting			
			listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	MS claims to have attended RCMNS&EA_QA_03: Quality issues: data raising methods, which is incorrect as stated before in text. This is indicated by "?" in Table II.B.1? MS attended only in 2012 and not in 2013.	Mostly	MS should follow recommendations.
Ш	Madula of the	e evaluation of the fishi	ng costor		•	
		eneral description of the	e fishing sector			
			Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	No major changes.	Yes	No action needed
	B Ec	onomic variables	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	Yes (but only supra-region "Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic" is relevant)		
			ea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic	Editori Arete, and North Atlantic 15 followard)		To fill the table according to the
			Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Inactive vessels must be presented by each segment according to length class. Lenght class should be indicated in a separate column	Mostly	template and add incative vessels by length.MS should resubmit TABLE
			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Segment names are different from Table III.B.1. The names of cluster fleet segment is not conistent with the Last version of the Guidelines	Partly	To fill the table according to the templeate MS should resubmit TABLE III.B.2
			Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	CV for a few variables is not provided	Mostly	MS should provide explanation why CV is not 0 when response rate is 100% and why they did not provide CV when the response rate is below 70%. MS should resubmit TABLE III.B.3 and fill the achieved sample rate column
	B1		esults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
			proposal?	Yes No deviations	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes NA	No action needed No action needed
	B2		ults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
	В3		Are the deviations justified?  onal and international recommendations	NA	NA	No action needed
	30		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recomendations	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA NA	No action needed
	B4		hortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
	C Bio	ological metier related	variables	According to Table III.A.1, MS is operating in Regions		<u> </u>
	Dogies News	Sea and Eastern Arctic	Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	NS&EA and NA		
	Region North C1		c Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR	Table complete but year 2012 is supposed to be an error. Some columns are given two times. Achievement rates are good for the three metiers sampled, both at sea and on shore. The fourth one, TBB_CRU, has derogation for not sampling crangon fishery.	_	MS should resubmit table IIIC3 with correct sampling year
			guidelines?  Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR	Table complete and consistent with III.C.3. Achievement rates are good for all activities sampled, both at sea and on shore, except sampling frame BEL17 a little bit undersampled. Frames rooncerning TBB_CRU have	Yes	
			guidelines?	derogations for not sampling crangon fishery in IVc.	Yes	no action needed

## Member State:

 Belgium
 Judgement levels

 AR year
 2013
 Compliance class
 Compliance level

 Version of the AR reviewed
 30 May 2014
 No
 < 10%</td>

 Version of the NP proposal
 March-April 2010
 Partly
 10-50%

 EWG Answer
 Mostly
 50-90%

 Overall compliance
 Mostly
 Yes
 > 90%

 NA
 not applicable

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR

Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP

Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region North Atlantic

C2

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR

Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

	NA	not applicable
EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
NP proposal colums were masked and 3 columns of the AR part are fully blank: columns of CVs and total numbers of fish measured are blank. Bilateral agreements are correctly reported. Achivement rates show that most of the species were hightly oversampled (sometimes more than 3000% for		MS to resubmit table IIIC5 with total number of fish sampled and calculated
example for sole and plaice), whilst rays not sampled at all.	Partly	CVs. Explanation required for the lack of sampling of rays
Some cells report zero achievement. MS seems to limit sampling at sea to a short list of species, so rays or other by-catches are not sampled (cells with 0). Total numbers sampled in table IIIIC6 is lower than total numbers in table IIIC5 which does not reflect the concurrent sampling by MS	Mostly	MS to give explanation why the totals in table IIIC6 are lower than in table IIIC5 and how concurrent sampling is applied. Also report the lack of sampling of rays
No important deviations, except the implementation of concurrent sampling at sea. Ms wrote to see in the AR text in table III.C.5 but nothing found about the Baltic sea rows.		MS to give explanation why the totals in table IIIC6 are lower than in table IIIC5 and how concurrent sampling is applied. Also report the lack of sampling of rays
Explanations are provided for metiers and frames undersampled: few vessels, switch between fisgrounds Oversampling of stocks due is a consequence of observers on board and without financial impact. When on board MS should explain why other by-catches species		MS to give explanation why the totals in table IIIC6 are lower than in table IIIC5 and how concurrent sampling is applied. Also report the lack of sampling of rays
were not sampled Yes	Mostly Yes	no action needed
	1	

No	CVs to be provided for all species
NA	no action needed
NA	no action needed
NA	no action needed
	NA NA

See section I.		
Most of the recommendations listed are not relevant to metier related parameters, also mostly from 2013 whereas the 2012 recommendations should also be listed		MS in future to list appropriate recommendatons
NA	No	MS to describe actions
NA	NA	no action needed

MS plans to review its sampling programmes according to the most recent characteristics of its national fleet.		no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

Table complete but sampling year is 2012 - supposed to		
be an error. Some columns are given two times.		
Achievement rates are good for most of the metiers		
sampled, both at sea and on shore, except		MS to review the 'sampling year' from
TTB_DEF_70_99 in VIIIab with only 57%.	Yes	2012 to 2013
Table complete and consistent with III.C.3. Achievement		
rates are good for all activities sampled, both at sea and		
on shore, except sampling frame BEL05 undersampled.		
Often more trips sampled at sea as planned. Frames		
concerning OTB_DEF in VIIfg area have derogations for		
not sampling.	Yes	no action needed
NP proposal colums were masked and 3 columns of the		
AR part are fully blank : CVs ones and total numbers of		
fish measured. Bilateral agreements are correctly		MS to resubmit table IIIC5 with total
reported.		number of fish sampled and calculated
Achievement rates show that most of the species were		CVs. Explanation required for the lack of
oversampled, whilst rays not sampled at all.	Partly	sampling of rays
Some cells blank. MS seems to limit sampling at sea to a		MS to report the lack of sampling of
short list of species, so rays or other by-catches are not		rays
sampled (cells with 0).	Mostly	
No important deviations, except the implementation of		
concurrent sampling at sea.	Mostly	no action needed
- 1	,	For on board sampling MS to explain
Explanations are provided correctly by metiers and frames		why observers did not measure other by-
undersampled. Reasons for over- or undersampling of		catch species - it appears that only
stocks not exlained by MS, but to be supposed the same		target species were sampled.
as in NS&EA. For on board sampling MS to explain why		g p
observers did not measure other by-catch species - it		
appears that only target species were sampled.	Mostly	
Yes	Yes	no action needed

No CV provided in Table III.C.5, neither for landings nor		
for discards.	No	CVs to be provided for all species
NA	No	MS to describe actions
Oddly enough, MS wrote in its AR 2013 to have done an		
effort to insert more CVs in 2013 compared to the		
previous years. No more explanation.	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed

See section I.	Yes	
MS did not list any relevant recommendations and there		MS in future to list relevant
are at least 1 regarding metier descriptions. AR lists many		recommendatons and in future only list
recomms that are not relevant.	No	the appropriate ones
NA	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed

MS plans to review its sampling programmes according to		
the most recent characteristics of its national fleet, and to		
be effective in 2014.	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

		: Belgium	2013		Judgement levels
		AR year Version of the AR reviewed	2013 30 May 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
		Version of the AH reviewed  Version of the NP proposal	March-April 2010	Partly	10-50%
		version of the NF proposal	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall com		Yes	>90%
				NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgoment	EWG
		Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective r	region? Text is not always consistent and easy to interpret.	Yes	No action needed
aion North	Sea and Eastern		region? Text is not always consistent and easy to interpret.	Yes	No action needed
gion North D1		ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Admicvenik	ins. results and deviation from the proposal			
			Updating for cod was planned in NP for 2013, but nothing		Yes. MS to update text for cod, if no
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NF			samples could be taken explain
		proposal?	provided and text seems as not reviewed since several		deviations and to update Table with
			years. No information on blue fin tuna sampling in the NP.	D	2013 data in III.D.1. AR2014: Menti
		Annual de la companion de la c	Sharks not mentioned in the NP/AR	Partly	all species named in the regulation
		Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No derogations apply	Yes	No action needed  Yes. MS to update text describing h
			Deviations not explained. Even though the 2013 data are		sampling took place and if any
		Are the deviations explained?	still preliminary we text on how the sampling was carried		deviations occurred, even when 20
			out is to be expected	No	data are preliminary
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
D2	2 Data qualit	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			No information on data quality provided, data may not be		Yes. MS to provide some information
		Were data quality targets provided?	public. This should not be a reason to not provide any		data quality issues
			insight on the data quality issues	Partly	
		Were data quality targets met?	NA	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
D3	Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations		1	Total
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
D4	Actions to	avoid shortfalls	10	l	The second second
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described	No comments	Yes	No action needed
					AR2014: MS to align AR2014 and
					for recreational fisheries. Now the N says that there is no recreational
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable	ie?		fisheries on sea bass, but the AR s
			In NP is stated that there is no seabass recreational		is planned to be sampled in 2014.
			fishery in MS.	Yes	
Bio	ological stock-rel	ated variables			
		to information on III E 4.4 about for each accounting	According to table III.A.1 MS is operating in Regions		
		Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective r	region? NS&EA and NA		
	Sea and Eastern				
E1	Achieveme	ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal		1	1
			the CV column not complete: few values but mostly blank.		MS to resubmit with CVs and notes
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR		Partly	shaded lines/annotations
		guidelines?	Some have a comment n.a.(f) but no note of explanation		
			No samples for ALKs of whiting and haddock in North sea,		
			including those provided by bilateral agreements with		Make emploise about the improvement
			DNK nd UK. Less fish than planned for brill and sole in	Mostly	Ms to explain shorfalls in age samp
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NF	VIId I anoth complex of haddeck, whiting and turbet		MS to explain or resubmit table
		proposal?	collected from landings but no otoliths collected.		
		рюрован	T		
			Text a little bit confusing between III.C and III.E issues		MO to alonify and locations on the six
			and not finalized for 2013. For turbot and brill MS states it wil use otolith drilling with no cooperation in 2012. MS	Mostly	MS to clarify explanations on their deviations
			should report what happened for this procedure in 2013		deviations
		Are the deviations explained?	Should report what happened for this procedure in 2010		
		And the desiration in the do		Partly	MS to clarify explanations on their
	D-4	Are the deviations justified?	<u></u>	,	deviations
E2	. Data quali	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No CV provided.	NA	no action needed
		Were CV estimates provided?	INO OV provided.		no action needed
		Word CV toracts mot?	NA		Ino action needed
		Were CV targets met?	NA	NA	
		Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?	NA No	NA NA	MS to provide CVs or explanatioin
		Are the deviations explained?			
E3	Follow-up		No	NA	MS to provide CVs or explanatioin this is not possible
E3	Follow-up	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No	NA	MS to provide CVs or explanation this is not possible no action needed
E3	s Follow-up	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations	No NA	NA NA	MS to provide CVs or explanation this is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the
E3	s Follow-up	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations	No NA See section I.	NA NA	MS to provide CVs or explanation this is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the Al
E3	6 Follow-up	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations	No NA	NA NA Yes	MS to provide CVs or explanation this is not possible no action needed  no action needed  MS needs to list only the recommendations related to the AI stock related variables. MS to ment
E3	Follow-up	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations	No NA See section I. One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which	NA NA	MS to provide CVs or explanation this is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the Al stock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action,
E3	Follow-up	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations	No NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing	NA NA Yes	MS to provide CVs or explanation this is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the Al stock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro
E3	s Follow-up	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations	No NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing	NA NA Yes	MS to provide CVs or explanation this is not possible no action needed  no action needed  MS needs to list only the recommendations related to the Afstock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did no
E3	Follow-up	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?	No NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and	NA NA Yes	MS to provide CVs or explanation withis is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the Afstock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did not sample turbot and brill.
E3	Follow-up	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?	No  NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.	NA NA Yes Yes	MS to provide CVs or explanation this is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the Al stock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did no sample turbot and brill. MS must be aware of the confusion their text.
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and	NA NA Yes	MS to provide CVs or explanation this is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the Al stock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did no sample turbot and brill.  MS must be aware of the confusior
E3		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?	No NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.  Yes	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	MS to provide CVs or explanation this is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the Al stock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did no sample turbot and brill. MS must be aware of the confusion their text.
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No  NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.  Yes  MS plans to improve otholiths collection for turbot and brill.	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	MS to provide CVs or explanation this is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the Al stock related variables. MS to meni according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did no sample turbot and brill. MS must be aware of the confusion their text no action needed
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.  Yes  MS plans to improve otholiths collection for turbot and brill. MS is in charge to read the otoliths of these two species	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	MS to provide CVs or explanation this is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the Afstock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did no sample turbot and brill. MS must be aware of the confusion their text no action needed In text the MS refers to 2012 insead.
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  avoid shortfalls	No NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.  Yes  MS plans to improve otholiths collection for turbot and brill. MS is in charge to read the otoliths of these two species for severall countries, but they are particurlarly expensive	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	MS to provide CVs or explanation this is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the Afstock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did no sample turbot and brill. MS must be aware of the confusion their text no action needed In text the MS refers to 2012 inseat
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described	No  NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.  Yes  MS plans to improve otholiths collection for turbot and brill. MS is in charge to read the otoliths of these two species for severall countries, but they are particurlarly expensive to buy on markets.	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	MS to provide CVs or explanation of this is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the Af stock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did no sample turbot and brill. MS must be aware of the confusion their text no action needed
<b>E</b> 4	Actions to	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  avoid shortfalls	No  NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.  Yes  MS plans to improve otholiths collection for turbot and brill. MS is in charge to read the otoliths of these two species for severall countries, but they are particurlarly expensive to buy on markets.	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	MS to provide CVs or explanation of this is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the AF stock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did not sample turbot and brill. MS must be aware of the confusion their text no action needed
<b>E</b> 4	Actions to	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable	No  NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.  Yes  MS plans to improve otholiths collection for turbot and brill. MS is in charge to read the otoliths of these two species for severall countries, but they are particurlarly expensive to buy on markets.	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	MS to provide CVs or explanation of this is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the AF stock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did not sample turbot and brill. MS must be aware of the confusion their text no action needed
E4	Actions to	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No  NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.  Yes  MS plans to improve otholiths collection for turbot and brill. MS is in charge to read the otoliths of these two species for severall countries, but they are particurlarly expensive to buy on markets.  Yes	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	MS to provide CVs or explanation this is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the Af stock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did no sample turbot and brill. MS must be aware of the confusion their text no action needed  In text the MS refers to 2012 insead 2013. IMS should update the AR te table no action needed
E4	Actions to	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR	No  NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.  Yes  MS plans to improve otholiths collection for turbot and brill. MS is in charge to read the otoliths of these two species for severall countries, but they are particurlarly expensive to buy on markets.  Yes  CV column not complete - mostly blank. Some lines have	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	MS to provide CVs or explanation this is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the Al stock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did no sample turbot and brill. MS must be aware of the confusion their text no action needed lin text the MS refers to 2012 inseat 2013. IMS should update the AR te table no action needed
E4	Actions to	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No  NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.  Yes  MS plans to improve otholiths collection for turbot and brill. MS is in charge to read the otoliths of these two species for severall countries, but they are particurlarly expensive to buy on markets.  Yes  CV column not complete - mostly blank. Some lines have a comment n.a.(f) but no note of	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	MS to provide CVs or explanation withis is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the Af stock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did no sample turbot and brill. MS must be aware of the confusion their text no action needed In text the MS refers to 2012 insead 2013. IMS should update the AR te table no action needed
E4	Actions to	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable ints: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No  NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.  Yes  MS plans to improve otholiths collection for turbot and brill. MS is in charge to read the otoliths of these two species for severall countries, but they are particurlarly expensive to buy on markets.  Yes  CV column not complete - mostly blank. Some lines have a comment n.a.(f) but no note of  No samples for ALKs of cod (VIIIab), hake, haddock,	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Mostly	MS to provide CVs or explanation this is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the Al stock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did no sample turbot and brill. MS must be aware of the confusion their text no action needed  In text the MS refers to 2012 inseat 2013. IMS should update the AR te table no action needed  MS to resubmit with CVs and notes shaded lines/annotations  Ms to explain shorfalls in age samp
E4	Actions to	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable.  Ints: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NF	No  NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.  Yes  MS plans to improve otholiths collection for turbot and brill. MS is in charge to read the otoliths of these two species for severall countries, but they are particurlarly expensive to buy on markets.  Yes  CV column not complete - mostly blank. Some lines have a comment n.a.(f) but no note of	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	MS to provide CVs or explanation withis is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the Af stock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did no sample turbot and brill. MS must be aware of the confusion their text no action needed In text the MS refers to 2012 insead 2013. IMS should update the AR te table no action needed
E4	Actions to	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable ints: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No  NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.  Yes  MS plans to improve otholiths collection for turbot and brill. MS is in charge to read the otoliths of these two species for severall countries, but they are particurlarly expensive to buy on markets.  Yes  CV column not complete - mostly blank. Some lines have a comment n.a.(f) but no note of  No samples for ALKs of cod (VIIIab), hake, haddock, plaice, brill collected.	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Mostly	MS to provide CVs or explanation this is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the Al stock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did no sample turbot and brill. MS must be aware of the confusion their text no action needed  In text the MS refers to 2012 inseat 2013. IMS should update the AR te table no action needed  MS to resubmit with CVs and notes shaded lines/annotations  Ms to explain shorfalls in age samp
E4	Actions to	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable.  Ints: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NF	No  NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.  Yes  MS plans to improve otholiths collection for turbot and brill. MS is in charge to read the otoliths of these two species for severall countries, but they are particurlarly expensive to buy on markets.  Yes  CV column not complete - mostly blank. Some lines have a comment n.a.(f) but no note of  No samples for ALKs of cod (VIIIab), hake, haddock,	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Mostly Mostly	MS to provide CVs or explanation this is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the Al stock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did no sample turbot and brill. MS must be aware of the confusion their text no action needed  In text the MS refers to 2012 inseat 2013. IMS should update the AR te table no action needed  MS to resubmit with CVs and notes shaded lines/annotations  Ms to explain shorfalls in age samp
E4 ion North	Actions to	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable.  Ints: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NF	No  NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.  Yes  MS plans to improve otholiths collection for turbot and brill. MS is in charge to read the otoliths of these two species for severall countries, but they are particurlarly expensive to buy on markets.  Yes  CV column not complete - mostly blank. Some lines have a comment n.a.(f) but no note of  No samples for ALKs of cod (VIIIab), hake, haddock, plaice, brill collected.  text inconsistent with outcomes in tables eg age targets	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Mostly Mostly	MS to provide CVs or explanation this is not possible no action needed  MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the Af stock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did no sample turbot and brill.  MS must be aware of the confusion their text no action needed  In text the MS refers to 2012 inseat 2013. IMS should update the AR te table no action needed  MS to resubmit with CVs and notes shaded lines/annotations  Ms to explain shorfalls in age samp MS to explain or resubmit table  MS to clarify deviations
E4	Actions to	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable.  Ints: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NF proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	No  NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.  Yes  MS plans to improve otholiths collection for turbot and brill. MS is in charge to read the otoliths of these two species for severall countries, but they are particurlarly expensive to buy on markets.  Yes  CV column not complete - mostly blank. Some lines have a comment n.a.(f) but no note of  No samples for ALKs of cod (VIIIab), hake, haddock, plaice, brill collected.  text inconsistent with outcomes in tables eg age targets for haddock and hake not achieved but text states targets were met	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Mostly Mostly Mostly	MS to provide CVs or explanation this is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the Al stock related variables. MS to men according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did no sample turbot and brill. MS must be aware of the confusion their text no action needed In text the MS refers to 2012 inseat 2013. IMS should update the AR te table no action needed  MS to resubmit with CVs and notes shaded lines/annotations Ms to explain shorfalls in age samp MS to explain or resubmit table  MS to clarify deviations not all deviations have been mentic
E4 ion North E1	Actions to  Atlantic Achieveme	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable ints: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NF proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	No  NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.  Yes  MS plans to improve otholiths collection for turbot and brill. MS is in charge to read the otoliths of these two species for severall countries, but they are particurlarly expensive to buy on markets.  Yes  CV column not complete - mostly blank. Some lines have a comment n.a.(f) but no note of  No samples for ALKs of cod (VIIIab), hake, haddock, plaice, brill collected.  text inconsistent with outcomes in tables eg age targets for haddock and hake not achieved but text states targets	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Mostly Mostly	MS to provide CVs or explanation this is not possible no action needed  MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the Af stock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did no sample turbot and brill.  MS must be aware of the confusion their text no action needed  In text the MS refers to 2012 inseat 2013. IMS should update the AR te table no action needed  MS to resubmit with CVs and notes shaded lines/annotations  Ms to explain shorfalls in age samp MS to explain or resubmit table  MS to clarify deviations
E4 on North	Actions to  Atlantic Achieveme	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable.  Ints: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NF proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	No  NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.  Yes  MS plans to improve otholiths collection for turbot and brill. MS is in charge to read the otoliths of these two species for severall countries, but they are particurlarly expensive to buy on markets.  Yes  CV column not complete - mostly blank. Some lines have a comment n.a.(f) but no note of  No samples for ALKs of cod (VIIIab), hake, haddock, plaice, brill collected.  text inconsistent with outcomes in tables eg age targets for haddock and hake not achieved but text states targets were met	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Mostly Mostly Mostly	MS to provide CVs or explanation this is not possible no action needed  MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the Afstock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did no sample turbot and brill.  MS must be aware of the confusion their text no action needed  In text the MS refers to 2012 inseat 2013. IMS should update the AR te table no action needed  MS to resubmit with CVs and notes shaded lines/annotations  Ms to explain shorfalls in age samp MS to explain or resubmit table  MS to clarify deviations  not all deviations have been mentic in the text
E4 ion North E1	Actions to  Atlantic Achieveme	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable ints: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NF proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	No  NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.  Yes  MS plans to improve otholiths collection for turbot and brill. MS is in charge to read the otoliths of these two species for severall countries, but they are particurlarly expensive to buy on markets.  Yes  CV column not complete - mostly blank. Some lines have a comment n.a.(f) but no note of  No samples for ALKs of cod (VIIIab), hake, haddock, plaice, brill collected.  text inconsistent with outcomes in tables eg age targets for haddock and hake not achieved but text states targets were met  Mostly	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Mostly Mostly Mostly Mostly	MS to provide CVs or explanation of this is not possible no action needed no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the AF stock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did not sample turbot and brill. MS must be aware of the confusion their text no action needed In text the MS refers to 2012 insead 2013. IMS should update the AR te table no action needed  MS to resubmit with CVs and notes shaded lines/annotations  Ms to explain shorfalls in age samp MS to explain shorfalls in age samp MS to explain or resubmit table  MS to clarify deviations  not all deviations have been mentio in the text  CVs should be provided or at least:
E4 ion North E1	Actions to  Atlantic Achieveme	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable ints: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NF proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  y: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No  NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.  Yes  MS plans to improve otholiths collection for turbot and brill. MS is in charge to read the otoliths of these two species for severall countries, but they are particurlarly expensive to buy on markets.  Yes  CV column not complete - mostly blank. Some lines have a comment n.a.(f) but no note of  No samples for ALKs of cod (VIIIab), hake, haddock, plaice, brill collected.  text inconsistent with outcomes in tables eg age targets for haddock and hake not achieved but text states targets were met	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Mostly Mostly Mostly	MS to provide CVs or explanation of this is not possible no action needed  no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the AF stock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fro DK or UK, even though BEL did not sample turbot and brill.  MS must be aware of the confusion their text no action needed  In text the MS refers to 2012 inseac 2013. IMS should update the AR te table no action needed  MS to resubmit with CVs and notes shaded lines/annotations  Ms to explain shorfalls in age samp MS to explain or resubmit table  MS to clarify deviations  not all deviations have been mentio in the text  CVs should be provided or at least attempt should be made to calculate
E4 ion North E1	Actions to  Atlantic Achievement	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable ints: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NF proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  y: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?	No NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.  Yes  MS plans to improve otholiths collection for turbot and brill. MS is in charge to read the otoliths of these two species for severall countries, but they are particurlarly expensive to buy on markets.  Yes  CV column not complete - mostly blank. Some lines have a comment n.a.(f) but no note of  No samples for ALKs of cod (VIIIab), hake, haddock, plaice, brill collected.  text inconsistent with outcomes in tables eg age targets for haddock and hake not achieved but text states targets were met  Mostly  No CV provided.	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  Yes Mostly Mostly Mostly Mostly No	MS to provide CVs or explanation vithis is not possible no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations rellated to the AF stock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fron DK or UK, even though BEL did not sample turbot and brill. MS must be aware of the confusion their text. no action needed  In text the MS refers to 2012 insead 2013. IMS should update the AR textable no action needed  MS to resubmit with CVs and notes shaded lines/annotations Ms to explain or resubmit table  MS to clarify deviations not all deviations have been mentio in the text  CVs should be provided or at least attempt should be made to calculations
E4 ion North E1	Actions to  Atlantic Achievement	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable ints: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NF proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  y: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No  NA  See section I.  One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?  Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.  Yes  MS plans to improve otholiths collection for turbot and brill. MS is in charge to read the otoliths of these two species for severall countries, but they are particurlarly expensive to buy on markets.  Yes  CV column not complete - mostly blank. Some lines have a comment n.a.(f) but no note of  No samples for ALKs of cod (VIIIab), hake, haddock, plaice, brill collected.  text inconsistent with outcomes in tables eg age targets for haddock and hake not achieved but text states targets were met  Mostly	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Mostly Mostly Mostly Mostly	MS to provide CVs or explanation vithis is not possible no action needed MS needs to list only the recommendations reliated to the AF stock related variables. MS to ment according to the responsive action, whether samples were received fron DK or UK, even though BEL did not sample turbot and brill.  MS must be aware of the confusion their text no action needed  In text the MS refers to 2012 insead 2013. IMS should update the AR textiable no action needed  MS to resubmit with CVs and notes shaded lines/annotations  Ms to explain shorfalls in age samp MS to explain or resubmit table  MS to clarify deviations not all deviations have been mentio in the text  CVs should be provided or at least: attempt should be made to calculate and the stock of the control of the text.

	ber Stat		Belgium	2010		dgement levels
			AR year Version of the AR reviewed	<b>2013</b> 30 May 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
			Version of the NP proposal	March-April 2010	Partly	10-50%
				EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance	e Mostly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
E3	Eollow		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	no action needed
E3	rollow-u		gional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?	See section I.	Yes	no action needed
			vere the relevant derogations listed:	Two recommendationsare liste : one of RCM NS&EA	1.00	
				2012 which is not rrelevant and of RCM NA, which is OK.		the text referencing Lophidae shappear under derogations. Also
				But AR text seem to have not been udated 2013, with some paragraphs highlighted in green and not really	Mostly	recommendation re bilateral
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	relevant.		agreements for NA is missing
				Text a little bit confusing between III.C nd III.E issues and	Mostly	responsive action for only one
			Are the responsive actions described?	not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.	-	recommendation is listed
E4	Actions t		Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls	Yes	Yes	no action needed
	Actions	o avoiu	Silvitians	AR text referencing to 2012 seems not have been	N 4 40	MO to conduct to the construction
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	updated.	Mostly	MS to update text re wrong yea
_			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
Iransv	ersal variab	oles				1
			Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines	? No comments	Yes	No action needed
F1	Capacity					•
	F11		ements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		T	1
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F13		to avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls identified.	Yes	No action needed
F2	Effort		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F11	Achieve	ements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
			proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No deviations	Yes	No action needed
	F12		Are the deviations justified?  uality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F13		up of Regional and international recommendations	No relevant recommendations	Ivos	No action readed
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	No relevant recomendations  No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F14		to avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No shortfalls identified.	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
F3	Landings E11		amente: Recults and deviation from ND assessed			
	F11	ACITIEVE	ements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
		1	proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?  Justified: Are the deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F12	Data a	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F12			No deviations	Yes	No action needed
	F12	į.	Are the deviations explained?			
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F12	Follow-	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Follow-	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments  No relevant recomendations	Yes	No action needed
		Follow-	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed
		Follow-	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments  No relevant recomendations	Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
	F13	Follow-	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified.	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed
	F13	Follow-	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? to avoid shortfalls	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
	F13 F14 rch surveys	Follow-	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified.	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed
Resear G1	F13 F14 rch surveys	Follow-	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified.	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed
	F13 F14 rch surveys	Follow- Actions at sea	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? tesults and deviation from NP proposal	No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload.	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed
	F13 F14 rch surveys	Follow- Actions at sea nents: R	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? tesults and deviation from NP proposal	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed Yes. MS to update text on data
	F13 F14 rch surveys	Follow- Actions at sea nents: R	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? tesults and deviation from NP proposal	No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload.	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed  No action needed  Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data.
	F13 F14 rch surveys	Follow- Actions at sea ments: R	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? tesults and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS.	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data. Yes. MS to ensure upload offsh
	F13 F14 rch surveys	Follow- Actions at sea ments: R	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data.  Yes. MS to ensure upload offsh beam trawl data in DATRAS act to NP.
	F13 F14 rch surveys	Actions at sea	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions and deviation from NP proposal  LIS Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS.	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Mostly	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data. Yes. MS to ensure upload offsh beam trawl data in DATRAS act to NP. Yes. MS to list not uploading da
	F13 F14 rch surveys	Actions at sea	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? tesults and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS.	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data.  Yes. MS to ensure upload offsh beam trawl data in DATRAS act to NP.
	F13 F14 rch surveys	Actions at sea	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? is to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Its and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS.  No, data upload in DATRAS has not taken place. No comments	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Another the	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data. Yes. MS to ensure upload offsh beam trawl data in DATRAS act to NP. Yes. MS to list not uploading da DATRAS as a deviation No action needed AR2014: MS to check numbers
G1	F14 F14 rch surveys Achieven	Actions at sea	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Its Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS.  No, data upload in DATRAS has not taken place. No comments	Yes	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed  Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data. Yes. MS to ensure upload offsh beam trawl dat in DATRAS act to NP. Yes. MS to list not uploading da DATRAS as a deviation No action needed
	F14 F14 rch surveys Achieven	Actions at sea nents: R	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Results and deviation from NP proposal  Its Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Sults and deviation from NP proposal	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS.  No, data upload in DATRAS has not taken place. No comments	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Another the	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data. Yes. MS to ensure upload offshbeam trawl data in DATRAS act to NP. Yes. MS to list not uploading da DATRAS as a deviation No action needed AR2014: MS to check numbers
G1	F14 F14 rch surveys Achieven	Actions at sea ments: R	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Its Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS.  No, data upload in DATRAS has not taken place. No comments NA Map numbers are not consistent in tables and text  No survey indices can be provided for offshore beam trawl	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Another the	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data. Yes. MS to ensure upload offshbeam trawl data in DATRAS act to NP. Yes. MS to list not uploading da DATRAS as a deviation No action needed AR2014: MS to check numbers
G1	F14 F14 rch surveys Achieven	Follow- Actions at sea ments: R	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS and taken place.  No, data upload in DATRAS has not taken place. No comments NA  Map numbers are not consistent in tables and text  No survey indices can be provided for offshore beam trawl surveys as data are not uploaded in DATRAS.	Yes	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed  Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data. Yes. MS to ensure upload offsh beam trawl data in DATRAS act to NP. Yes. MS to list not uploading da DATRAS as a deviation No action needed AR2014: MS to check numbers in tables and text  No action needed
G1	F14 F14 rch surveys Achieven	Follow- Actions at sea ments: R	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? is to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are design and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Butts and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained?	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS has not taken place. No, data upload in DATRAS has not taken place. No comments NA  Map numbers are not consistent in tables and text  No survey indices can be provided for offshore beam trawl surveys as data are not uploaded in DATRAS No comments	Yes	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed  Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data. Yes. MS to ensure upload offsh beam trawl data in DATRAS ac to NP. Yes. MS to list not uploading da DATRAS as a deviation No action needed AR2014: MS to check numbers in tables and text  No action needed No action needed No action needed
G1 G2	F14 rch surveys Achieven	Actions at sea nents: R	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are design and deviation from NP proposal  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Sults and deviation from NP proposal  Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS and taken place.  No, data upload in DATRAS has not taken place. No comments NA  Map numbers are not consistent in tables and text  No survey indices can be provided for offshore beam trawl surveys as data are not uploaded in DATRAS.	Yes	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed  Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data. Yes. MS to ensure upload offsh beam trawl data in DATRAS ac to NP. Yes. MS to list not uploading da DATRAS as a deviation No action needed AR2014: MS to check numbers in tables and text  No action needed
G1 G2	F14 rch surveys Achieven	Follow- Actions at sea ments: R	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? is to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are design and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Butts and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained?	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS has not taken place. No, data upload in DATRAS has not taken place. No comments NA  Map numbers are not consistent in tables and text  No survey indices can be provided for offshore beam trawl surveys as data are not uploaded in DATRAS No comments	Yes	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed  Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data. Yes. MS to ensure upload offsh beam trawl data in DATRAS ac to NP. Yes. MS to list not uploading da DATRAS as a deviation No action needed AR2014: MS to check numbers in tables and text  No action needed No action needed No action needed
G1 G2	F14 rch surveys Achieven	Actions at sea nents: R	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? to tavoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Its Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations from NP proposal is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  sults and deviation from NP proposal is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  Jonal and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS. No, data upload in DATRAS has not taken place. No comments NA  Map numbers are not consistent in tables and text  No survey indices can be provided for offshore beam trawl surveys as data are not uploaded in DATRAS No comments NA  Recommendation by WGBEAM 2011 on upload data still not implemented	Yes	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed  Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data. Yes. MS to ensure upload offsh beam trawl data in DATRAS ac to NP. Yes. MS to list not uploading da DATRAS as a deviation No action needed AR2014: MS to check numbers in tables and text  No action needed Yes, MS to put recommendation WGBEAM 2011 into practice
G1 G2	F14 rch surveys Achieven	Follow- Actions at sea ments: R	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? It a void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Results and deviation from NP proposal  Its Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Its there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Sults and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Igional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described?	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS. No, data upload in DATRAS has not taken place. No comments NA Map numbers are not consistent in tables and text  No survey indices can be provided for offshore beam trawl surveys as data are not uploaded in DATRAS No comments NA  Recommendation by WGBEAM 2011 on upload data still not implemented No comments	Yes	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed  Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data. Yes. MS to ensure upload offsh beam trawl data in DATRAS act to NP. Yes. MS to list not uploading da DATRAS as a deviation No action needed AR2014: MS to check numbers in tables and text  No action needed No action needed No action needed Yes. MS to put recommendation WGBEAM 2011 into practice No action needed
G1 G2	F14  rch surveys Achieven  Data qua	Follow- Actions at sea ments: R	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? is to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Its and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Sults and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Igional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described?	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS. No, data upload in DATRAS has not taken place. No comments NA  Map numbers are not consistent in tables and text  No survey indices can be provided for offshore beam trawl surveys as data are not uploaded in DATRAS No comments NA  Recommendation by WGBEAM 2011 on upload data still not implemented	Yes	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed  Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data. Yes. MS to ensure upload offsh beam trawl data in DATRAS ac to NP. Yes. MS to list not uploading da DATRAS as a deviation No action needed AR2014: MS to check numbers in tables and text  No action needed Yes, MS to put recommendation WGBEAM 2011 into practice
G1 G2	F14  rch surveys Achieven  Data qua	Follow- Actions at sea ments: R	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? It a void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Results and deviation from NP proposal  Its Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Its there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Sults and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Igional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described?	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS. No, data upload in DATRAS has not taken place. No comments NA  Map numbers are not consistent in tables and text  No survey indices can be provided for offshore beam trawl surveys as data are not uploaded in DATRAS No comments NA  Recommendation by WGBEAM 2011 on upload data still not implemented No comments	Yes	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed  Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data. Yes. MS to ensure upload offsh beam trawl data in DATRAS ac to NP. Yes. MS to list not uploading da DATRAS as a deviation No action needed AR2014: MS to check numbers in tables and text  No action needed No action needed No action needed Yes, MS to put recommendation WGBEAM 2011 into practice No action needed
G1 G2	F14  rch surveys Achieven  Data qua	Follow- Actions at sea nents: R	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? is to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Its and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Sults and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Igional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described?	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS. No, data upload in DATRAS has not taken place. No comments NA Map numbers are not consistent in tables and text  No survey indices can be provided for offshore beam trawl surveys as data are not uploaded in DATRAS No comments NA  Recommendation by WGBEAM 2011 on upload data still not implemented No comments	Yes	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed  Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data. Yes. MS to ensure upload offsh beam trawl data in DATRAS ac to NP. Yes. MS to list not uploading da DATRAS as a deviation No action needed AR2014: MS to check numbers in tables and text  No action needed No action needed No action needed Yes, MS to put recommendation WGBEAM 2011 into practice No action needed No action needed
G1 G2 G3	F13  F14  rch surveys Achieven  Data qua  Follow-u	Actions at sea nents: R	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Its Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  sults and deviation from NP proposal is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations for proposal is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS. No, data upload in DATRAS has not taken place. No comments NA  Map numbers are not consistent in tables and text  No survey indices can be provided for offshore beam trawl surveys as data are not uploaded in DATRAS No comments NA  Recommendation by WGBEAM 2011 on upload data still not implemented No comments	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  Yes  Yes  Mostly Yes NA  Mostly Yes NA  Mostly Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed  Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data. Yes. MS to ensure upload offsh beam trawl data in DATRAS act to NP. Yes. MS to list not uploading da DATRAS as a deviation No action needed AR2014: MS to check numbers in tables and text  No action needed No action needed No action needed Yes, MS to put recommendation WGBEAM 2011 into practice No action needed No action needed No action needed
G1 G2 G3 G4	F14  rch surveys Achieven  Data qua  Follow-u	Follow- Actions at sea nents: R	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? It avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Results and deviation from NP proposal  Its Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Its there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Sults and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Jonal and International recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? homic situation of the aquaculture and processing indu	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS. No, data upload in DATRAS has not taken place. No comments NA  Map numbers are not consistent in tables and text  No survey indices can be provided for offshore beam trawl surveys as data are not uploaded in DATRAS No comments NA  Recommendation by WGBEAM 2011 on upload data still not implemented No comments	Yes	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed  Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data. Yes. MS to ensure upload offsh beam trawl data in DATRAS act to NP. Yes. MS to list not uploading da DATRAS as a deviation No action needed AR2014: MS to check numbers in tables and text  No action needed
G1 G2 G3 G4	F14  rch surveys Achieven  Data qua  Follow-u	Follow- Actions at sea nents: R	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Its Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  sults and deviation from NP proposal is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations for proposal is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS.  No, data upload in DATRAS has not taken place. No comments NA  Map numbers are not consistent in tables and text  No survey indices can be provided for offshore beam trawl surveys as data are not uploaded in DATRAS No comments NA  Recommendation by WGBEAM 2011 on upload data still not implemented No comments No comments No comments Data not uploaded to DATRAS should be listed as a shortfall. NA	Yes	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed  Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data. Yes. MS to ensure upload offsh beam trawl data in DATRAS act to NP. Yes. MS to list not uploading da DATRAS as a deviation No action needed AR2014: MS to check numbers in tables and text  No action needed
G1 G2 G3 G4	F14  rch surveys Achieven  Data qua  Follow-u	Follow- Actions at sea nents: R	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? It avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Results and deviation from NP proposal  Its Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Its there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Sults and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Jonal and International recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? homic situation of the aquaculture and processing indu	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS.  No, data upload in DATRAS has not taken place. No comments NA Map numbers are not consistent in tables and text  No survey indices can be provided for offshore beam trawl surveys as data are not uploaded in DATRAS No comments NA  Recommendation by WGBEAM 2011 on upload data still not implemented No comments Data not uploaded to DATRAS should be listed as a shortfall. NA  stry	Yes	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed  Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data. Yes. MS to ensure upload offsh beam trawl data in DATRAS act to NP. Yes. MS to list not uploading da DATRAS as a deviation No action needed AR2014: MS to check numbers in tables and text  No action needed
G1 G2 G3 G4	F14  rch surveys Achieven  Data qua  Follow-u	Follow- Actions at sea ments: R	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? It avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Results and deviation from NP proposal  Its Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Its there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Sults and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Jonal and International recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? homic situation of the aquaculture and processing indu	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS.  No, data upload in DATRAS has not taken place. No comments NA  Map numbers are not consistent in tables and text  No survey indices can be provided for offshore beam trawl surveys as data are not uploaded in DATRAS No comments NA  Recommendation by WGBEAM 2011 on upload data still not implemented No comments No comments No comments Data not uploaded to DATRAS should be listed as a shortfall. NA	Yes	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed  Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data. Yes. MS to ensure upload offsh beam trawl data in DATRAS act to NP. Yes. MS to list not uploading da DATRAS as a deviation No action needed AR2014: MS to check numbers in tables and text  No action needed
G1 G2 G3 G4	F14  rch surveys Achieven  Data qua  Follow-u	Follow- Actions at sea nents: R	Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? is to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Sults and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Igional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ommic situation of the aquaculture and processing induning the aquaculture	No comments  No relevant recomendations No comments No comments No shortfalls identified. No shortfalls identified. No comments  Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS. No, data upload in DATRAS has not taken place. No comments NA Map numbers are not consistent in tables and text  No survey indices can be provided for offshore beam trawl surveys as data are not uploaded in DATRAS No comments NA  Recommendation by WGBEAM 2011 on upload data still not implemented No comments Table is not consistent with Guidelines: no cell should be removed from the tables. The cells should be filled either	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  Yes  Mostly Yes NA  Mostly Yes NA  Mostly Yes NA  Mostly Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed  Yes. MS to update text on data in DATRAS for offshore data. Yes. MS to ensure upload offshbeam trawl data in DATRAS act to NP. Yes. MS to list not uploading da DATRAS as a deviation No action needed AR2014: MS to check numbers in tables and text  No action needed

	Mem	ber State:	Belgium	0010		dgement levels
			AR year Version of the AR reviewed	<b>2013</b> 30 May 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
			Version of the NP proposal	March-April 2010	Partly	10-50%
			Overall compliance	EWG Answer  Mostly	Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
			O Totali oonipilalis	incomy	NA NA	not applicable
	<b>A</b> 1	Achievements: F	lesults and deviation from NP proposal	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	N/A	NA	No action and deal
			proposal? Are the deviations explained?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA	No action needed
	A2	Data quality: Res	sults and deviation from NP proposal		•	
			Is respective data quality information given?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Na NA	NA NA	No action needed No action needed
	А3	Follow-up of Red	ional and international recommendations	IVA	INA	No action needed
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA NA	NA	No action needed
	A4	Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
	***	riodorio to avoid	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
	B Collecti	ion of data conce	rning the processing industry guidelines?	Yes	YES	No action needed
			guidelines :	res	163	MS has to clarify which type of a
						Collection scheme they used (that
			Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	The collection scheme is not clear. Some cv's are missing	Mostly	should be the same for IVB1) and explain why the CV is not provided
	B1	Achievements: F	lesults and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	MS should consider other actions to increase the		MS should consider other actions to
			proposal?	response rate including SBS data	Mostly	increase the response rate including SBS data
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	B2	Data quality D	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	B2	Data quality: Hes	sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	CVs are missing	Mostly	MS should provide provide the CVs
				-		MS should provide explanations abo
			Are the deviations explained?	No	No	data quality MS should provide explanations abo
			Are the deviations justified?	No	No	data quality
	B3	Follow-up of Reg	jional and international recommendations	No. 1	lv.	The second second
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	No relevant recommendations NA	Yes NA	No action needed No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA	No action needed
	B4	Actions to avoid	shortfalls		1	T
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	The action described are not enough to avoid shortfalls	Mostly	MS should provide explanations about shortfalls
					,	An exchange with the National
						Statistical Office of Belgium in order t check where they get their data from
				It seems to be a progress in data collection of Belgian		
	Madula of avaluati	ion of the officeto	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	It seems to be a progress in data collection of Belgian Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small	Mostly	
			of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		Mostly	sector in the SBS framework may be
			of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem d deviation from NP proposal	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small	T	sector in the SBS framework may be done.
			of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small	Yes	sector in the SBS framework may be
			of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem d deviation from NP proposal	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small	T	sector in the SBS framework may be done.
	1 Achieve		of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem d deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.	Yes Yes	sector in the SBS framework may be idone.  No action needed  No action needed
	1 Achieve	ements: Results an	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem d deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments	Yes	sector in the SBS framework may be idone.  No action needed
	1 Achieve	ements: Results an	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem d deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSPDF and WKMSTB	Yes Yes	sector in the SBS framework may be idone.  No action needed  No action needed
	1 Achieve	ements: Results an	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem d deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter	Yes Yes	sector in the SBS framework may be idone.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
	1 Achieve	ements: Results an	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of	Yes Yes	sector in the SBS framework may be idone.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data Q3 surveys are being collected, on
	1 Achieve 2 Actions	ements: Results an	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners	Yes Yes	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data Q3 surveys are being collected, on
	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manage	ements: Results and to avoid shortfalls	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of	Yes Yes	sector in the SBS framework may be idone.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data (33 surveys are being collected, on
	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manage	ements: Results and to avoid shortfalls	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  the data	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.	Yes Yes	sector in the SBS framework may be idone.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data i C3 surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe
	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manage	ements: Results and to avoid shortfalls	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  the data	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of	Yes Yes	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data and CS surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are
	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manage	ements: Results and to avoid shortfalls	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  the data deviation from NP proposal  Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.  Table seems not updated for 2013. See many colors, why	Yes Yes  Yes  Mostly	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data in CBS surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are necessary, table should be resubmitted.
	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manage	ements: Results and to avoid shortfalls	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  the data deviation from NP proposal  Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.  Table seems not updated for 2013. See many colors, why those colours? E.g. is AER updated?  No comments	Yes Yes Yes Mostly	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data i Q3 surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are
	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manage	ements: Results and to avoid shortfalls	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  the data deviation from NP proposal  Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.  Table seems not updated for 2013. See many colors, why those colours? E.g. is AER updated?  No comments	Yes Yes  Yes  Mostly	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data in CBS surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are necessary, table should be resubmitted.
	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manage	ements: Results and to avoid shortfalls	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? the data of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for wimer spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners in gist be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.  Table seems not updated for 2013. See many colors, why those colours? E.g. is AER updated?  No comments No comments Only general information provided by MS. But MS	Yes Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data i G3 surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are necessary, table should be resubmitt No action needed
	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manage	ements: Results and to avoid shortfalls	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? the data of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in O3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.  Table seems not updated for 2013. See many colors, why those colours? E.g. is AER updated?  No comments  No comments Only general information provided by MS. But MS detailed in its 2013 AR progress made in year 2013,	Yes Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data i Q3 surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are necessary, table should be resubmitt No action needed  No action needed
	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manage	ements: Results and to avoid shortfalls	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? the data of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for wimer spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners in gist be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.  Table seems not updated for 2013. See many colors, why those colours? E.g. is AER updated?  No comments No comments Only general information provided by MS. But MS	Yes Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data i G3 surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are necessary, table should be resubmitt No action needed
	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manag 1 Achieve	to avoid shortfalls to avoid shortfalls lement and use of	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  the data deviation from NP proposal  Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.  Table seems not updated for 2013. See many colors, why those colours? E.g. is AER updated?  No comments Only general information provided by MS. But MS detailed in its 2013 AR progress made in year 2013, under a concise but precise form.	Yes Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data i G3 surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are necessary, table should be resubmitt.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manag 1 Achieve	ements: Results and to avoid shortfalls	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  the data deviation from NP proposal  Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.  Table seems not updated for 2013. See many colors, why those colours? E.g. is AER updated?  No comments  Only general information provided by MS. But MS detailed in its 2013 AR progress made in year 2013, under a concise but precise form.  No deviation.	Yes Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data i Q3 surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are necessary, table should be resubmitt.  No action needed
	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manag 1 Achieve	to avoid shortfalls to avoid shortfalls lement and use of	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  the data of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.  Table seems not updated for 2013. See many colors, why those colours? E.g. is AER updated?  No comments  No comments Only general information provided by MS. But MS detailed in its 2013 AR progress made in year 2013, under a concise but precise form.  No deviation.	Yes Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data i O3 surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are necessary, table should be resubmitt No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
ı	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manag 1 Achieve	to avoid shortfalls  tement and use of tements: Results and the tements: Results and to avoid shortfalls	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  the data of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.  Table seems not updated for 2013. See many colors, why those colours? E.g. is AER updated?  No comments Only general information provided by MS. But MS detailed in its 2013 AR progress made in year 2013, under a concise but precise form. No deviation. No comments  New IT system will avoid shortfalls.	Yes Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data i O3 surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are necessary, table should be resubmitted. No action needed
11	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manag 1 Achieve	to avoid shortfalls  tement and use of tements: Results and the tements: Results and to avoid shortfalls	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  the data of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.  Table seems not updated for 2013. See many colors, why those colours? E.g. is AER updated?  No comments Only general information provided by MS. But MS detailed in its 2013 AR progress made in year 2013, under a concise but precise form. No deviation. No comments  New IT system will avoid shortfalls.	Yes Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data i C3 surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are necessary, table should be resubmitt. No action needed
1	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manag 1 Achieve	to avoid shortfalls  tement and use of tements: Results and the tements: Results and to avoid shortfalls	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  the data deviation from NP proposal  Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.  Table seems not updated for 2013. See many colors, why those colours? E.g. is AER updated?  No comments  Only general information provided by MS. But MS detailed in its 2013 AR progress made in year 2013, under a concise but precise form.  No deviation.  No comments  New IT system will avoid shortfalls.  No comments	Yes Yes Yes Mostly  Mostly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data i G3 surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are necessary, table should be resubmitt No action needed  Action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Action needed  Action needed  Action needed  No action reeded  No action reeded  No action reeded  No action reeded  The action reeded  Action reeded
1	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manag 1 Achieve	to avoid shortfalls  tement and use of tements: Results and the tements: Results and to avoid shortfalls	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  the data of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for wimer spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.  Table seems not updated for 2013. See many colors, why those colours? E.g. is AER updated?  No comments  No comments  Only general information provided by MS. But MS detailed in its 2013 AR progress made in year 2013, under a concise but precise form.  No deviation.  No comments  New IT system will avoid shortfalls.  No comments  Not explicitlely mentioned that there were no relevant recommendations in. Header refers	Yes Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data i C3 surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are necessary, table should be resubmith No action needed  AR2014: MS to explicitly mention if there were no relevant recommendations or the MS in the reporting year
1	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manag 1 Achieve	to avoid shortfalls  tement and use of tements: Results and the tements: Results and to avoid shortfalls	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? the data of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations is pusified?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? One	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.  Table seems not updated for 2013. See many colors, why those colours? E.g. is AER updated?  No comments  No comments Only general information provided by MS. But MS detailed in its 2013 AR progress made in year 2013, under a concise but precise form. No deviation. No comments  New IT system will avoid shortfalls. No comments  Not explicitely mentioned that there were no relevant recommendations in. Header refers	Yes Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data i GS surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are necessary, table should be resubmitt.  No action needed  Ano action needed  No action needed
1	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manag 1 Achieve	to avoid shortfalls  tement and use of tements: Results and tements: Results and to avoid shortfalls  to avoid shortfalls	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  the data of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.  Table seems not updated for 2013. See many colors, why those colours? E.g. is AER updated?  No comments  No comments  Only general information provided by MS. But MS detailed in its 2013 AR progress made in year 2013, under a concise but precise form.  No deviation.  No comments  New IT system will avoid shortfalls.  No comments  Not explicitlely mentioned that there were no relevant recommendations in. Header refers  No comments	Yes Yes Yes Mostly  Mostly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data i C3 surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are necessary, table should be resubmitt No action needed  AR2014: MS to explicitly mention if there were no relevant recommendations for the MS in the reporting year  No action needed  No action needed
1	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manag 1 Achieve 2 Actions  Follow-up of STEC	to avoid shortfalls  tement and use of tements: Results and to avoid shortfalls  to avoid shortfalls	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  the data d deviation from NP proposal  Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations igustified?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.  Table seems not updated for 2013. See many colors, why those colours? E.g. is AER updated?  No comments  No comments Only general information provided by MS. But MS detailed in its 2013 AR progress made in year 2013, under a concise but precise form. No deviation. No comments  New IT system will avoid shortfalls. No comments  Not explicitely mentioned that there were no relevant recommendations in. Header refers	Yes Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data i Q3 surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are necessary, table should be resubmitt  No action needed  Ano action needed  No action needed
1	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manag 1 Achieve 2 Actions	to avoid shortfalls  tement and use of tements: Results and to avoid shortfalls  to avoid shortfalls	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  the data d deviation from NP proposal  Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations igustified?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.  Table seems not updated for 2013. See many colors, why those colours? E.g. is AER updated?  No comments  No comments  No comments  No deviation.  No deviation.  No deviation.  No comments  No comments  No comments  Not explicitly mentioned that there were no relevant recommendations in. Header refers No comments  No comments  No comments	Yes Yes Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data i C3 surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are necessary, table should be resubmitt No action needed  AR2014: MS to explicitly mention if there were no relevant recommendations for the MS in the reporting year  No action needed  No action needed
1	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manag 1 Achieve 2 Actions  Pollow-up of STEC  List of acronyms a	to avoid shortfalls  tement and use of tements: Results and to avoid shortfalls  to avoid shortfalls	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  the data d deviation from NP proposal  Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations igustified?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.  Table seems not updated for 2013. See many colors, why those colours? E.g. is AER updated?  No comments  No comments  Only general information provided by MS. But MS detailed in its 2013 AR progress made in year 2013, under a concise but precise form.  No deviation.  No comments  New IT system will avoid shortfalls.  No comments  Not explicitlely mentioned that there were no relevant recommendations in. Header refers  No comments	Yes Yes Yes Mostly  Mostly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data i C3 surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are necessary, table should be resubmitt No action needed  AR2014: MS to explicitly mention if there were no relevant recommendations for the MS in the reporting year  No action needed  No action needed
1	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manag 1 Achieve 2 Actions  Follow-up of STEC	to avoid shortfalls  tement and use of tements: Results and to avoid shortfalls  to avoid shortfalls	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  the data deviation from NP proposal  Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described?  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?  lons  Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.  Table seems not updated for 2013. See many colors, why those colours? E.g. is AER updated?  No comments  No comments  No comments  No deviation.  No deviation.  No deviation.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  Not explicitly mentioned that there were no relevant recommendations in. Header refers  No comments	Yes Yes Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data i G3 surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are necessary, table should be resubmitt No action needed  AR2014: MS to explicitly mention if there were no relevant recommendations for the MS in the reporting year  No action needed
"III	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manag 1 Achieve 2 Actions  Pollow-up of STEC  List of acronyms a	to avoid shortfalls  tement and use of tements: Results and to avoid shortfalls  to avoid shortfalls	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  the data of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for wimer spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.  Table seems not updated for 2013. See many colors, why those colours? E.g. is AER updated?  No comments  No comments  Only general information provided by MS. But MS detailed in its 2013 AR progress made in year 2013, under a concise but precise form.  No deviation.  No comments  No comments  Not explicitely mentioned that there were no relevant recommendations in. Header refers  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  Comments passed on to Commission by STECF EWG 14-	Yes Yes Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data in C3 surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are necessary, table should be resubmitted. No action needed  AR2014: MS to explicitly mention if there were no relevant recommendations for the MS in the reporting year  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
11 11 11 11 K	1 Achieve 2 Actions  Module for manag 1 Achieve  2 Actions  Follow-up of STEC  List of acronyms a  Comments, sugge	to avoid shortfalls  tement and use of tements: Results and to avoid shortfalls  to avoid shortfalls	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem of deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  the data deviation from NP proposal  Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described?  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?  lons  Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	Fish processors, even if total numbers are still small  No comments No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.  No comments It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.  Table seems not updated for 2013. See many colors, why those colours? E.g. is AER updated?  No comments  No comments  Only general information provided by MS. But MS detailed in its 2013 AR progress made in year 2013, under a concise but precise form.  No deviation.  No comments  New IT system will avoid shortfalls.  No comments  No comments	Yes Yes Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	sector in the SBS framework may be done.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data i GS surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.  MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are necessary, table should be resubmitted. No action needed  AR2014: MS to explicitly mention if the reporting year  No action needed

Member State:

Belgium		Jud	Igement levels
AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	March-April 2010	Partly	10-50%
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
Overall complianc	Mostly	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

	Mami	oer State:	Croatia	1	I	d
	weiiii	ber State:	AR year	2013	Compliance class	dgement levels  Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No Portly	<10% 10-50%
			Version of the NP proposal	May 2013 EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
					NA	not applicable
General f	framewor	k		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
			Are derogations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
National (		ection organisati	on and participating institutes			
		солосропист	Are the partners involved in the national data	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			collection and their roles well described? Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			ls there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
В	Region: B1	al and Internation	nal coordination International meetings			
	ъ.	Attendance on	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	B2	Follow-up of re	gional and international recommendations		tes	No action needed
		-	Are the general recommendations from Liaison	Reference not made to Liaison but to RCM meetings.	V	No
			Meeting listed? Are the responsive actions described?	Seems to be OK anyway. No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Module r	of the eve	luation of the fisl	ning sector			
Module o A			he fishing sector			_
			Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well			
			described?	No changes are described	Yes	No action needed
В	France	nic variables	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra- region given?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
		nic variables lediterranean Se	a and Black Sea	no comments	162	no action needed
			Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR	IVA	INA	No action needed
			guidelines? Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR	NA	NA	No action needed
			guidelines?	NA	NA	No action needed
	B1	Achievements: I	Results and deviation from NP proposal			1
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
	B2	Data quality: Pa	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal	NA	NA	No action needed
	D2	Data quality. He	Is respective data quality information given?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
	В3	Follow-up of Re	Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations	NA	NA	No action needed
	50	Tollow up of the	Are the relevant recommendations from LM			
			listed? Are the responsive actions described?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
	B4	Actions to avoid				1
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future			
С	Riologic	cal metier related	acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
-	_iologii	relatet	·			
				İ		•
			Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
Region M		nean Sea and Bla	ick Sea	Yes	Yes	no action needed
Region N	Mediterrar C1			Yes  MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the	Yes	no action needed  MS to resubmit tables with total
Region N			Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column	Yes Mostly	MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year
Region N			Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the		MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year
Region №			Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column	Mostly Mostly	MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year the precision targets should be gi
Region №			Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column  Yes some information missing. 2 metler level 6 descriptions	Mostly	MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year
Region N			Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column  Yes some information missing, 2 metier level 6 descriptions and 3 RFMO areas missing	Mostly Mostly	MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year the precision targets should be given the precision targets should be given to the precision targets and the precision targets are the precision targets are the precision targets and the precision targets are the precision targets and the precision targets are the
Region N			Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the	MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column  Yes some information missing. 2 metier level 6 descriptions and 3 RFMO areas missing The few deviations are represented by sampling trips for metier LLD_LPF_0_0_0 BFT and LLD_LPF_0_0_0	Mostly Mostly Yes	MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year the precision targets should be give as numbers and not as %s
Region N			Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column  Yes some information missing. 2 metier level 6 descriptions and 3 RFMO areas missing  The few deviations are represented by sampling trips for metier LLD_LPF_0_0_0 BFT and LLD_LPF_0_0_0 SWO	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Mostly  Mostly	MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year the precision targets should be ging as numbers and not as %s  MS to complete table  no action needed
Region N			Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column  Yes some information missing. 2 metier level 6 descriptions and 3 RFMO areas missing The few deviations are represented by sampling trips for metier LLD_LPF_0_0_0 BFT and LLD_LPF_0_0_0 SWO  Yes	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Mostly  Mostly	MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year the precision targets should be given as numbers and not as %s  MS to complete table  no action needed no action needed
Region N		Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column  Yes some information missing. 2 metier level 6 descriptions and 3 RFMO areas missing  The few deviations are represented by sampling trips for metier LLD_LPF_0_0_0 BFT and LLD_LPF_0_0_0 SWO	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Mostly  Mostly	MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year the precision targets should be given as numbers and not as %s  MS to complete table  no action needed no action needed no action needed
Region N	C1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal	MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column  Yes some information missing. 2 metier level 6 descriptions and 3 RFMO areas missing The few deviations are represented by sampling trips for metier LLD_LPF_0_0_0 BFT and LLD_LPF_0_0_0 SWO  Yes  Yes	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes	MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year the precision targets should be given as numbers and not as %s  MS to complete table  no action needed no action needed in action needed  In future MS should ensure age sampling is sufficient to calculate.
Region N	C1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column  Yes some information missing. 2 metier level 6 descriptions and 3 RFMO areas missing The few deviations are represented by sampling trips for metier LLD_LPF_0_0_0 BFT and LLD_LPF_0_0_0 SWO  Yes	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Mostly  Mostly	MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year the precision targets should be given as numbers and not as %s  MS to complete table  no action needed no action needed in future MS should ensure age
Region N	C1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  sesults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?	MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column Yes some information missing. 2 metier level 6 descriptions and 3 RFMO areas missing The few deviations are represented by sampling trips for metier LLD_LPF_0_0_0 BFT and LLD_LPF_0_0_0 SWO Yes	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Mostly	MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year the precision targets should be given as numbers and not as %s  MS to complete table  no action needed no action needed in future MS should ensure age sampling is sufficient to calculate precision CV no action needed no action needed no action needed
Region N	C1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?	MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column Yes some information missing. 2 metier level 6 descriptions and 3 RFMO areas missing The few deviations are represented by sampling trips for metier LLD_LPF_0_0_0 BFT and LLD_LPF_0_0_0 SWO Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  For 6 species was not reached the requested CV	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes	MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year the precision targets should be given as numbers and not as %s  MS to complete table  no action needed no action needed no action needed in future MS should ensure age sampling is sufficient to calculate precision CV no action needed no action needed in future MS should ensure age sampling is sufficient to calculate precision CV
Region N	C1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? esults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?	MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column Yes some information missing. 2 metier level 6 descriptions and 3 RFMO areas missing The few deviations are represented by sampling trips for metier LLD_LPF_0_0_0 BFT and LLD_LPF_0_0_0 SWO Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  For 6 species was not reached the requested CV	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly	MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year the precision targets should be given as numbers and not as %s  MS to complete table  no action needed no action needed in future MS should ensure age sampling is sufficient to calculate precision CV no action needed no action needed in cutton needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed in outling MS should ensure age
Region N	C1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? esults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained?	MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column Yes some information missing. 2 metier level 6 descriptions and 3 RFMO areas missing The few deviations are represented by sampling trips for metier LLD_LPF_0_0_0 BFT and LLD_LPF_0_0_0 SWO Yes Yes Yes  Yes  Yes  Mostly	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes	MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year the precision targets should be given as numbers and not as %s  MS to complete table  no action needed no action needed in future MS should ensure age sampling is sufficient to calculate a precision CV no action needed in future MS should ensure age sampling is sufficient to calculate a precision CV no action needed in future MS should ensure age sampling is sufficient to calculate a precision CV
Region N	C1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations justified? esqual and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM	MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column  Yes some information missing. 2 metier level 6 descriptions and 3 RFMO areas missing The few deviations are represented by sampling trips for metier LLD_LPF_0_0_0 BFT and LLD_LPF_0_0_0  SWO Yes Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Mostly	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Mostly  Yes	MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year the precision targets should be given as numbers and not as %s  MS to complete table  no action needed no action needed no action needed In future MS should ensure age sampling is sufficient to calculate a precision CV no action needed in future MS should ensure age sampling is sufficient to calculate a precision CV no action needed
Region N	C1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? esults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column Yes some information missing. 2 metier level 6 descriptions and 3 RFMO areas missing The few deviations are represented by sampling trips for metier LLD_LPF_0_0_0 BFT and LLD_LPF_0_0_0 SWO Yes Yes  Yes  Yes  Mostly Yes  Yes	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes	MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year the precision targets should be given as numbers and not as %s.  MS to complete table  no action needed no action needed no action needed in future MS should ensure age sampling is sufficient to calculate precision CV no action needed in future MS should ensure age sampling is sufficient to calculate precision CV no action needed in future MS should ensure age sampling is sufficient to calculate precision CV no action needed no action needed no action needed
Region N	C1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations justified? esqual and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM	MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column  Yes some information missing. 2 metier level 6 descriptions and 3 RFMO areas missing The few deviations are represented by sampling trips for metier LLD_LPF_0_0_0 BFT and LLD_LPF_0_0_0  SWO Yes Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Mostly	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Mostly  Yes	MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year the precision targets should be given as numbers and not as %s  MS to complete table  no action needed no action needed no action needed In future MS should ensure age sampling is sufficient to calculate precision CV no action needed in future MS should ensure age sampling is sufficient to calculate precision CV no action needed in future MS should ensure age sampling is sufficient to calculate precision CV
Region N	C1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? esults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls	MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column Yes some information missing. 2 metier level 6 descriptions and 3 RFMO areas missing The few deviations are represented by sampling trips for metier LLD_LPF_0_0_0 BFT and LLD_LPF_0_0_0 SWO Yes  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes	MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year the precision targets should be given as numbers and not as %s  MS to complete table  no action needed no action needed no action needed in future MS should ensure age sampling is sufficient to calculate a precision CV no action needed
Region N	C2	Data quality: Re	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column Yes some information missing. 2 metier level 6 descriptions and 3 RFMO areas missing The few deviations are represented by sampling trips for metier LLD_LPF_0_0_0 BFT and LLD_LPF_0_0_0 SWO Yes  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes	MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year the precision targets should be given as numbers and not as %s  MS to complete table  no action needed no action needed no action needed in future MS should ensure age sampling is sufficient to calculate a precision CV no action needed

	_		_		
Mem	ber State		2010		ludgement levels
		AR year Version of the AR reviewed	2013 31 May 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
		Version of the NP proposal	May 2013	Partly	10-50%
		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compliance	e Mostly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
		Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		respective region?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
Region Mediterra	nean Sea an				1.0 0.000
D1	Achievem	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal		1	D/ MO:
		Are design and achievements consistent with th NP proposal?	<ul> <li>No informations on recreational fisheries for tuna are provided</li> </ul>	Partly	Yes. MS to provide information on recreational fisheries of tuna.
		Ni proposar:	provided	1 uniy	Yes. MS to provide more information
		Are obtained derogations mentioned?		.,	on date and mechanism of derogation
			Derogations are reported for eel and sharks	Yes	approval. Yes. MS to provide information on
		Are the deviations explained?			whether steps have been taken to
		And the desiration is stilled.	No relevant information provided.	No	improve data collection for tuna.
D2	Data quali	Are the deviations justified? y: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	NA	No action needed
52	Data quan	y. Hesuits and deviation from the proposal			
		Were data quality targets provided?	N	D	MS should provide data quality targets
		Were data quality targets met?	No information provided for tuna fishery  No comments	Partly NA	for all relevant recreational fisheries  No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
D3	Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations		1	
		Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		listed?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
D4	Actions to	avoid shortfalls		1	Yes. MS to provide information on
					progress made regarding
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future			strengthening the system of
		described ?			registration of the catches for BFT made by the recreational fisheries in
			No actions described although information is missing in		terms of robustness and data quality
			the report.	No	control as indicated in NP.
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
E Biologi	cal stock-re	ated variables	NO COMMENTS	INA	No action needed
		Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each	Yes		
		respective region?	103		
Region Mediterrar		ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Acilieveili	ints. Results and deviation from NF proposal			For fature AD the MO should use
			'Planned required CV' is given in % rather than		For future AR the MS should use correct units for planned CVs and the
			numbers. Some achieved CVs given with an excess of decimal places. The % achievement column is given as	Mostly	achieved CV column should have
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AF	% and as a number. %s should be given for all		fewer and consistent decimal places.
		guidelines?			Acheivements to be presented as a %
		Are design and achievements consistent with th NP proposal?	e Yes	Yes	no action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	no action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	no action needed
E2	Data quali	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No.		T
		Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?	Yes The requested CVs have not been achieved	Yes No	no action needed no action needed
		were ov targets met:	MS should provide informations for the deviations of		MS should provide informations for the
		Are the deviations explained?	planned CV	No	deviations of planned CV
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	MS should provide informations for the
E3	Follow-un	Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations		<u> </u>	deviations of planned CV
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM	Yes	Yes	no action needed
		listed? Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
E4	Actions to	avoid shortfalls		1	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	shortfalls for CVs not justified	No	MS should provide informations for the
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future			deviations of planned CV
		acceptable?	NA	NA	NA
F Transv	ersal variab	es Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR		1	<del></del>
		guidelines?	Accuracy indicators should be provided in percentage	Mostly	No action needed
F1	Capacity	· ·			
	F11	chievements: Results and deviation from NP proposa		1	
		Are design and achievements consistent with th NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F13	actions to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future		T .	
		described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	No comments		
	E#	acceptable?	sommonto	Yes	No action needed
F2	Effort F11	achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposa	I		
		Are design and achievements consistent with the			1
		NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F12	Are the deviations justified?  Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	1 12	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F13	follow-up of Regional and international recommendation  Are the relevant recommendations from LM	ons	ı	<del></del>
		listed?	No recommendation adressed by RCM_LDF to MS.	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed

	per State:	Croatia			Judgement levels
		AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No Double	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	May 2013  EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
		Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
		·		NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F14 Actio	ns to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	No comments		
		described ?	THE COMMENTS	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
F3	Landings	addeptable.		100	140 dollori ricoded
	_	evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the	No comments		
		NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
	F12 Data	quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	no comments	163	No action needed
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F13 Follo	w-up of Regional and international recommendation Are the relevant recommendations from LM	ns .	1	1
		listed?	No relevant recomendations	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F14 Actio	ns to avoid shortfalls			·
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	No comments	V-	No action resided
		described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future		Yes	No action needed
		acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	ch surveys at se				
G1	Achievements	: Results and deviation from NP proposal		1	
		Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are design and achievements consistent with the		162	740 dollori riceded
		NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved	No comments	NA	No action needed
		sampling activities?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
G2	Data quality: F	Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be			
		kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?			1
			No comments	NA	No action needed
G3	Follow-up of R	egional and international recommendations	INO comments	NA	No action needed
G3	Follow-up of R	regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey		<u> </u>	
G3	Follow-up of R	degional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?	No recommendations	NA	No action needed
G3	Follow-up of R	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described?	No recommendations No comments	NA NA	No action needed No action needed
G3 G4	Follow-up of R	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No recommendations	NA	No action needed
	·	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	No recommendations No comments No comments	NA NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed
	·	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No recommendations No comments	NA NA	No action needed No action needed
	·	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	No recommendations No comments No comments	NA NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
G4	Actions to avo	egional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	No recommendations No comments No comments No comments No comments	NA NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed
G4 Module of the eva	Actions to avo	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture	No recommendations No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry	NA NA NA NA	No action needed
G4 Module of the eva	Actions to avo	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces	No recommendations No comments No comments No comments No comments	NA NA NA	No action needed
G4 Module of the eva	Actions to avo	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture	No recommendations No comments No comments No comments No comments sing industry No comments	NA NA NA NA	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for
G4 Module of the eva	Actions to avo	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture	No recommendations No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry	NA NA NA NA	No action needed
G4 Module of the eva	Actions to avo	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No recommendations No comments No comments No comments No comments sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same	NA NA NA NA	No action needed In action needed
G4 Module of the eva	Actions to avo	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR	No recommendations No comments No comments No comments No comments sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables	NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA MA NA Mostly	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01)
G4 Module of the eva A Collecti	Actions to avo	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No recommendations No comments No comments No comments No comments sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted	NA NA NA NA NA	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for
G4  Module of the eva	Actions to avo	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the	No recommendations No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing	NA NA NA NA NA NA MA NA Mostly Mostly	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs
G4 Module of the eva A Collecti	Actions to avo	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No recommendations No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments	NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA Yes  Mostly Mostly Yes	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed
G4 Module of the eva A Collecti	Actions to avo	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	No recommendations No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments No comments	NA NA NA NA NA NA NA Ves Mostly Yes Yes Yes	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed No action needed
G4 Module of the eva A Collecti	Actions to avo	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations systained?	No recommendations No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments	NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA Yes  Mostly Mostly Yes	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed
G4 Module of the eva A Collecti	Actions to avo	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation systified? esults and deviation from NP proposal	No recommendations No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments No comments No comments No comments	NA NA NA NA NA NA NA  NA  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed No action needed No action needed
G4 Module of the eva A Collecti	Actions to avo	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations systained?	No recommendations No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments No comments	NA NA NA NA NA NA NA Ves Mostly Yes Yes Yes	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed No action needed
G4 Module of the eva A Collecti	Actions to avo	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces eming the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?	No recommendations No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments	NA NA NA NA NA NA NA  NA  Yes  Mostly  Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
G4 Module of the eva A Collecti	Actions to avo	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? agional and international recommendations	No recomments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments	NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA  NA  Yes  Mostly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed
G4  Module of the eva  Collecti  A1	Actions to avo	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Besults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations pustified? Begional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM	No recomments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments	NA N	No action needed  No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS shoudl provide the CVs  No action needed
G4 Module of the eva A Collecti A1	Actions to avo	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations yealtied? esults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations yestified? Are the deviations systified? Are the deviations systified? Are the deviations systified? Are the deviations pusified? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No recomments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments	NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA  NA  Yes  Mostly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed
G4  Module of the eva A Collecti  A1	Actions to avo	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Besults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations pustified? Begional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM	No recomments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments	NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA  Yes  Mostly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed
G4 Module of the eva A Collecti A1	Actions to avo	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pusified? Begional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the tresponsive actions described? Are the tresponsive actions acceptable? Are the tresponsive actions acceptable?	No recommendations No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments	NA N	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed
G4  Module of the eva A Collecti  A1  A2  A3	Actions to avoid a second of data concerns and a second of data co	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations pustified? sesults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations iguisfied? egional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? dishortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	No recomments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments	NA Nostly Mostly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed
G4  Module of the eva A Collecti  A1  A2  A3	Actions to avoid a second of data concerns and a second of data co	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? sesults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations synlained? Are the deviations from NP proposal Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No recommendations No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments	NA N	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample/Planed sample for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed
G4  Module of the eva A Collecti  A1  A2  A3	Actions to avoid a second of data concerns and a second of data co	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations pustified? sesults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations iguisfied? egional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? dishortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	No recomments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments	NA Nostly Mostly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed
G4  Module of the eva A Collecti  A1  A2  A3	Actions to avoid actions to avoid Actions to avoid Actions to avoid	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations igustified? sesults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations yustified? sejonal and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are story of the story of	No recomments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing  No comments	NA Nostly Mostly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example) 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed
G4  Module of the eva A Collecti  A1  A2  A3	Actions to avoid actions to avoid Actions to avoid Actions to avoid	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations ipustified? Are the deviations pustified? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? erning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR	No recomments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments	NA Nostly Mostly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed
G4  Module of the eva A Collecti  A1  A2  A3	Actions to avoid actions to avoid Actions to avoid Actions to avoid	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations igustified? sesults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations yustified? sejonal and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are story of the story of	No recomments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing  No comments	NA Nostly Mostly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example) 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed
G4  Module of the eva A Collecti  A1  A2  A3	Actions to avoid actions to avoid Actions to avoid Actions to avoid	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? egional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? erning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No recomments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments	NA Nostly Mostly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed
G4  Module of the eva A Collecti  A1  A2  A3	Actions to avoid a concord	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? sesults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations ipustified? are the deviations in pustified? Are the deviations in pustified? Are the deviations in pustified? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? erning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal	No recomments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments	NA Nostly Mostly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NO	No action needed  No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs  No action needed
G4  Module of the eva A Collecti  A1  A2  A3  A4	Actions to avoid a concord	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations igustified? seults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations synlained? Are the deviations synlained? Are the deviations from NP proposal Are the responsive actions from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Fable IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the	No recomments No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments Data are missing Data are missing Data are missing	NA Nostly Mostly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NO No	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed
G4  Module of the eva A Collecti  A1  A2  A3  A4	Actions to avoid a concord	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces eming the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pusified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations justified? esponsive actions described? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Is actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Evaluations in the future acceptable IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No recomments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments Do comments No comments	NA N	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed
G4  Module of the eva A Collecti  A1  A2  A3  A4	Actions to avoid a concord	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? esplonal and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the deviations justified? esplonal and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? erning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	No recomments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments Data are missing Data are missing Data are missing Data collection has started in 2013, so results are still pending as the collection is going on MS gave explanations on the delay and the new data col	NA N	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed
G4  Module of the eva A Collecti  A1  A2  A3  A4	Actions to avoid a concord	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces eming the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pusified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations justified? esponsive actions described? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Is actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Evaluations in the future acceptable IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No recomments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments Do comments No comme	NA N	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example)/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed
Module of the eva A Collecti  A1  A2  A3  A4  B Collecti	Actions to avoid a concord	egional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? sesults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations spusified? Are the deviations pustified? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  erning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviation spustified? Are the deviation spustified? Are the deviation spustified? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviation spustified?  Are the deviation spustified?  Are the deviation spustified?  Are the deviation spustified?  Braults and deviation from NP proposal	No recomments No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments Data are missing Data are missing Data are missing Data are missing Data collection has started in 2013, so results are still pending as the collection is going on MS gave explanations on the delay and the new data col Mostly For the reference year, MS could not provide data	NA N	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed
G4  Module of the eva A Collecti  A1  A2  A3  A4  B Collecti	Actions to avoid a concord	legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? sesults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations syntamed? Are the deviations from NP proposal Is respective data quality information from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? sesults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	No recomments No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments No comme	NA N	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,011) MS should provide the CVs No action needed
G4  Module of the eva A Collecti  A1  A2  A3  A4  B Collecti	Actions to avoid a concord	egional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and proces erning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? sesults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations spusified? Are the deviations pustified? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  erning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviation spustified? Are the deviation spustified? Are the deviation spustified? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviation spustified?  Are the deviation spustified?  Are the deviation spustified?  Are the deviation spustified?  Braults and deviation from NP proposal	No recomments No comments No comments No comments No comments Sing industry No comments Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables Some of CVs are missing No comments Data are missing Data are missing Data are missing Data are missing Data collection has started in 2013, so results are still pending as the collection is going on MS gave explanations on the delay and the new data col Mostly For the reference year, MS could not provide data	NA N	No action needed MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planed sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01) MS should provide the CVs No action needed

Mambay State	Oversite	<b>¬</b>		
Member State:				udgement levels
	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
	Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
	Version of the NP proposal	May 2013	Partly	10-50%
		EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
	Overall complianc	e Mostly	Yes	>90%
			NA	not applicable
		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM			It could be very interesting for MS to
	listed?	No comments	Yes	take account of LM recommandations
	Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
B4 Actions to a	void shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future			
	described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future			
	acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
V Module of evaluation of the effe	ects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem			
	ts and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR			
	quidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are the relevant derogations listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed
2 Actions to avoid short			•	
2 / 10110110 10 47 014 011011	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future			
	described?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	100		THE GOLOTT HEEGE
	acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
VI Module for management and us				
	ts and deviation from NP proposal			
T / to mo vo monto. Thousand	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR			
	quidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements			
	consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section			
	well detailed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP			
	proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No deviation.	Yes	No action neededd
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action neededd
2 Actions to avoid short				
= /1010110 10 07010 011011	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future			
	described ?	No comments	Yes	No action neededd
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future			TVO GOLOTI TIOOGOGG
	acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action neededd
VII Follow-up of STECF recommen				Tto dollor ricododd
Show up of O i Eor recommen				IAR2014: MS to list relevant STECF
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations	No recommendations listed, and no information if there		recommendations, including
	listed?	were no relevant recommendations.	No	responsive actions
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA NA	No action needed
VIII 1 i-t -t	The state of the s	IVA	INA	INO action needed
VIII List of acronyms and abbreviat		In .		Isi e i i
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
IX Comments, suggestions and re	effections	_		

No comments

No comments

No comments

No action needed

No action needed

No action needed

Yes

Yes

Yes

IX Comments, suggestions and reflections
Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?

XI Annexes

Is there a complete list of references?

Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?

Memi	ber State:	Cyprus	1	lude	jement levels
WEIIII	oei otate.	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	31 May 2014 May 2010	No Partly	<10% 10-50%
		Overall compliance	EWG Answer Mostly	Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
				NA	not applicable
General framewor	k		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
		Ara desperties listed?	Yes. No comments	Yes	MS should provide information if the listed derogations have been
National data colle					approved or rejected
A Nationa	l correspondent	and participating institutes Are the partners involved in the national data collection and	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		their roles well described? Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments	No	MS is request to implement a DCI
					database and should provide the intended timeframe
		Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	No comments	NA	see comment above
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		coordination meetings? If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
B Regiona B1	al and Internation Attendance of i	nternational meetings			
		Is Table II.B.1 complete?  Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings	No comments None of the meetings been attended	Yes Yes	No action needed MS should try to participate in the
		explained?			DCF meetings in order to improve the collaboration with the countries in the Region
B2	Follow-up of re	gional and international recommendations  Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		listed?			
		Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
Module of the eval	uation of the fiel	ning sector			
		he fishing sector	Ma annual and a second a second and a second a second and	V	This sealing annual of
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
B Econon SUPRA-REGION N	nic variables lediterranean Se	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given? a and Black Sea	Yes (only Med & BS relevant)	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Reference year should be 2012; unclear why two segments are listed twice; supraregion name incomplete; clustered segments should be marked with asterisk; inactive vessels are not reported	Mostly	MS should resubmit the table according to the ewg comments
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Reference year should be 2012; supraregion name incomplete; clustered segments should be marked with asterisk	Mostly	MS should resubmit the table according to the ewg comments
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Reference year should be 2012; supraregion name incomplete; some CVs missing	Mostly	MS should resubmit the table according to the ewg comments
B1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Inactive vessels not listed. The reference year is 2013 instead of 2012	Mostly	MS should provide more information on the reference year the economic variables and the
		Are the deviations explained?	The MS should provide more information on inactive vessels and reference year	Mostly	number of inactive vessels MS should provide more information on the reference year the economic variables and the number of inactive vessels
		Are the deviations justified?	The MS provided no information for the deviations eg. Inactive vessels	Mostly	MS should provide more information on the reference year the economic variables and the number of inactive vessels
B2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
В3	Follow-up of Re	Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations	NA	NA	No action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations NA	Yes NA	No action needed No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
B4	Actions to avoid	shortfalls	More specific information should be provided for the actions to avoid shortfalls	Mostly	MS should be more specific regarding the procedure for
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	More specific information should be provided for the	Mostly	improving the response rate MS should be more specific
C Biologie	cal metier related	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	actions to avoid shortfalls		regarding the procedure for improving the response rate
		Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Region Mediterran C1		ck Sea Results and deviation from NP proposal			
-	- /	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes. The ICCAT fishing grounds should be according to the RFMO divisions	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR	Yes. The ICCAT fishing grounds should be according to	Yes	No action needed
		guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	the RFMO divisions  Merluccius merluccius is not reported in Table III.C.5 but does appear in Table III.C.6. The ICCAT fishing grounds should be according to the RFMO divisions. CV for large pelagic has been calculated, even if for 2012 data, during the PGMed 2013 and these output should be reported	Mostly	MS to ensure that all species are included from concurrent samplin in Table III.C.6 in future AR's, and that naming conventions are respected
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Merluccius merluccius is not reported in Table III.C.5 but does appear in Table III.C.6. It does not appear that any concurrent sampling was carried out, in spite of the fact	Mostly	MS to ensure that all species are included from concurrent samplin in Table III.C.6 in future Annual
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	that sampling at sea trips were completed.  There are deviations in the planned sampling for longline targeting albacore and for OTB targetting demersal	Mostly	Reports MS to increase efforts to sample the undersampled or not sampled
			species		metiers.
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes Yes	metiers. No action needed No action needed

		AR year Version of the AR reviewed	2013 31 May 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
		Version of the NP proposal	May 2010	Partly	10-50%
		• •	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall complianc	e Mostly	Yes	>90%
			l	NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		Were CV targets met?	requested CVs were met for only two species	Partly	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
C3	Follow-up of R	egional and international recommendations	To .		Dr. e
		Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
C4	Actions to avo				
٠.	710110110110110	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Recre	ational fisheries				
		Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region	? No comments	Yes	No action needed
	anean Sea and Bla				
D1	Achievements	Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	MS asked a derogation for all the three Rec Fishery (tuna, sharks and eel). It is not reported if, and when, the Commission has approved the requests for bluefin tuna and sharks, however the MS indicates that fishing for these species is prohibited according to recreational fishing licenses. A derogation for sampling eel recreational fisheries is in place.	Yes	No action needed
		Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
D2	Data quality: F	esults and deviation from NP proposal			
	-	Were data quality targets provided?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		Were data quality targets met?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
-	F-P :-	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
D3	Follow-up of R	egional and international recommendations	No comments	NA	No action needed
		Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
D4	Actions to avo				
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
Biolog	gical stock-related	variables			•
_	-	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region	? No comments	Yes	No action needed
n Mediterra	anean Sea and Bla	ck Sea	•		
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR	No comments	Yes	The ICCAT fishing grounds sho
		guidelines?			according to the RFMO division And for LPF the RFMO should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF A
		guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	The number of albacore specimens (the only species that should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is	Yes	And for LPF the RFMO should assigned to ICCAT. MS to
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they	Yes	And for LPF the RFMO should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required		And for LPF the RFMO should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF.  No action needed
<b>E</b> 2	Data quality: F	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required No comments No comments	Yes	And for LPF the RFMO should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
<b>E</b> 2	Data quality: F	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required.  No comments	Yes	And for LPF the RFMO should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF / No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in
<b>E</b> 2	Data quality: F	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  esults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required No comments No comments  Yes, apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the	Yes Yes Yes	And for LPF the RFMO should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in
E2	Data quality: F	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required. No comments  No comments  Yes, apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold	Yes Yes Yes Partly	And for LPF the RFMO should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cv'
E2 E3		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required. No comments  No comments  Yes, apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold.  No comments  No comments	Yes Yes Partly  Yes Yes Yes	And for LPF the RFMO should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cv'  No action needed  No action needed
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations systified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required No comments No comments Ves, apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold No comments No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes Partly  Yes Yes Yes	And for LPF the RFMO should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cv'  No action needed  No action needed
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required. No comments  No comments  Yes, apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold.  No comments  No comments	Yes Yes Partly  Yes Yes Yes	And for LPF the RFMC should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cv. No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required  No comments  Yes, apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No derogations are requested for this module  There were no relevant derogations proposed by the RCM	Yes Yes Partly  Yes Yes NA NA	And for LPF the RFMC should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cv:  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required No comments No comments Ves, apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold No comments No comments No comments No comments No derogations are requested for this module There were no relevant derogations proposed by the RCM No comments	Yes Yes Yes Partly  Yes Yes Yes	And for LPF the RFMO should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cv's No action needed
	Follow-up of R	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required  No comments  Yes, apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No derogations are requested for this module  There were no relevant derogations proposed by the RCM	Yes Yes Yes Partly  Yes Yes NA NA	And for LPF the RFMC should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cv:  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
<b>E</b> 3		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required No comments No comments Ves, apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold No comments No comments No comments No comments No derogations are requested for this module There were no relevant derogations proposed by the RCM No comments	Yes Yes Yes Partly  Yes Yes NA NA	And for LPF the RFMO should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cv's No action needed
<b>E</b> 3	Follow-up of R	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required  No comments  Yes, apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold  No comments  No comments  No derogations are requested for this module  There were no relevant derogations proposed by the RCM  No comments  No comments	Yes Yes Yes Partty  Yes Yes NA NA NA NA	And for LPF the RFMC should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cv:  No action needed
E3 E4	Follow-up of R	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required No comments No comments  Yes, apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold No comments CV is missing for Probability Sample Surveys carried out. According to the text this data is availabale, but not	Yes Yes Yes Partly  Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA Yes	And for LPF the RFMC should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF / No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cv's No action needed
E3 E4 Trans	Follow-up of R Actions to avo	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table Ill.F.1 complete and consistent with AR	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required No comments  Yes, apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold No comments  No comments  No derogations are requested for this module There were no relevant derogations proposed by the RCM No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments CV is missing for Probability Sample Surveys carried out.	Yes Yes Yes Partly  Yes Yes NA NA NA NA Ves Yes Yes	And for LPF the RFMC should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cv's:  No action needed
E3 E4	Follow-up of R  Actions to avoversal variables  Capacity	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required No comments No comments  Yes, apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold No comments CV is missing for Probability Sample Surveys carried out. According to the text this data is availabale, but not	Yes Yes Yes Partly  Yes Yes NA NA NA NA Ves Yes Yes	And for LPF the RFMC should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cv's:  No action needed
E3 E4 Trans	Follow-up of R  Actions to avoversal variables  Capacity	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table Ill.F.1 complete and consistent with AR	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required No comments No comments  Yes, apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold No comments CV is missing for Probability Sample Surveys carried out. According to the text this data is availabale, but not	Yes Yes Yes Partly  Yes Yes NA NA NA NA Ves Yes Yes	And for LPF the RFMC should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cv's:  No action needed
E3 E4 Trans	Follow-up of R  Actions to avoversal variables  Capacity	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required No comments No comments Ves, apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold No comments CV is missing for Probability Sample Surveys carried out. According to the text this data is availabale, but not reported in the Excel tables.  No comments	Yes Yes Yes Partly  Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA Yes Yes  Mostly	And for LPF the RFMC should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cv*:  No action needed  Provide missing quality indicat
E3 E4 Trans	Follow-up of R  Actions to avoversal variables  Capacity	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required No comments No comments Ves. apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments CV is missing for Probability Sample Surveys carried out. According to the text this data is availabale, but not reported in the Excel tables.  No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes Partly  Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA Ves Yes Mostly  Yes NA	And for LPF the RFMO should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cv'  No action needed  Provide missing quality indicated  No action needed
E3 E4 Trans	Follow-up of F Actions to avoversal variables Capacity F11 Achi	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  exements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations justified?	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required No comments No comments Ves, apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold No comments CV is missing for Probability Sample Surveys carried out. According to the text this data is availabale, but not reported in the Excel tables.  No comments	Yes Yes Yes Partly  Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA Yes Yes  Mostly	And for LPF the RFMC should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cv:  No action needed  Provide missing quality indicat
E3 E4 Trans	Follow-up of F Actions to avoversal variables Capacity F11 Achi	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations synlained? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations justified? Ins to avoid shortfalls	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required  No comments  No comments  Yes, apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold  No comments  No comments  No derogations are requested for this module  There were no relevant derogations proposed by the RCM  No comments  No comments  CV is missing for Probability Sample Surveys carried out. According to the text this data is availabale, but not reported in the Excel tables.  No comments  No comments	Yes Yes Yes Partly  Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA  Yes Yes  Mostly  Yes NA NA	And for LPF the RFMC should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cv:  No action needed  Provide missing quality indicat  No action needed  No action needed
E3 E4 Trans	Follow-up of F Actions to avoversal variables Capacity F11 Achi	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations sylatified? Are the deviations to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required No comments No comments  Yes, apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold No comments No comments No comments No comments  No derogations are requested for this module There were no relevant derogations proposed by the RCM No comments No comments CV is missing for Probability Sample Surveys carried out. According to the text this data is availabale, but not reported in the Excel tables.  No comments	Yes Yes Yes Partly  Yes Yes NA NA NA NA  Yes Yes  Mostly  Yes NA	And for LPF the RFMO should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cv.  No action needed  Provide missing quality indicat  No action needed
E3 E4 Trans	Follow-up of R  Actions to avoversal variables  Capacity F11 Achi F13 Action	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations synlained? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations justified? Ins to avoid shortfalls	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required  No comments  No comments  Yes, apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold  No comments  No comments  No derogations are requested for this module  There were no relevant derogations proposed by the RCM  No comments  No comments  CV is missing for Probability Sample Surveys carried out. According to the text this data is availabale, but not reported in the Excel tables.  No comments  No comments	Yes Yes Yes Partly  Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA  Yes Yes  Mostly  Yes NA NA	And for LPF the RFMC should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF,  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cvt.  No action needed  Provide missing quality indicat  No action needed  No action needed
E3 E4 Trans	Follow-up of R  Actions to avoversal variables  Capacity F11 Achi F13 Actio	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations justified? estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  exements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations justified? ns to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required No comments No comments  Yes, apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold No comments No comments No comments No comments  No derogations are requested for this module There were no relevant derogations proposed by the RCM No comments No comments CV is missing for Probability Sample Surveys carried out. According to the text this data is availabale, but not reported in the Excel tables.  No comments	Yes Yes Yes Partly  Yes Yes NA NA NA NA  Yes Yes  Mostly  Yes NA	And for LPF the RFMC should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cv's No action needed  Provide missing quality indicat  No action needed
E3 E4 Trans	Follow-up of R  Actions to avoversal variables  Capacity F11 Achi F13 Actio	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations pustified? are the deviations found in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required No comments No comments Ves. apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments  No derogations are requested for this module There were no relevant derogations proposed by the RCM No comments No comments  No comments  No comments	Yes Yes Yes Partly  Yes Partly  Yes Yes NA NA NA NA  Yes Yes  Mostly  Yes NA	And for LPF the RFMO should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF / No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cv's No action needed  Provide missing quality indicated in the pro
E3 E4 Trans	Follow-up of R  Actions to avoversal variables  Capacity F11 Achi F13 Actio	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations justified? estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  exements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations justified? ns to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required No comments No comments  Yes, apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold No comments No comments No comments No comments  No derogations are requested for this module There were no relevant derogations proposed by the RCM No comments No comments CV is missing for Probability Sample Surveys carried out. According to the text this data is availabale, but not reported in the Excel tables.  No comments	Yes Yes Yes Partly  Yes Yes NA NA NA NA  Yes Yes  Mostly  Yes NA	And for LPF the RFMO should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF / No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cv's No action needed  Provide missing quality indicated in the pro
E3 E4 Trans	Follow-up of R  Actions to avoversal variables  Capacity F11 Achi F13 Actio	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations usuffied? In to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required No comments No comments Ves. apart from Tuna planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments  No derogations are requested for this module There were no relevant derogations proposed by the RCM No comments No comments  No comments  No comments	Yes Yes Yes Partly  Yes Partly  Yes Yes NA NA NA NA  Yes Yes  Mostly  Yes NA	And for LPF the RFMC should assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF / No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to increase efforts to achie sampling targets, which will in help with the calculation of cv's No action needed  Provide missing quality indicated in the part of the

MEII	nber Sta		Cyprus		l d	gement levels
	iibei ota		AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	May 2010 EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
			Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
					NA	not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
			Is respective data quality information given?	MS mentioned some issues appeared due to transition to	Yes	No action needed
				the electronic reporting system.	NA	No astino and al
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments No comments	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
	F13		-up of Regional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	F14		s to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F3	Landing	js	•			•
	F11	Achiev	rements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	N		Dr. e
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	F12		uality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Vee	No action peopled
			Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?	No comments No comments	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
	F13		-up of Regional and international recommendations		l.	
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommdations	NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
	F14		Are the responsive actions acceptable? s to avoid shortfalls	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Г14		s to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
Resea	arch survey		•			
G1	Achieve	ments: F	Results and deviation from NP proposal			F
			Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			proposal?			<u>.</u>
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling	No comments No comments	Yes	No action needed
			activities?	no commente	100	no dollon noodod
G2	Data qu	ality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			coverage etc.)?			
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
G3	Follow-	up of Re	gional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning	No recommendations listed	NA NA	No action needed
			Groups listed?	Te recommendations instead	1471	No action necaca
			Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
G4	Actions		shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls identified	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
ule of the ev	valuation o		nomic situation of the aquaculture and processing indus			•
Collec	ction of dat		nomic situation of the aquaculture and processing mud			
	oo o. aa.		ning the aquaculture			T
	o o. aa.	a concer	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	0.10.1. 01 00.1	a concer	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013	Yes Mostly	MS should provide more
	0	a concer	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?	No comments		MS should provide more information regarding the referenc year
		a concer	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013		MS should provide more information regarding the referenc year MS should provide more
		a concer	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013	Mostly	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the reference information regarding the regarding the reference information regarding the reference in
<b>A</b> 1		a concer	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013	Mostly	MS should provide more information regarding the referenc year MS should provide more
<b>A</b> 1		a concer	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? esults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013	Mostly	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the reference information regarding the regarding the reference information regarding the reference in
A1		a concer	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? essults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments	Mostly  Mostly  Yes	MS should provide more information regarding the referenc year MS should provide more information regarding the referenc year No action needed
A1		a concer	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments No comments	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  NA	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed No action needed
A1 A2	Achieve	a concer	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? essults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments	Mostly  Mostly  Yes	MS should provide more information regarding the referenc year MS should provide more information regarding the referenc year No action needed
	Achieve	a concer ments: R ality: Res	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Ults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments No comments No comments No comments	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  Yes	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed
	Achieve	a concer ments: R ality: Res	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  ults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  Yes  NA	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed
A2	Achieve Data qu	a concer ments: R ality: Res	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  ults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained?	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments No comments No comments No comments	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  Yes	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed
	Achieve Data qu	a concer ments: R ality: Res	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ional and international recommendations	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  NA	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS action needed No action needed
A2	Achieve Data qu	ments: R ality: Res	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  ults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained?	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  Yes  NA	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed
A2	Achieve Data qu	ments: R ality: Res	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Ults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations pustified? ional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments	Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  Yes	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed
A2	Achieve Data qu Follow-u	ments: R ality: Res	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Is the deviations pustified?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed
A2 A3	Achieve Data qu Follow-u	ments: R ality: Res	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  ults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments	Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed
A2 A3 A4	Achieve  Data qu  Follow-u	ments: R ality: Res	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? It sand deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the relevant recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed
A2 A3 A4	Achieve  Data qu  Follow-u	ments: R ality: Res	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? It sand deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is and the deviations in the full stad? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Is shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Ining the processing industry	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments No relevant recommendations No comments	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  N	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear year MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed
A2 A3 A4	Achieve  Data qu  Follow-u	ments: R ality: Res up of Reg to avoid s	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? It sand deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the relevant recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments	Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  NA  Ves  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear year MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed No action n
A2 A3 A4	Achieve  Data qu  Follow-u	ments: R ality: Res up of Reg to avoid s	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations pustified?  Is respective data quality information given? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Ining the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments Reference year should be 2012	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  Mostly  Mostly	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed
A2 A3 A4	Achieve  Data qu  Follow-u	ments: R ality: Res up of Reg to avoid s	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  ults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? ional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments No relevant recommendations No comments	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  N	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed No a
A2 A3 A4	Achieve  Data qu  Follow-u	ments: R ality: Res up of Reg to avoid s	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations pustified?  Is respective data quality information given? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Ining the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments Reference year should be 2012	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  Mostly  Mostly	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed
A2 A3 A4	Achieve  Data qu  Follow-t  Actions  ction of dat	ments: R ality: Res up of Reg to avoid s a concer	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  ults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? ional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments Ro comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Ro comments No comments Ro comments Ro comments Ro comments Ro comments Ro comments Reference year should be 2012 Reference year should be 2012	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  NA  NA  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed No a
A2 A3 A4 Collect	Achieve  Data qu  Follow-t  Actions  ction of dat	ments: R ality: Res up of Reg to avoid s a concer	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? It is and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments Reference year should be 2012	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  Mostly  Mostly	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed No a
A2 A3 A4 Collect	Achieve  Data qu  Follow-t  Actions  ction of dat	ments: R ality: Res up of Reg to avoid s a concer ments: R	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations justified? Is respective data quality information given? Are the responsive actions commendations Are the relevant recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Inling the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments Ro comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Ro comments No comments Ro comments Ro comments Ro comments Ro comments Ro comments Reference year should be 2012 Reference year should be 2012	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  NA  NA  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed No a
A2 A3 A4 Collect	Achieve  Data qu  Follow-t  Actions  ction of dat	ments: R ality: Res up of Reg to avoid s a concer	ning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? It is and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments Reference year should be 2012 Reference year should be 2012 .	Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed
A2 A3 A4 Collect	Achieve  Data qu  Follow-t  Actions  ction of dat  Achieve	ments: R ality: Res up of Reg to avoid s a concer ments: R	ning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations justified?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ining the processing industry  Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations justified?  ults and deviation from NP proposal	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments Reference year should be 2012 Reference year should be 2012 .  No comments No comments Reference year should be 2012 .	Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  N	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed MS action needed MS action needed No action needed
A2 A3 A4 Collect	Achieve  Data qu  Follow-t  Actions  ction of dat  Achieve	ments: R ality: Res up of Reg to avoid s a concer ments: R	ning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with the NP proposal?  Are deasign and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations pustified?  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the relevant recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  In the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ining the processing industry  Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations pustified?  Ults and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments Ro comments No comments Reference year should be 2012  No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  NA  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  NA  Mostly  Yes  NA  Mostly	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
A2 A3 A4 Collect	Achieve  Data qu  Follow-t  Actions  ction of dat  Achieve	ments: R ality: Res up of Reg to avoid s a concer ments: R	ning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations justified?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ining the processing industry  Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations justified?  ults and deviation from NP proposal	No comments The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013 The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013  No comments Reference year should be 2012 Reference year should be 2012 .  No comments No comments Reference year should be 2012 .	Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  NA  Yes  NA  NA  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  N	MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear MS should provide more information regarding the referency ear No action needed MS action needed MS action needed No action needed

	Member State:	Cyprus		Jud	gement levels
		AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	May 2010	Partly	10-50%
			EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%
				NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	B4 Actions to avoid				-
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
v	Module of evaluation of the effects	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		•	•
		d deviation from NP proposal			
		F SPECIAL	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
		Are the relevant derogations listed?	Derogations not listed. Indicator 9 (Fuel efficiency of fish	No	Yes. MS should request derogation
			capture) is not sampled even though this is indicated in		for indicator 9 if not possible to
			NP	l	estimate this.
	2 Actions to avoid shortfalls		No. of the second		N NO 1 11 11 11 11
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No actions decribed	No	Yes. MS should request derogation
					for indicator 9 or address shortfall.
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
VI	Module for management and use of	•	The definition to		No dollor ricodod
٧ı		d deviation from NP proposal			
	i Achievementa. Heauta an	d deviation nom Nr. proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	The definition of		no dollon needed
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent	No comments	NA	No action needed
		with the NP proposal?			
		Is progress in the "Management of data" section well	No comments	Mostly	MS should better explain the
		detailed?			situation of the national database
					and the implementation for the
		And the median construction with the NID conservation	No comments	Mostly	future see previous comment
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	2 Actions to avoid shortfalls	Are the deviations justified?	no comments	162	140 dollon needed
	Z Actions to avoid shortfalls	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
VII	Follow-up of STECF recommendation	•	No comments	165	140 action needed
VII	1 Onow-up of 31 ECF recommendation	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
VIII	List of acronyms and abbreviations		THE COMMENTS	103	140 detion needed
V	List of actoriyins and abbreviations	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
IX	Comments, suggestions and reflect		The definition to		TTO GOLIOT HOUSE
11	Comments, suggestions and reflect		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?			
Х	References	2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3		•	
		Is there a complete list of references?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
ΧI	Annexes	•		•	
			No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information			
		to support statements made in the main text?			

		01-1-	Dammanh	_		
	wem	ber State:	Denmark AR year	2013	Compliance class	dgement levels  Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2011 EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
			Overall complianc		Yes	>90%
				L	NA	not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
	General framewor	k	Are derogations listed?	No comments	Yes	Action needed?
	National data colle		on	NO comments	103	110
	A Nationa	Il correspondent	and participating institutes Are the partners involved in the national data collection an	d		
			their roles well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is there a national DCF website available? Is the information provided on the website in line with legal	It is stated, but could not checked as address is mis	No	Yes, please provide web address
			requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	URL (web address) not given, no check possible	No	Yes, please provide web address
			Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes, briefly	Yes	No action needed
			If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	B Region B1	al and Internation Attendance of i	nal coordination International meetings			
						No cells shall be deleted from the table,
				Yes, however, according to the AR guidelines, the full reference list of eligible meetings sent by the		even if the meeting is not relevant to the MS. In the future please provide the
			Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Commission should have been used.	Mostly	total list.
				In general, yes. More detail would have been helpful, e.g. why the relevant groups WGNEW and		
				WKMSGAD have not been attended. WGISDAA		Please provide the reasons for non-
			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	has been attended by Denmark (error in Table II.B.1).	Mostly	attendace in more detail and correct table II.B.1, then resubmit.
	B2	Follow-up of re	gional and international recommendations	,		, , ,
			Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
ı	Module of the eva	luation of the fish	ning sector			
		l description of the	he fishing sector			1
			Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
				Yes (only supra-region 'Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic', however, is		
	B Econor	nic variables	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	relevant for DK)	Yes	No action needed
	SUPRA-REGION E	altic Sea, North	Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR			
			guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR	Column with number of vessels in the segment by		MS should resubmit the table with the
			guidelines?	the 1st of January of the sampling year is empty	Mostly	number of vessels in column I
			Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	B1	Achievements: I	Results and deviation from NP proposal	165	162	IVO action needed
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	D0	Data analita Da	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	B2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
				Yes. From 2012, MS uses a different model (more		
			Are the deviations explained?	pronounced) for economic data estimation which is improvement fom NP	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	В3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recomendation	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
	B4	Actions to avoid	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	C Biologi	cal metier related		Yes	Yes	no action needed
	Region Baltic Sea		Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	Tes	res	no action needed
	C1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal			IMO should not 200 1 100 2
			Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	MS should remove filters from III C tables before submission
			Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR			
			guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	Yes	Yes	no action needed
			guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR	Yes	Yes	no action needed
			guidelines?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Most metiers undersampled	Partly	no action needed
			proposal? Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
	C2	Data quality: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
			Were CV targets met?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Na	NA NA	no action needed
	СЗ	Follow-up of Re	Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations	NA	NA	no action needed
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	in section I	Yes	no action needed
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	Yes	Recommendations from 2011 and 2010 should not be listed in this AR
			Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
	C4	Actions to avoi	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	no action needed
	C4	ACTIONS TO BYON	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
	Region North Sea C1		t <mark>ic</mark> Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	O.		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR			MS should remove filters from III C
			guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR	Yes	Yes	tables before submission
			guidelines?	Yes	Yes	no action needed

	ber State:	Denmark AR year	2013	Compliance class	Udgement levels  Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2011 EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
		Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
				NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	EWG COMMENTS	Ewa juugement	EWG
		guidelines?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	100	100	no detion needed
		proposal?	Most metiers undersampled	Mostly	no action needed  MS to explain shortfall in GNS_D
			Missing samples from GNS DEF 90-99 0 0 not		sampling. MS to confirm metier r
			explained (4 trips were planned for GNS_DEF, zero		concerning OTB_MSD>=120 /
		Are the deviations explained?	conducted).	Mostly	OTB_MCD in text  MS to explain shortfall in GNS_D
					sampling. MS to confirm metier r
					concerning OTB_MSD>=120 /
C2	Data sualitus D	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	OTB_MCD in text
62	Data quality: H	esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
		Were CV targets met?	in most cases (75 of 87)	Mostly	no action needed
					sandeel fishery was reported in A
			not in detail, refer to new sampling design in		as 2012. MS to confirm year. Det deviations need to be more fully
		Are the deviations explained?	general	Partly	explained
					sandeel fishery was reported in A
					as 2012. MS to confirm year. Det deviations need to be more fully
		Are the deviations justified?	Partly	Partly	explained
C3	Follow-up of R	egional and international recommendations			
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	in section I	Yes	no action needed
					Recommendations from 2011, 20
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	Yes	and 2009 should not be listed in t
		Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes Yes	no action needed no action needed
C4	Actions to avo	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		168	по аспол пеецец
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
egion North Atla C1		Results and deviation from NP proposal			
O.	Admicvements	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR	Yes, MS has only one metier (OTM_SPF_32-		
		guidelines?	69_0_0 on boarfish)	Yes	no action needed
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR		100	no dollon noodod
		guidelines?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP		100	
		proposal?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	no action needed no action needed
C2	Data quality: R	esults and deviation from NP proposal	IVA	INA	no action needed
		Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
		Were CV targets met?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	no action needed no action needed
C3	Follow-up of R	egional and international recommendations	INA	INA	no action needed
			in section I (derogation for discard sampling		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	approved)	Yes	no action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	NA NA	Yes Yes	no action needed no action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	no action needed
C4	Actions to avo	id shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA NA	NA NA	no action needed
Recres	ational fisheries	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	no action needed
. 1001 66			Baltic and NS&EA are dealt with together)		AR2014: MS to separate the text
agion Politic C	North Soc and I	Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region'	Same and Nearly are dealt with together)	No	region
egion Baitic Sea D1	a, North Sea and I Achievements:	Eastern Arctic Results and deviation from NP proposal			
**			It's a conflict in the way it is presented. Results		
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	from recreational fishery has been reported to the relevant assessment WG but not showed in the		
		proposal?	AR. AR is stating that no results can be provided		Yes. MS to update text with the re
			since the data is not ready.	Partly	delivered to the ICES WG
		Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No derogations	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No results are provided, so deviations can not be checked	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No results are provided, so deviations can not be		
D2	Data evalities D		checked	NA	No action needed
D2	יים quality: R	esults and deviation from NP proposal	Г		
		Were data quality targets provided?	No text provided	No	Yes. MS to update text on data q
		Were data quality targets met?	No text provided	NA	Vec MS to undata text an data
			No text provided	INA	Yes. MS to update text on data qu
		Are the deviations explained?	No text provided	NA	Yes. MS to update text on data q
		Are the deviations justified?	No text provided	NA	NA
		egional and international recommendations	No derogations	NIA	No action readed
D3	Follow-up of R			NA	No action needed AR2014: Only recommendations
D3	Follow-up of R	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations		
D3	Follow-up of R	Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	The recommendations listed are not for MS	NA	MS should be listed
D3	Follow-up of R	Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?	The recommendations listed are not for MS No comment	NA	MS should be listed No action needed
	·	Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	The recommendations listed are not for MS		MS should be listed
D3	Follow-up of R	Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  id shortfalls	The recommendations listed are not for MS No comment No comment	NA NA	MS should be listed No action needed No action needed
	·	Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	The recommendations listed are not for MS No comment	NA	MS should be listed No action needed

			_		
Ме	mber State:	Denmark			udgement levels
		AR year Version of the AR reviewed	2013 31 May 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
		Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
			EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compliance	e Mostly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
			L	101	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
egion Baltic S					
E1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR			for future AR please present planned
		guidelines?	Yes	Yes	CVs as numbers rather than %s
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Under-and over-sampling occurs. 11 from 52	Mostly	no action needed
		proposal?	variables are undersampled no explanation of undersampling of herring from	Widotiy	
		Are the deviations explained?	SD25-32 and eel from SD 22-24	Mostly	MS to give expalnation on deviations concerning herring and eel as listed
		The the deviations explained.		Months	MS to give expalnation on deviations
		Are the deviations justified?	yes except for herring and eel	Mostly	concerning herring and eel as listed
E2	Data quality: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal			TABLE TO BE MO STATE THE COVER OF THE COVER
					Although MS states that CVs can only be used from calculations at regional
			some CVs provided. Only 24 stock variables from		level, this year there should still have
			46 have CVs provided	Mostly	been an attempt to provide these
					estimates nationally. The column 'required CVs' should not be given as
		Were CV estimates provided?			%s
		Were CV targets met?	not many targets achieved	Partly	MS to explain deviations
		Are the deviations explained?	no	no	MS to explain deviations
		Are the deviations justified?	No	no	MS to explain deviations
E3	Follow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations	in agetian I	Yes	no action panded
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	in section I	res	no action needed in future the earlier years (eg
			Yes	Yes	2010,2011) recommendations should
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	<u></u>	.,	not be listed
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
E4	Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
E4	Actions to avoid	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes, well described	Yes	no action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
egion North S	Sea and Eastern Arct	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
E1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	for future AR please present planned CVs as numbers rather than %s
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
		proposal?	Under-and over-sampling occurs	Mostly	no action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	explanation missing for herring, lemon sole (wt	Mostly	MS to provide explanations on
		Are the deviations explained:	/sex), sole and pout (age/mat)		deviations for these species  MS to provide explanations on
		Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	Mostly	deviations for these species
E2	Data quality: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal			
					Although MS states that CVs can only be used from calculations at regional
					level, this year there should still have
			85 from 147 CVs not provided	Mostly	been an attempt to provide these
					estimates nationally. The column
		Were CV estimates provided?			'required CVs' should not be given as %s
		Were CV targets met?	most of the provided CVs are below the targets	Partly	no action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No	No	MS to explain deviations
		Are the deviations justified?	No	No	MS to explain deviations
E3	Follow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?	in agetian I	Vaa	no action panded
		were the relevant derogations listed?	in section I partly - but for previous years which are not	Yes	no action needed
			required. 1 recommendation from LM 2012 missing	Partly	MS to list relevant recommendations and provide responsive action
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	(bilaterals)		and provide responsive action
			partly - but for previous years which are not required. 1 recommendation from LM 2012 missing	Partly	MS to list relevant recommendaions
		Are the responsive actions described ?	(bilaterals)		and provide responsive action
			partly - but for previous years which are not		MS to list relevant recommendations
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	required. 1 recommendation from LM 2012 missing (bilaterals)	Partly	and provide responsive action
E4	Actions to avoid		(Similard)		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	refer to Baltic section	Yes	no action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
egion North A		Decults and deviation from ND			
E1	Acnievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR	[		for future AR please present planned
		guidelines?	Yes	Yes	CVs as numbers rather than %s
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	oversampling	Yes	no action needed
		proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
E2	Data quality: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal			
		Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
		Were CV targets met?	No	No	no action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
E3	Follow up of Po	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
E3	i onow-up of ne	egional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA (none requested)	NA	no action needed
			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		There was one recommendation from
					NA RCM 2012 re boar fish. This should
			NA (none relevant)	NA	have been listed even though MS
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			already has a sampling scheme in place
		Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	no action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	no action needed
E4	Actions to avoid		- I		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA NA	NA NA	no action needed
Tran	nsversal variables	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	INA	no action needed
iidi	variables		According to derogations from NP, some effort data		T
		Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR	is not provided, but as far as it is in line with NP, it		L
F1	Consolt	guidelines?	is acceptable	Yes	No action needed
гі	Capacity				

Capacity
F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

N	Viemb	er State:	Denmark		J	udgement levels
			AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	31 May 2014 31 October 2011	No Partly	<10% 10-50%
				EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
				L	INA	пот аррисавіе
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
			proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	Yes	No action needed
		F13 Actio	Are the deviations justified? ons to avoid shortfalls	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		rio Acii	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No shortfalls	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
F		Effort F11 Achi	evements. Results and deviation from NR avenagel			
		FII ACIII	evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No		
			proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Derogation is provided  No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
		F12 Data	quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	The dominion of	100	No action needed
			Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Quality of data is expected to increase after introductios of compulsory to use e-logbooks.	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		F13 Follo	w-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recomendations	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		F14 Action	ons to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
F		Landings				
		F11 Achi	evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	[ I		
			proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	Yes	No action needed
		F12 Data	Are the deviations justified? quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	Yes	No action needed
		F13 Follo	Are the deviations justified? w-up of Regional and international recommendations	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recomendations	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		F14 Actio	Are the responsive actions acceptable? ons to avoid shortfalls	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls	Yes	No action needed
G B	Research	survevs at se	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		n surveys at se Achievements	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? a: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a:  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? a: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments  No comments In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a:  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR	No comments  No comments In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No comments  No comments In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a:  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments  No comments In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the 'International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which is not explained.	Yes Yes Mostly	No action needed  No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a:  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	No comments  No comments In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the 'International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which is not explained. see above	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling	No comments  No comments In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the 'International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which is not explained.  see above see above	Yes  Yes  Mostly  No  NA	No action needed  No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text  MS to update text
G	31	Achievements	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a:  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No comments  No comments In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the 'International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which is not explained. see above	Yes  Yes  Mostly No	No action needed  No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text
G	31	Achievements	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a:  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g.	No comments  No comments In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the 'International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which is not explained.  see above see above	Yes  Yes  Mostly  No  NA	No action needed  No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text  MS to update text
G	31	Achievements	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a:  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  lesults and deviation from NP proposal	No comments  No comments In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the 'International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which is not explained.  see above see above	Yes  Yes  Mostly  No  NA	No action needed  No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text  MS to update text
G	31	Achievements	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained?	No comments  No comments In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the 'International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which is not explained. see above see above No comments  No comments	Yes  Yes  Mostly No NA  Yes  Yes	No action needed  No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text  MS to update text  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
G	31 32	Achievements	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a:  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations syplained?  Are the deviations syplained?	No comments  No comments In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the 'International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which is not explained. see above see above No comments  No comments	Yes  Yes  Mostly No NA Yes	No action needed  No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text MS to update text No action needed  No action needed
G	31 32	Achievements	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations justified?  Are the deviations justified?  Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning	No comments  No comments In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the 'International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which is not explained. see above see above No comments  No comments	Yes  Yes  Mostly No NA  Yes  Yes	No action needed  No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text  MS to update text  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
G	31 32	Achievements	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a:  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Regional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?	No comments    No comments   No comments	Yes  Yes  Mostly No NA Yes  Yes NA NA NA	No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text  MS to update text  No action needed
G	31 32	Achievements	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations justified?  Are the deviations justified?  Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning	No comments  No comments In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the 'International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which is not explained. see above see above No comments  No comments No comments No comments No comments No but text refers to international survey manuals, which are followed. No comments	Yes  Yes  Mostly No NA Yes  Yes NA NA	No action needed  No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text  MS to update text  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
G	31 32 33	Achievements	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations sustified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations instified?  Is the deviations instified?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments  No comments In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the 'International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which is not explained. see above see above No comments  No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments	Yes  Yes  Mostly No NA Yes  Yes  NA NA NA	No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text MS to update text No action needed
G	31 32 33	Achievements  Data quality: F	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  It is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  It is indicated in the commendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  It is a survey indicated? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  It is a survey indicated? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  It is a survey indicated?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  It is a survey indicated?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  It is a survey indicated?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  It is a survey indicated in the	No comments  No comments In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which is not explained. see above see above No comments  No comments No comments No comments No comments No but text refers to international survey manuals, which are followed. No comments	Yes  Yes  Mostly No NA Yes  Yes  NA NA NA NA NA	No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text MS to update text No action needed
G	31 32 33	Achievements  Data quality: F	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Regional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  id shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments  No comments In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the 'International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which is not explained. see above see above No comments No text describing the identified deviations / shortfalls No text describing the identified deviations /	Yes  Mostly No NA Yes  Yes  NA	No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text MS to update text No action needed
G G	33 33	Data quality: F Follow-up of F	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a:  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  lesults and deviation from NP proposal  Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the responsive actional recommendations  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  iid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments    No comments   No comments	Yes  Yes  Mostly No NA Yes  Yes  NA NA NA NA NA	No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text MS to update text No action needed
G G G IV Module of ti	33 33 34 4 hhe evalu	Data quality: F Follow-up of F Actions to avo	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Regional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  id shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments    No comments   No comments	Yes  Mostly No NA Yes  Yes  NA	No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text MS to update text No action needed
G G G IV Module of ti	33 33 34 4 hhe evalu	Data quality: F Follow-up of F Actions to avo	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  Is the eviations insuffied?  Is the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? It is shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  onomic situation of the aquaculture and processing indusering the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?	No comments    No comments   No comments	Yes  Mostly No NA Yes  Yes  NA	No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text MS to update text No action needed
G G G IV Module of ti	33 33 34 4 hhe evalu	Data quality: F Follow-up of F Actions to avo	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  lesults and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations justified? Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and processing induserning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR	No comments  In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which is not explained. see above see above  No comments  No text describing the identified deviations / shortfalls  No text describing the identified deviations / shortfalls  Stry	Yes  Mostly No NA Yes  Yes NA	No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text MS to update text No action needed
G G G IV Module of ti	33 33 34 4 hhe evalu	Data quality: F Follow-up of F Actions to avo	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  lesults and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? sonomic situation of the aquaculture and processing induserning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR	No comments    No comments   No comments	Yes  Yes  Mostly No NA Yes  Yes  NA	No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text MS to update text No action needed
G G G IV Module of the A	33 33 34 he evalu	Achievements  Data quality: F  Follow-up of F  Actions to avo	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  lesults and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and processing induserning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments  In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which is not explained. see above see above  No comments  No text describing the identified deviations / shortfalls  No text describing the identified deviations / shortfalls  Stry	Yes  Mostly No NA Yes  Yes NA	No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text MS to update text No action needed
G G G IV Module of the A	33 33 34 he evalu	Achievements  Data quality: F  Follow-up of F  Actions to avo	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  lesults and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations suptified?  legional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  id shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  conomic situation of the aquaculture and processing indusering the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No comments    No comments   No comments	Yes  Yes  Mostly No NA Yes  Yes  NA	No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text MS to update text No action needed
G G G IV Module of the A	33 33 34 he evalu	Achievements  Data quality: F  Follow-up of F  Actions to avo	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  lesults and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and processing induserning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments  In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which is not explained. see above see above  No comments  No text describing the identified deviations / shortfalls  No text describing the identified deviations / shortfalls  Stry  Yes  Yes	Yes  Yes  Mostly No NA Yes  Yes NA	No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text MS to update text No action needed
G G G IV Module of the A	33 33 34 he evalu	Achievements  Data quality: F  Follow-up of F  Actions to avo	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations systified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Is there a map of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations igustified? Is the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? In actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? In actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	No comments    No comments   No comments	Yes  Yes  Mostly No NA Yes  Yes NA NA NA NA NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA	No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text MS to update text No action needed
G G G G A A A A	333 34 whe evalu	Achievements  Data quality: F  Follow-up of F  Actions to avoid action of the econor o	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations ijustified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  lesults and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? iid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and processing induserning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations fyustified?  esults and deviation from NP proposal	No comments  In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which is not explained. see above see above  No comments  No text describing the identified deviations / shortfalls  No text describing the identified deviations / shortfalls  stry  Yes  Yes  Yes	Yes  Yes  Mostly No NA Yes  Yes NA	No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text MS to update text No action needed
G G G G A A A A	333 34 whe evalu	Achievements  Data quality: F  Follow-up of F  Actions to avoid action of the econor o	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Is there a map of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations instified?  Regional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  id shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  conomic situation of the aquaculture and processing indusering the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations pustified?  Seults and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?	No comments  No comments  In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which is not explained.  see above see above No comments  No text describing the identified deviations / shortfalls  No text describing the identified deviations / shortfalls  stry  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	Yes  Yes  Mostly No NA Yes  Yes NA NA NA NA NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA	No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text MS to update text No action needed
G G G G A A A A	333 34 whe evalu	Achievements  Data quality: F  Follow-up of F  Actions to avoid action of the econor o	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Is there a map of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Is the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? In actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? In Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained?	No comments  In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which is not explained. see above see above  No comments  No text describing the identified deviations / shortfalls  No text describing the identified deviations / shortfalls  stry  Yes  Yes  Yes	Yes  Yes  Mostly No NA Yes  Yes NA	No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text MS to update text No action needed
G G G G A A A A	333 334 Whee evaluation	Data quality: F Follow-up of F Actions to avoidation of the econoridata concider of th	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  lesults and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  conomic situation of the aquaculture and processing induserning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  seults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations pustified?  segional and international recommendations	No comments  In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which is not explained. see above see above  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No text describing the identified deviations / shortfalls  No text describing the identified deviations / shortfalls  stry  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	Yes  Yes  Mostly No NA Yes  Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA  NA NA  NA  NA  NA	No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text MS to update text No action needed  No action needed
G G G G A A A A	333 334 Whee evaluation	Data quality: F Follow-up of F Actions to avoidation of the econoridata concider of th	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations systified?  Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations igustified?  Is the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  iid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  conomic situation of the aquaculture and processing induserning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  apiculal and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments    No comments   No comments	Yes  Yes  Mostly No NA Yes  Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA  NA  NA  Ves  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text MS to update text No action needed
G G G G A A A A	333 334 Whee evaluation	Data quality: F Follow-up of F Actions to avoidation of the econoridata concider of th	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  Regional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Bromomic situation of the aquaculture and processing indusering the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  Besults and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations systified?  Begional and international recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?	No comments    No comments   No comments	Yes  Yes  Mostly No NA Yes  Yes NA  NO NA  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text MS to update text No action needed  No action needed
G G G G G G A A A A A A	333333344he evaltoollection	Data quality: F Follow-up of F Actions to avoidation of the econoridata concider of th	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Is there a map of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations instified?  Regional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  commic situation of the aquaculture and processing induserning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations instified?  Seults and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  Segional and international recommendations  Are the responsive actions described?	No comments  No comments  In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which is not explained.  see above see above No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No text describing the identified deviations / shortfalls  No text describing the identified deviations / shortfalls  stry  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	Yes  Yes  Mostly No NA Yes  Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA  NA NA  NO NA  Yes  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Y	No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text MS to update text No action needed
G G G G G G A A A A A A	333333344he evaltoollection	Achievements  Data quality: F  Follow-up of F  Actions to avoid action of the extention of the extention of data concomplete.  Achievements:  Data quality: R  Follow-up of Re	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  a Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  lesults and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and processing induserning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pusified?  sesults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations pusified?  Are the deviations pusified?  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments    No comments   No comments	Yes  Yes  Mostly No NA Yes  Yes NA  NO NA  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	No action needed  Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%  MS to update text MS to update text No action needed  No action needed

			AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
				2013		
			Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
				EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
					iviostry	
			Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%
					NA	not applicable
				<u> </u>		
				FWO COMMENTO	FWO industrial	FIMO
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
В	Collecti	on of data concer	ning the processing industry			
			Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR			
			guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR			
				v/		L
			guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	B1	Achievements: E	Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	ъ.	Achievements. I				T
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
			proposal?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			And the desirations contained		NA	
			Are the deviations explained?	NA		No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
				101	101	140 detion needed
	B2	Data quality: Res	sults and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
						-
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
				INC	INA	INO ACTION NEEDED
	B3	Follow-up of Reg	ional and international recommendations			
		- 1 3	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
				NA .	NA NA	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	INA	NA	No action needed
	B4	Actions to avoid	shortfalls			
		10 44014		NIA	A	No action manda !
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
				INA	IN/A	INO action needed
Module o	of evaluati	on of the effects of	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem			
	1 Achieve	monto: Populto on	d deviation from NP proposal			
	I Acmeve	ments. nesuits an	a deviation nom NF proposal			
			Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation	NA	No action needed
	2 Actions	to avoid shortfalls				
	Z ACTIONS	to avoid shortians				to a second second
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls	NA	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No shortfalls	NA	No action needed
				NO SHOILIANS	101	INO action needed
Module f	for manage	ement and use of	the data			
	I Acnieve	ments: Results and	d deviation from NP proposal			
			Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
			to rable viir complete and consistent with viir galacimos.	Data calls for offert and processing industry data:		
			Table VIII complete and consistent William I galdennice.	Data calls for effort and processing industry data:		
			The state of the s	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to;		
			to table the complete and conditions which is guidelined.	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to;		
			to take the compact and constant that the guidelines.	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to		
			to ratio in garages and contacton min in garages con	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't		
			to ratio in garages and contacton min in garages.	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't		
			to ratio in garages and contaction man in garages con	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, <i>Nephrops</i> in the North Sea is now		
			to ratio in our production and in the galactico.	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, <i>Nephrops</i> in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND,		
			to ratio in our procedure contration with in galactico.	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, <i>Nephrops</i> in the North Sea is now		Denmark is asked to clarify and to
			to ratio in our pace and containing mining galactice.	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be	Moethy	Denmark is asked to clarify and to
				old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, <i>Nephrops</i> in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND,	Mostly	Denmark is asked to clarify and to resubmit table with updated informat
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.	•	resubmit table with updated informat
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be	•	resubmit table with updated informat
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.	Mostly Yes	Denmark is asked to clarify and to resubmit table with updated informat No action needed
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, <i>Nephrops</i> in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes	resubmit table with updated informat  No action needed
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.	Yes	resubmit table with updated informat  No action needed
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, <i>Nephrops</i> in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes Yes	resubmit table with updated informat  No action needed  No action needed
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments  No comments  No comments	Yes Yes Yes	resubmit table with updated informat  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments  No comments  No comments	Yes Yes Yes	resubmit table with updated informat  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments	Yes Yes Yes Yes	resubmit table with updated informal  No action needed
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments  No comments  No comments	Yes Yes Yes	resubmit table with updated informat  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
	2 Actions	to avoid shortfalls	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments	Yes Yes Yes Yes	resubmit table with updated informat  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
	2 Actions	to avoid shortfalls	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	resubmit table with updated informat  No action needed
	2 Actions	to avoid shortfalls	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments	Yes Yes Yes Yes	resubmit table with updated informat  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
3	2 Actions	to avoid shortfalls	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	resubmit table with updated informat No action needed
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	resubmit table with updated informat  No action needed
		to avoid shortfalls	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	resubmit table with updated informat No action needed
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	resubmit table with updated informat No action needed
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes	resubmit table with updated informat No action needed
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes	resubmit table with updated informat No action needed
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes	resubmit table with updated informal No action needed
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes	resubmit table with updated informal No action needed
Follow-u	up of STEC	CF recommendation	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes	resubmit table with updated informat No action needed
Follow-u	up of STEC		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes	resubmit table with updated informat No action needed
Follow-u	up of STEC	CF recommendation	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes	resubmit table with updated informat No action needed
Follow-u	up of STEC	CF recommendation	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes	resubmit table with updated informal No action needed
Follow-u	up of STEC	CF recommendation	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes	resubmit table with updated informa  No action needed
Follow-u	up of STEC	CF recommendation	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes	resubmit table with updated informa  No action needed
Follow-u	up of STEC	CF recommendation	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes	resubmit table with updated informa  No action needed
Follow-up	up of STEC	CF recommendation	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes	resubmit table with updated informa  No action needed
Follow-u	up of STEC	CF recommendation	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes	resubmit table with updated informa  No action needed
Follow-up	up of STEC	CF recommendation	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?  Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes	resubmit table with updated informal No action needed
Follow-up List of ac Commen	up of STEC acronyms a nts, sugge	CF recommendation	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments   Yes	resubmit table with updated informat No action needed	
Follow-up	up of STEC acronyms a nts, sugge	CF recommendation	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?  Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes	resubmit table with updated informat No action needed
Follow-up List of ac Commen	up of STEC acronyms a nts, sugge	CF recommendation	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?  Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes	resubmit table with updated informat No action needed
Follow-up List of ac Commen	up of STEC acronyms a nts, sugge	CF recommendation	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?  ions  Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?  Is there a complete list of references?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes	resubmit table with updated informat  No action needed  Action needed  No action needed  No action needed
Follow-up List of ac Commen	up of STEC acronyms a nts, sugge	CF recommendation	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?  Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, Nephrops in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones.  No comments	Yes	resubmit table with updated informat No action needed

Judgement levels

Member State:

Denmark

				-		
	Men	nber State:	Estonia AR year	2013	Judgem Compliance class	ent levels  Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	31 March 2010 (20 Sep 2010?), AR text section D mentions a version of 2 June 2011	Partly	10-50%
				EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance	Partly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
	General framewo	ork			ETT & judgement	Action needed?
			Are derogations listed?	Derogations are not listed in AR, but in contrary, NP 2011- 13 contains such list.	No	List of derogations have to be provided
	National data col	lection organisation	n	To contains such list.		Ibiovided
	A Nation	nai correspondent	and participating institutes  Are the partners involved in the national data collection and	N	V	No selfer resided
			their roles well described? Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needded  No action needded
			Is the information provided on the website in line with legal	No comments	Yes	No action needded
			requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)? Is there an overview and description of contents of national			
			coordination meetings?	No comments	Yes	No action needded
ı	B Regio	nal and Internation	If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?  al coordination	No comments	Yes	No action needded
	B1	Attendance of i	nternational meetings	No. An old list (2012) of meetings have been used. Only		Ī
			Is Table II.B.1 complete?	two meetings were attended.	Partly	No action needded
			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No comments	No	Reasons for not attendance have be provided
	B2	Follow-up of re	gional and international recommendations		•••	
			Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needded
			Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needded
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needded
		aluation of the fishi				
,	4 Gener	al description of th	ne fishing sector  Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact or	1		T
			the NP implementation well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needded
		omic variables	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
5			Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic	For inactive vessels indication of gear type is not		
			Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	necessary.	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Rows for clustered segments from A to F column have to be merged.	Yes	No action needed
			13 Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with Art guidelines.	For some variables CV is not provided when response	103	140 delion necded
				rate was below 100%. Response rate for some variables which were collected is indicated as NR, which is not		
				acceptable. Achieved sample rate should be provided for		MS should resubmit the table
	B1	Achievements: F	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal	all variables.	Mostly	according to ewg comments
	D1	Achievements. I	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
			proposal? Are the deviations explained?	There is a deviation from the NP proposal Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	B2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	В3	Fallow up of Do	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	ь	Lollow-rib of Hei	gional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	В4	Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable? I shortfalls	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	C Bioloc	ical metier related	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Region Baltic Sea C1		Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	O.	Achievements.	• •	Sampling year is 2013? (Table says '2011')		
			Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Mostly	MS should edit and re-submit Tab III.C.3 according to EWG comme
			<b>5</b>	Sampling year is 2013? (Table says '2012'). Sampling		g .c =
				frame 'BT': achieved no. of trips deviate from Table III.C.3: at sea 100 trips, on shore 25 trips (the other way		
				round than in Table III.C.3). In the AR text, however, an		
				oversampling of the metier "OTM_SPF_16-104_0_0" is being explained, while the overall achieved no. of trips		
			Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?	exactly matches the NP proposal in both tables.	Mostly	MS should edit and re-submit Tab III.C.4 according to EWG comme
				CVs should be reported in absolute numbers (e.g. 0.11)	iviOStly	Ĭ
			Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	instead of percentages (e.g. 11%), see guidelines p. 15.	Yes	MS should edit and re-submit Tab III.C.5 according to EWG comme
				Metier codes deviate from those in NP proposal and in	**	_
			Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Tables III.C.1-3. New codes (GNS_FWS_0_0_0, FPN_SPF_0_0_0, FYK_FWS_0_0_0) should be used.	Mostly	MS should edit and re-submit Tak III.C.6 according to EWG comme
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	FPN_SPF_0_0_0, FYK_FWS_0_0_0) should be used.  AR text refers to 2012, GNS_DEF_>=36_0_0 is old  matier code (page GNS_EMS_0_0_0)	•	Re-submission of tables (see
			proposal? Are the deviations explained?	metier code (now GNS_FWS_0_0_0) Yes	Yes Yes	comments above) No action needed
		D-1	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	C2	Data quality: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Were CV targets met?	only for 3 out of 12	Partly	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No	No	MS to explain reasons for not achieving the CVs in most cases
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA NA	No action needed
	C3	Follow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	No	No action needed
			violo the relevant derogations listed?	110	No, there at least 2 relevant	
				No, only old recommendations	recommendations from the RCM Baltic 2012	MS to provide relevant 2012 recommendations
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM lieted?	, only ora recommendations	שמונוט בט וב	MS to provide responsive actions
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			
			Are the responsive actions described ?	NA NA	No No	the added recommendations
	C4	Actions to avoi	Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	No No	the added recommendations No action needed
	C4	Actions to avoi	Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?			the added recommendations

IVICITIE	ber State:	Estonia	1	luduam	ant lavela
	Jer State:	AR year	2013	Compliance class	ent levels  Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	31 March 2010 (20 Sep 2010?), AR text section D mentions a version of 2 June 2011	Partly	10-50%
			EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compliance	Partly	Yes NA	>90%
			l	NA NA	not applicable
				EWG judgement	EWG
			Sampling year is 2013? (Table says '2011'). "Expected no. trips to be sampled at sea by MS" for metier		
			"OTB_CRU_40_2_19-22" was 8 in NP proposal, while		
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	only 3 trips are listed here. NAFO areas should be referred	Mostly	MS should edit and re-submit Table III.C.3 according to EWG comments
		guideinies :	to as North Atlantic	Wostly	In.C.3 according to EWG comments
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR	sampling year is 2013? (Table says '2012'). NAFO areas	Months	MS should edit and re-submit Table
		guidelines?	should be referred to as North Atlantic	Mostly	III.C.4 according to EWG comments
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR			MS should edit and re-submit Table
		guidelines?	NAFO areas should be referred to as North Atlantic	Mostly	III.C.5 according to EWG comments
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR			MS should edit and re-submit Table
		guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	NAFO areas should be referred to as North Atlantic No explanation given in the AR text on additional sampling	Mostly	III.C.6 according to EWG comments
		proposal?	of cod	Mostly	MS to add AR text on cod sampling
		Are the deviations explained?	AR text refers to 8 trips, while 9 trips were conducted	Yes	amend AR text
C2	Data quality: Br	Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal	NA	NA	No action needed
02	Data quality. He		Yes. CV for Pandalus discards missing, but explained in		
		Were CV estimates provided?	AR text (cannot be analysed, damaged) only for 1 out of 7	Yes	No action needed
		Were CV targets met?	only for 1 out of 7	No	No action needed
					MS to explain why CV has not been
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes for shrimp, not for the other species Yes for shrimp, not for the other species	Partly Partly	achieved for the other species  No action needed
C3	Follow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations	res for shiftip, not for the other species	1 artiy	No action needed
			No	No, there is one relevant RCM NA	MS to provide the relevant RCM
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	2012 recommendation.	recommendation MS to provide responsive actions to
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No, only old recommendations (RCM NA 2008)	No	the added recommendation
		Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	No NA	No action needed  No action needed
C4	Actions to avoid		IVA	NA NA	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
Pacrosti	tional fisheries	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
ricorcan	ional nanches		Yes, (Estonian recreational fishery only present in the		
on Baltic Sea		Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	Baltic Sea)	Yes	No action needed
D1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	N	V	No. anti-manadad
		proposal? Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No comments no derogations requested	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	no deviations	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
D2	Data quality: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided?	Information on data quality provided. No specific target.	Yes	No action needed
		Were data quality targets met?	Not specified	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
D3	Follow-up of Re	Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations	No comments	NA	No action needed
20	. oo up o	Were the relevant derogations listed?	no derogations listed	NA	NA
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
D4	Actions to avoid	d shortfalls		.00	The dollor headed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls	NA	No action needed
Riologic	cal stock-related v	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
Diologic	ai stock-related t	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
on Baltic Sea					
	Achievements:				
E1	710111011011101	Results and deviation from NP proposal			T
E1	7.0010	Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
E1	7.0.10.7.0.1.0.1.0.1	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50-		MS to explain where planned
E1		• •	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50- 70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal, where do the planned numbers come from?	Yes Mostly	
E1		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50- 70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal, where do the planned numbers come from? Oversampling: yes, explained; Undersampling: yes for eel,		MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal
E1		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50- 70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal, where do the planned numbers come from? Oversampling: yes, explained; Undersampling: yes for eel, not for the other species	Mostly Partly	MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal MS to provide missing explanations
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50- 70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal, where do the planned numbers come from? Oversampling: yes, explained; Undersampling: yes for eel,	Mostly	MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal MS to provide missing explanations
E1		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  esults and deviation from NP proposal	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50- 70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal, where do the planned numbers come from? Oversampling: yes, explained; Undersampling: yes for eel, not for the other species Yes, for those cases where deviations were explained	Mostly Partly Partly	MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal MS to provide missing explanations MS to provide missing explanations
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50- 70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal, where do the planned numbers come from? Oversampling: yes, explained; Undersampling: yes for eel, not for the other species	Mostly Partly	MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal MS to provide missing explanations
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  seults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50- 70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal,  where do the planned numbers come from?  Oversampling: yes, explained; Undersampling: yes for eel,  not for the other species  Yes, for those cases where deviations were explained  Yes  No  The AR text claims that "samples are too small to get	Mostly Partly Partly Yes No	MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal MS to provide missing explanations  MS to provide missing explanations  No action needed  No action needed
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  ssults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50- 70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal, where do the planned numbers come from?  Oversampling: yes, explained; Undersampling: yes for eel, not for the other species  Yes, for those cases where deviations were explained  Yes  No  The AR text claims that "samples are too small to get accurate estimates.", but for most species, several	Mostly Partly Partly Yes	MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal MS to provide missing explanations MS to provide missing explanations No action needed
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? seults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50- 70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal, where do the planned numbers come from? Oversampling: yes, explained; Undersampling: yes for eet, not for the other species Yes, for those cases where deviations were explained  Yes No The AR text claims that "samples are too small to get accurate estimates", but for most species, several hundred or thousand individuals were measured.	Mostly Partly Partly Yes No Mostly	MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal MS to provide missing explanations  MS to provide missing explanations  No action needed No action needed MS to provide explanation for not achieving CVs
	Data quality: Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50- 70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal, where do the planned numbers come from?  Oversampling: yes, explained; Undersampling: yes for eel, not for the other species  Yes, for those cases where deviations were explained  Yes  No  The AR text claims that "samples are too small to get accurate estimates.", but for most species, several	Mostly Partly Partly Yes No	MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal MS to provide missing explanations MS to provide missing explanations No action needed No action needed MS to provide explanation for not
<b>E</b> 2	Data quality: Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? seults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50- 70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal, where do the planned numbers come from? Oversampling: yes, explained; Undersampling: yes for eet, not for the other species Yes, for those cases where deviations were explained  Yes No The AR text claims that "samples are too small to get accurate estimates", but for most species, several hundred or thousand individuals were measured.	Mostly Partly Partly Yes No Mostly	MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal MS to provide missing explanations  MS to provide missing explanations  No action needed No action needed MS to provide explanation for not achieving CVs
<b>E</b> 2	Data quality: Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified? souths and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations instified? glonal and international recommendations	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50- 70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal, where do the planned numbers come from? Oversampling: yes, explained; Undersampling: yes for eel, not for the other species Yes, for those cases where deviations were explained  Yes No The AR text claims that "samples are too small to get accurate estimates.", but for most species, several hundred or thousand individuals were measured.  No	Mostly Partly Partly Yes No Mostly No	MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal MS to provide missing explanations MS to provide missing explanations MS to provide missing explanations No action needed No action needed MS to provide explanation for not achieving CVs No action needed No action needed
<b>E</b> 2	Data quality: Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified? souths and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations instified? glonal and international recommendations	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50- 70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal,  where do the planned numbers come from?  Oversampling: yes, explained; Undersampling: yes for eel,  not for the other species  Yes, for those cases where deviations were explained  Yes  No  The AR text claims that "samples are too small to get  accurate estimates.", but for most species, several  hundred or thousand individuals were measured.  No	Mostly Partly Partly Yes No Mostly	MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal MS to provide missing explanations MS to provide missing explanations No action needed No action needed MS to provide explanation for not achieving CVs
<b>E</b> 2	Data quality: Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Sesults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50- 70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal, where do the planned numbers come from? Oversampling: yes, explained; Undersampling: yes for eel, not for the other species Yes, for those cases where deviations were explained  Yes No The AR text claims that "samples are too small to get accurate estimates.", but for most species, several hundred or thousand individuals were measured.  No  NA Only old recommendations from 2008 and 2011 listed. NA	Mostly Partly Partly Yes No Mostly No NA	MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal MS to provide missing explanations MS to provide missing explanations No action needed No action needed MS to provide explanation for not achieving CVs No action needed
E2 E3	Data quality: Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  south and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations instified?  egional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50- 70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal, where do the planned numbers come from? Oversampling: yes, explained; Undersampling: yes for eet, not for the other species Yes, for those cases where deviations were explained  Yes No The AR text claims that "samples are too small to get accurate estimates.", but for most species, several hundred or thousand individuals were measured. No  NA Only old recommendations from 2008 and 2011 listed.	Mostly Partly Partly Yes No Mostly No NA No	MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal MS to provide missing explanations MS to provide missing explanations No action needed No action needed MS to provide explanation for not achieving CVs No action needed No action needed No action needed Old (non-relevant) recommendations should be deleted
<b>E</b> 2	Data quality: Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  south and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations instified?  egional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50- 70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal, where do the planned numbers come from? Oversampling: yes, explained; Undersampling: yes for eel, not for the other species Yes, for those cases where deviations were explained  Yes No The AR text claims that "samples are too small to get accurate estimates.", but for most species, several hundred or thousand individuals were measured.  No  NA Only old recommendations from 2008 and 2011 listed. NA	Mostly Partly Partly Yes No Mostly No NA	MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal MS to provide missing explanations MS to provide missing explanations No action needed No action needed MS to provide explanation for not achieving CVs No action needed
E2 E3	Data quality: Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations sexplained? Are the deviations pustified? agional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50- 70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal, where do the planned numbers come from? Oversampling: yes, explained; Undersampling: yes for eet, not for the other species Yes, for those cases where deviations were explained  Yes No The AR text claims that "samples are too small to get accurate estimates.", but for most species, several hundred or thousand individuals were measured. No  NA Only old recommendations from 2008 and 2011 listed. NA NA Yes, but rather briefly (better planning needed).	Mostly Partly Partly Yes No Mostly No NA NA NA Partly	MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal MS to provide missing explanations MS to provide explanation for not action needed MS to provide explanation for not achieving CVs No action needed Mo action needed Mo action needed No action needed MS to provide more details on
E2 E3	Data quality: Re Follow-up of Re Actions to avoke	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations pustfied? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustfied? Begional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  d shortfalls	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50- 70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal, where do the planned numbers come from? Oversampling: yes, explained; Undersampling: yes for eet, not for the other species Yes, for those cases where deviations were explained  Yes No The AR text claims that "samples are too small to get accurate estimates.", but for most species, several hundred or thousand individuals were measured. No  NA Only old recommendations from 2008 and 2011 listed. NA NA	Mostly Partly Partly Yes No Mostly No NA NA NA	MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal MS to provide missing explanations MS to provide missing explanations No action needed No action needed MS to provide explanation for not achieving CVs No action needed No action needed Old (non-relevant) recommendations should be deleted No action needed
E2 E3	Data quality: Re Follow-up of Re Actions to avoke	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations sexplained? Are the deviations pustified? agional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50- 70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal, where do the planned numbers come from? Oversampling: yes, explained; Undersampling: yes for eet, not for the other species Yes, for those cases where deviations were explained  Yes No The AR text claims that "samples are too small to get accurate estimates.", but for most species, several hundred or thousand individuals were measured. No  NA Only old recommendations from 2008 and 2011 listed. NA NA Yes, but rather briefly (better planning needed).	Mostly Partly Partly Yes No Mostly No NA NA NA Partly	MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal MS to provide missing explanations MS to provide explanation for not action needed MS to provide explanation for not achieving CVs No action needed Mo action needed Mo action needed No action needed MS to provide more details on
E2 E3 E4 on North Atlan	Data quality: Re Follow-up of Re Actions to avoke	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations justified? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations from NP proposal Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Pegional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50- 70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal, where do the planned numbers come from? Oversampling: yes, explained; Undersampling: yes for eet, not for the other species Yes, for those cases where deviations were explained  Yes No The AR text claims that "samples are too small to get accurate estimates.", but for most species, several hundred or thousand individuals were measured. No  NA Only old recommendations from 2008 and 2011 listed. NA NA Yes, but rather briefly (better planning needed).	Mostly Partly Partly Yes No Mostly No NA NA NA Partly	MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal MS to provide missing explanations MS to provide missing explanations No action needed No action needed MS to provide explanation for not achieving CVs No action needed
E2 E3 E4 on North Atlan	Data quality: Re Follow-up of Re Actions to avoke	Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Sesults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations instified?  agional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant derogations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50- 70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal, where do the planned numbers come from? Oversampling: yes, explained; Undersampling: yes for eel, not for the other species Yes, for those cases where deviations were explained  Yes No The AR text claims that "samples are too small to get accurate estimates.", but for most species, several hundred or thousand individuals were measured. No  NA Only old recommendations from 2008 and 2011 listed. NA NA Yes, but rather briefly (better planning needed). No, should be more detailed	Mostly Partly Partly Yes No Mostly No NA NA Partly	MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal MS to provide missing explanations MS to provide missing explanations No action needed No action needed MS to provide explanation for not achieving CVs No action needed MS to provide more details on avoidance of shortfalls
E2 E3 E4 on North Atlan	Data quality: Re Follow-up of Re Actions to avoke	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations justified? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations from NP proposal Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Pegional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50- 70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal, where do the planned numbers come from? Oversampling: yes, explained; Undersampling: yes for eel, not for the other species Yes, for those cases where deviations were explained  Yes No The AR text claims that "samples are too small to get accurate estimates", but for most species, several hundred or thousand individuals were measured. No NA Only old recommendations from 2008 and 2011 listed. NA NA NA Yes, but rather briefly (better planning needed). No, should be more detailed  Yes	Mostly Partly Partly Yes No Mostly No NA NA Partly	MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal MS to provide missing explanations MS to provide missing explanations No action needed No action needed MS to provide explanation for not achieving CVs No action needed MS to provide more details on avoidance of shortfalls

		AR year Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal Overall compila	2013 31 May 2014 31 March 2010 (20 Sep 2010?), AR text section D mentions a version of 2 June 2011 EWG Answer	Compliance class No Partly	Compliance level <10% 10-50%
		Version of the NP proposal	31 March 2010 (20 Sep 2010?), AR text section D mentions a version of 2 June 2011	Partly	
		• •			10-50%
		Overell complic		Mostly	50-90%
		Overali compila		Yes	>90%
				NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS Undersampling of shrimp is explained; oversampling (and	EWG judgement	EWG
			financial implications) of Greenland halibut and additional	Partly	MS to provide missing explan
		Are the deviations explained?	sampling of cod not explained		
	_	Are the deviations justified?	Yes for shrimp, not for the other species	Partly	MS to provide missing explan
E2	Data qual	ity: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Were CV targets met?	No	No	No action needed
			Not in detail, some information from NAFO on the	No	MS to provide explanation fo
		Are the deviations explained?	assessment of international data quality would be helpful	-	achieving CVs
E3	Follow-ur	Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations	No	No	No action needed
	. 00 4	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	No	No action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Only old recommendations from RCM NA 2008	No, there is one relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendation.	MS to provide the relevant R recommendation
		Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	No	MS to provide responsive ac the added recommendation
		Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	No	No action needed
E4	Actions to	avoid shortfalls			IMC to provide more details a
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Briefly, not addressing the shortfalls	No	MS to provide more details of avoidance of shortfalls
_		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No	No	No action needed
Transvei	rsal variab	les			T
E4	O=== "	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelin	es? Reference year is not correct	Mostly	No action needded
	Capacity F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No comments	V	No action
		proposal? Are the deviations explained?	No comments No deviations	Yes NA	No action needded No action needded
	E46	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needded
	F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls	Yes	No action needded
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA NA	No action needded
	Effort F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	• • • •	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
		proposal?	Effort data for vessels below 12 m is missing	Mostly	Missing data have to be prov MS needs to explain not prov
		Are the deviations explained?	No deviation identified, although it was observed	No	information
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	No	MS needs to justify not provi information
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	V	No anti-constant
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needded MS needs to explain not prov
		Are the deviations explained?	Deviations identified, but not explainied	No	information MS needs to explain not prov
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	No	information
	F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recomendations	Yes	No action needded
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needded
	F14	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Actions to avoid shortfalls	No comments	NA	No action needded
				N	MS needs to provide actions
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Actions to avoid shortfalls is not comprehensive	No	shortfalls MS needs to provide actions
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	No	shortfalls
	Landings F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No comments	Voc	No action pooddod
		proposal? Are the deviations explained?	No comments No deviations	Yes NA	No action needded No action needded
	E10	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needded
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needded
		Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	NA	No action needded
	F13	Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No comments	NA	No action needded
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Listed recomendations not from LM	Yes	No action needded
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA NA	No action needded
	F14	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls	No comments	NA	No action needded
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls	NA	No action needded
Researc	h surveys	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? at sea	No comments	NA	No action needded
		ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal			N HO
		Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR	Information on Echo NM is missing in table. Confusing * in		Yes. MS to update table with information on Echo NM and
		guidelines?	table. It seems to be no need for it	Mostly	the need for *
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	the difference in number of hauls in NP and AR is explained	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling	No comments	Yes	No action needed
CO	Doto ····	activities?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
G2	⊔ata qua	ity: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.	g.		
		no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical	No comments	Von	No action pooded
		coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning	No list presented (no relevant recommendations from		Τ
G3		Groups listed?	WGBIFS 2012).	NA	No action needed
G3		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
G3		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	UNO COMMENTS	NA	No action needed
G3 G4	Actions to	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  a avoid shortfalls	No comments	NA NA	No action needed

				_	1		
		Member St	ate:	Estonia	0040		ent levels
				AR year Version of the AR reviewed	2013 31 May 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
				70.00.00	31 March 2010 (20 Sep 2010?), AR text section D		1.075
				Version of the NP proposal	mentions a version of 2 June 2011	Partly	10-50%
				Overall compliance	EWG Answer Partly	Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
				Overali compilance	Faitty	NA	not applicable
					EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
IV				nomic situation of the aquaculture and processing indust	ry		
	Α	Collection of dat	ta concer	ning the aquaculture			No Commented
				Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR	Yes	Yes	No action needed MS should resubmit the table
				quidelines?	Table is not consistent with the AR guidelines because the	Mostly	according to the guidelines
				Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR	Table to the consistent with the 744 gardenness seedade the	moony	according to the generalize
				guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		A1 Achieve	ements: R	esults and deviation from NP proposal			1
				Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
				Are the deviations explained?	N.A.	N.A.	No action needed
				Are the deviations justified?	N.A.	N.A.	No action needed
		A2 Data qu	uality: Res	ults and deviation from NP proposal			
				Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No acton needed
				Are the deviations explained?	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
				Are the deviations justified?	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
		A3 Follow-	up of Reg	ional and international recommendations	No valouant vacammandation -	V	No action peopled
				Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	No relevant recommendations NA	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
				Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA NA	No action needed
		A4 Actions	to avoid		144	14/1	140 dollori riceded
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes, but MS should indicate which measures are taken in co	Yes	No action needed
	В	Collection of dat	ta concer	ning the processing industry			
				Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		D4 Askisson	D	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		B1 Achieve	ements: H	esults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Yes, even an improvement, from probability sampling to		1
				proposal?	census.	Yes	No action needed
				Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
				Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		B2 Data qu	uality: Res	ults and deviation from NP proposal	Ex.		Te
				Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
				Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
		B3 Follow-	un of Rea	ional and international recommendations	165	165	No action needed
				Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
				Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No action needed
				Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
		B4 Actions	to avoid		D		To a second
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
v	Modulo of	avaluation of the	offooto o	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  f the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem	NA	NA	No action needed
٧				deviation from NP proposal			
			June and		North Atlantic region is not listed in NP but in AR. No		1
					survey in North Atlantic means that indicator 1-4 should be	Mostly	Yes. MS to update table for North
				Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	a "No" instead of a "Yes" in table.	V	Atlantic
		Antinum to avaid	aha utfalla	Are the relevant derogations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	2	Actions to avoid	anuntialis	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls	NA	No action needed
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
VI	Module fo	r management an	nd use of	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	1	Achievements: R	tesults and	deviation from NP proposal			
					Not clear which data from ICES Sub-areas VII and VIII have been transmitted to the RCM NA (not RCM NE Atlantic), as Tables III.C.1 and III.E.1 do not list any		
				Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent	Estonian fisheries in these areas.	Mostly	No action needded
				with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well	No comments No comments	NA	No action needded
				detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes Yes	No action needded No action needded
				Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	NA Yes	No action needded
				Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA NA	No action needded
	2	Actions to avoid	shortfalls	•			
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No shortfalls	Yes	No action needded
			_	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needded
VII	Follow-up	of STECF recom	nmendatio	ns	listed and not all relevant recommendation is listed (e.g.:" EWG 11-08 recommends that information and descriptions of the method/software used for		
				Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	descriptions of the method/software used for calculation of CV's should be included (or referred to) in the AR if not provided in NP"). No reference to description of method in AP or NP.	Partly	Yes. MS to update the list with relevant recommendations
				And the management of the state	Van if listed	Vac	Yes. MS to update the list with

For some recommendation no concrete actions is

described

No comments

Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable? VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations

Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations? IX Comments, suggestions and reflections

Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?

X References

Is there a complete list of references?

XI Annexes Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?

Yes No comments No action needed AR2014: MS to include reference list No reference list provided No annex provided No action needed

Yes

Mostly

relevant recommendations Yes. MS to update table and provide

more concrete text about action

No action needed

		ber State:	Finland		Ju	idgement levels
			AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	31 May 2014 3 April 2013	No Partly	<10% 10-50%
			• •	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
Gene	eral framewor	rk				Action needed?
Natio	onal data colle	ection organisation	Are derogations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Α	Nationa	al correspondent	and participating institutes  Are the partners involved in the national data collection and		Т	1
			their roles well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is there a national DCF website available? Is the information provided on the website in line with legal	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
3	Region B1	al and Internation Attendance of i	al coordination nternational meetings			
			-	Only meetings where Finland was supposed to		MS should not delete meetings, even
			Is Table II.B.1 complete?	participate were included.	Mostly	they were not relevant to the MS MS should indicate reason for non-
			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Ves but only your general	Months	attendance for each meeting specifically.
	B2	Follow-up of re	gional and international recommendations	Yes, but only very general.	Mostly	specifically.
				Only partly. E.g. issues about VMS data access (LM		
				Stock related variables: Setting up of Bilateral agreements and "RCM Baltic 2012 Métier related"		
			Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	variables: Routines for establishing bilatereal agreement are not listed and commented.	Partly	MS should check LM report and reply
					Partly	all respective recommendations.  MS should check LM report and reply
			Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes, but only for one recommendation Yes, but only for the one mendtioned	Partly	all respective recommendations.  MS should check LM report and reply
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	recommendation	Partly	all respective recommendations.
lod.	ule of the ove	luation of the fish	ing sector			
ioau		luation of the fish Il description of th	ne fishing sector			
			Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Only present situation is described. No description of changes.	Mostly	MS should also state, if there are relevant changes
3		nic variables	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
SUPF	RA-REGION E	Baltic Sea, North S	Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic	Table IIIB1 does not follow the AR guidelines. The		T
				planed sample number, the planned sample rate and		
			Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR	the achieved sample number should be exact numbers. Achieved sample no / planned sample no is		MS can resubmit the Table according
			guidelines?	incorrect	Mostly	the guidelines and ewg comments
			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR			
	B1	Achievements: I	guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	v	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	N
			proposal? Are the deviations explained?	Yes NA	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
	B2	Data quality: He	sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
	В3	Follow up of Por	Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations	NA	NA	No action needed
	55	1 Ollow-up of Fie	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recomendations	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA NA	No action needed
	В4	Astions to sucid		NA	NA	No action needed
			shortfalls			
		Actions to avoid	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Piologi		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
	Biologi	cal metier related	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
	on Baltic Sea	cal metier related	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? variables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	_	cal metier related	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? variables	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	on Baltic Sea	cal metier related	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? variables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal	Yes  NA (Finland only has fisheries in the Baltic Sea)  Yes. National sub-metiers were established to distinguish between whitefish (COREG) and	Yes	No action needed
	on Baltic Sea	cal metier related	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Ivariables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes  NA (Finland only has fisheries in the Baltic Sea)  Yes. National sub-metiers were established to	Yes	No action needed
	on Baltic Sea	cal metier related	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR	Yes  NA (Finland only has fisheries in the Baltic Sea)  Yes. National sub-metiers were established to distinguish between whitefish (COREG) and perch/pike-perch (PERCIF) in the metiers FYK FWS >0 0 0 and GNS FWS >0 0 0.	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
	on Baltic Sea	cal metier related	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Ivariables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	Yes  NA (Finland only has fisheries in the Baltic Sea)  Yes. National sub-metiers were established to distinguish between whitefish (COREG) and perch/pike-perch (PERCIF) in the metiers FYK FWS >0 0 and GNS FWS >0 0.0.  Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
	on Baltic Sea	cal metier related	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes  NA (Finland only has fisheries in the Baltic Sea)  Yes. National sub-metiers were established to distinguish between whitefish (COREG) and perch/pike-perch (PERCIF) in the metiers FYK FWS >0 0 0 and GNS FWS >0 0 0.	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
	on Baltic Sea	cal metier related	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Ivariables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	Yes  NA (Finland only has fisheries in the Baltic Sea)  Yes. National sub-metiers were established to distinguish between whitefish (COREG) and perch/pike-perch (PERCIF) in the metiers FYK_FWS_>0_0_0 and GNS_FWS_>0_0_0.  Yes  Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
	on Baltic Sea	cal metier related	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Ivariables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR	Yes  NA (Finland only has fisheries in the Baltic Sea)  Yes. National sub-metiers were established to distinguish between whitefish (COREG) and perch/pike-perch (PERCIF) in the metiers FYK FWS >0 0 and GNS FWS >0 0 0.	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed
	on Baltic Sea	cal metier related	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Ivariables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Yes  NA (Finland only has fisheries in the Baltic Sea)  Yes. National sub-metiers were established to distinguish between whitefish (COREG) and perch/pike-perch (PERCIF) in the metiers FYK_FWS >0_0_0 and GNS_FWS >0_0_0.  Yes  Yes  Overall targets met within margins, apart from sea trout (129 sampled, 500 planned). Shifts from onshore (undersampling) to at-sea sampling	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed
	on Baltic Sea	cal metier related	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes  NA (Finland only has fisheries in the Baltic Sea)  Yes. National sub-metiers were established to distinguish between whitefish (COREG) and perch/pike-perch (PERCIF) in the metiers FYK FWS >0 0 and GNS FWS >0 0 0.  Yes  Yes  Yes  Overall targets met within margins, apart from sea trout (129 sampled, 500 planned). Shifts from onshore (undersampling) to at-sea sampling (oversampling) in the perch/pike-perch fisheries.	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Mostly	No action needed
	on Baltic Sea C1	cal metier related	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Ivariables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes  NA (Finland only has fisheries in the Baltic Sea)  Yes. National sub-metiers were established to distinguish between whitefish (COREG) and perch/pike-perch (PERCIF) in the metiers FYK_FWS >0_0_0 and GNS_FWS >0_0_0.  Yes  Yes  Overall targets met within margins, apart from sea trout (129 sampled, 500 planned). Shifts from onshore (undersampling) to at-sea sampling	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed
	on Baltic Sea	cal metier related	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Ivariables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations gustified? Is and deviation from NP proposal	Yes  NA (Finland only has fisheries in the Baltic Sea)  Yes. National sub-metiers were established to distinguish between whitefish (COREG) and perch/pike-perch (PERCIF) in the metiers FYK_FWS >0_0_0 and GNS_FWS >0_0_0.  Yes  Yes  Ves  Overall targets met within margins, apart from sea trout (129 sampled, 500 planned). Shifts from onshore (undersampling) to at-sea sampling (oversampling) in the perch/pike-perch fisheries.  Yes	Yes	No action needed
	on Baltic Sea C1	cal metier related	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Ivariables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes  NA (Finland only has fisheries in the Baltic Sea)  Yes. National sub-metiers were established to distinguish between whitefish (COREG) and perch/pike-perch (PERCIF) in the metiers FYK FWS >0 0 0 and GNS FWS >0 0 0.  Yes  Yes  Yes  Overall targets met within margins, apart from sea trout (129 sampled, 500 planned). Shifts from onshore (undersampling) to at-sea sampling (oversampling) in the perch/pike-perch fisheries.  Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Mostly Yes	No action needed
	on Baltic Sea C1	cal metier related	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Ivariables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Posults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?	Yes. National sub-metiers were established to distinguish between whitefish (COREG) and perch/pike-perch (PERCIF) in the metiers FYK_FWS_>0_0_0 and GNS_FWS_>0_0_0.  Yes  Yes  Ves  Overall targets met within margins, apart from sea trout (129 sampled, 500 planned). Shifts from onshore (undersampling) to at-sea sampling (oversampling) in the perch/pike-perch fisheries. Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	Yes	No action needed
	on Baltic Sea C1	Achievements:	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Ivariables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  Populations are provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?	Yes  NA (Finland only has fisheries in the Baltic Sea)  Yes. National sub-metiers were established to distinguish between whitefish (COREG) and perch/pike-perch (PERCIF) in the metiers FYK_FWS_>0_0_0 and GNS_FWS_>0_0_0.  Yes  Yes  Yes  Overall targets met within margins, apart from sea trout (129 sampled, 500 planned). Shifts from onshore (undersampling) to at-sea sampling (oversampling) in the perch/pike-perch fisheries. Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	Yes	No action needed
	on Baltic Sea C1	Achievements:	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Ivariables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? soults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? gloonal and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes. National sub-metiers were established to distinguish between whitefish (COREG) and perch/pike-perch (PERCIF) in the metiers FYK_FWS_>0_0_0 and GNS_FWS_>0_0_0.  Yes  Yes  Ves  Overall targets met within margins, apart from sea trout (129 sampled, 500 planned). Shifts from onshore (undersampling) to at-sea sampling (oversampling) in the perch/pike-perch fisheries. Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	Yes	No action needed
	on Baltic Sea C1	Achievements:	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Ivariables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes. National sub-metiers were established to distinguish between whitefish (COREG) and perch/pike-perch (PERCIF) in the metiers FYK_FWS_>0_0_0 and GNS_FWS_>0_0_0.  Yes  Yes  Overall targets met within margins, apart from sea trout (129 sampled, 500 planned). Shifts from onshore (undersampling) to at-sea sampling (oversampling) in the perch/pike-perch fisheries. Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes And NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  delete duplicates
C Regid	on Baltic Sea C1	Achievements:	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Ivariables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? soults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? gloonal and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes. National sub-metiers were established to distinguish between whitefish (COREG) and perch/pike-perch (PERCIF) in the metiers FYK_FWS_>0_0_0 and GNS_FWS_>0_0_0.  Yes  Yes  Ves  Overall targets met within margins, apart from sea trout (129 sampled, 500 planned). Shifts from onshore (undersampling) to at-sea sampling (oversampling) in the perch/pike-perch fisheries. Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	Yes	No action needed
	on Baltic Sea C1	Achievements:	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Ivariables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? soults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations justified? Segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? d shortfalls	Yes. National sub-metiers were established to distinguish between whitefish (COREG) and perch/pike-perch (PERCIF) in the metiers FYK_FWS_>0_0_0 and GNS_FWS_>0_0_0.  Yes  Yes  Overall targets met within margins, apart from sea trout (129 sampled, 500 planned). Shifts from onshore (undersampling) to at-sea sampling (oversampling) in the perch/pike-perch fisheries. Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes, although most of the stocks were undersampled NA NA  Yes (but in section I)  Yes, but duplicates should be deleted Yes	Yes	No action needed
	con Baltic Sea C1	Achievements:  Data quality: Re	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Ivariables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations justified?  Pare the relevant recommendations Were the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes. National sub-metiers were established to distinguish between whitefish (COREG) and perch/pike-perch (PERCIF) in the metiers FYK FWS >0 0 0 and GNS FWS >0 0 0.  Yes  Yes  Ves  Ves  Overall targets met within margins, apart from sea trout (129 sampled, 500 planned). Shifts from onshore (undersampling) to at-sea sampling (oversampling) in the perch/pike-perch fisheries.  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes, although most of the stocks were undersampled NA  NA  Ves (but in section I)  Yes, but duplicates should be deleted  Yes  Yes, for perch sampling	Yes	No action needed
	C1 C2 C3 C4	Achievements:  Data quality: Re	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Ivariables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? soults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations justified? Segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? d shortfalls	Yes. National sub-metiers were established to distinguish between whitefish (COREG) and perch/pike-perch (PERCIF) in the metiers FYK_FWS_>0_0_0 and GNS_FWS_>0_0_0.  Yes  Yes  Overall targets met within margins, apart from sea trout (129 sampled, 500 planned). Shifts from onshore (undersampling) to at-sea sampling (oversampling) in the perch/pike-perch fisheries. Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes, although most of the stocks were undersampled NA NA  Yes (but in section I)  Yes, but duplicates should be deleted Yes	Yes	No action needed

	Member State:		Finland	Judgement levels		
	WEILD	ei State	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	3 April 2013 EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
			Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
					NA	not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
	D1	Achieveme	ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are obtained derogations mentioned?	no derogations	NA NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	no derogations	NA	No action needed
	D2	Doto qualit	Are the deviations justified? y: Results and deviation from NP proposal	no derogations	NA	No action needed
	D2	Data quant	Were data quality targets provided?	Information on data quality provided. No specific		
			1 7 9 1	target.	Yes	No action needed
			Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained?	No specific text No deviations	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	NA NA	No action needed
	D3	Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations			
			Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no derogations	NA Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	RCM Baltic 2012 recommendation  No comments	Yes	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	D4	Actions to	avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	no real shortfalls (data collection every second year)  No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
E	Biologic:	l stock-rel:	ated variables	No comments	165	No action needed
-	Diologici	ii Stock Tek	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	? Yes	Yes	No action needed
Region Ba						
	E1	Achieveme	ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR		<u> </u>	T
			guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Yes, only salmon in SD 32 undersampled.	Yes	No action peoded
			proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	E2	Data qualit	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Were CV estimates provided?	Yes, only age reading of perch missing. in 6 of 18 cases	Yes Partly	No action needed
			Were CV targets met?	Yes, MS focuses on length@age where CVs were	i i	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	met	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	E3	Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations	Ver for each (in eaching Land Table III F 0)	V	In a land
			Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes, for sprat (in section I and Table III.E.3) Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	E4	Actions to	avoid shortfalls	Yes, for salmon in SD 32	Yes	No astronomondo
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed  No action needed
F	Transvei	sal variable				No dollar ricoda
			Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR		V	
	F1	Capacity	guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No comments	Vee	No action needed
			proposal? Are the deviations explained?	No comments No deviations	Yes Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		F13 /	Actions to avoid shortfalls		1	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
	F2	Effort	Are actions to avoid shortialis in the luture acceptable:	INO COMMENTS	res	No action needed
		F11 /	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		T	
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No deviations	Yes	No action needed
		F12 [	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	V	No action page
			Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?	No comments No deviations	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		<b>F13</b> F	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	<u> </u>		Tex
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?	No relevant recomendations No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		F14 /	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F3	Landings	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	. •		Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No comments	V	No action monder!
			proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	No comments No deviations	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		F12 [	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No deviations No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
		<b>F13</b> F	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		100	no dollon nocaca
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		F14 /	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		,	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
•	n		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
G	Research	n surveys a	t sea			

				7		
	мет	er State:	Finland AR year	2013	Compliance class	Judgement levels  Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	3 April 2013 EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
			Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
					NA	not applicable
			Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR	EWG COMMENTS  Mosly, Number of rectangles are presented instead of	EWG judgement	EWG
			guidelines?	Echo NM	Mostly	MS to update table
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA (no recreational fisheries in this region)	Mostly	MS to update table
			Are the deviations explained?	No commment	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes, since data was used and accepted by the end users	Yes	No action needed
			Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling			
	G2	D-4	activities? esults and deviation from NP proposal	Maps in annex and not in the main body text	Mostly	AR2014: add maps in the text
	G2	Data quality: Re	Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g.			
			no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical		V	
			coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained?	dispite change of vessel, no changes described technical problem and bad wether	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	G3	Follow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations			AR2014: MS to explicitly mention ever
			Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning			though no recommendations are
			Groups listed?	No text	NA NA	established NA
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No text NA	NA NA	NA NA
	G4	Actions to avoi	d shortfalls	-		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed
Mod	dule of the eval	uation of the ec	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? conomic situation of the aquaculture and processing indus	No comments stry	168	No action needed
A			rning the aquaculture	· 		
			Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR			
	<b>A</b> 1	Achievemente:	guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	AI	Achievements.	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
			proposal?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed No action needed
	A2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed No action needed
	A3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	N.A. N.A.	NA NA	No action needed No action needed
	A4	Actions to avoid				
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	N.A.	NA NA	No action needed
В	Collection	on of data conce	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? rning the processing industry	N.A.	NA	No action needed
			Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR	v		
			guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	B1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal		T	
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
	B2	Data quality: Re	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal	NA	NA	No action needed
	DZ	Data quality. He	Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
	В3	Follow-up of Re	Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations	NA	NA	No action needed
	20	Tollow up of the	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA NA	No action needed
	В4	Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	N.A.	NA	No action needed
,, .	ula af!	af the -"	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	N.A.	NA	No action needed
Mod			of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem and deviation from NP proposal			
		riodulio di		I	.,	
			Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	No comments	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
	2 Actions t	o avoid shortfalls		No derogations identified	I INA	No action needed
				Tout in minning in the	NA	AR2014: MS to insert text on shortfa
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Text is missing in the report		in the report.  AR2014: MS to insert text on shortfa
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Text is missing in the report	NA	in the report.
Mod	_	ement and use o	f the data nd deviation from NP proposal			
	· Actilevel	i icaulta di	• •			
			Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent	Aquaculture data call missing	Mostly	Update table with aquaculture call.
			with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is progress in the "Management of data" section well			
			detailed?  Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	0.4	a avaid de 17 "	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
		o avoid shortfalls		No comments	Yes	No action needed
	2 Actions t		Are actions to avoid shormalis in the future described 7			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Follo		F recommendati	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	

AR year Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal  April 2013  April 2013  April 2013  Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?  Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?  X References  Are there a complete list of references?  Is there a complete list of references?  No comments  No comments  No comments  Yes  No action needed  Yes  No action needed  Yes  No action needed  No comments  Yes  No action needed	Member State:	Finland	]	Ju	dgement levels
Version of the NP proposal  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  Yes No action needed  The responsive actions acceptable?  No comments  No comments  No comments  Yes No action needed		AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Overall compliance    Mostly		Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Overall compliance  Mostly Yes Some relevant recommendations made for the period 2011-2012 are missing No comments No comments No comments No comments Yes No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No comments No comments Yes No action needed No action needed No comments No comments No comments Yes No action needed No comments No comments No comments Yes No action needed No comments No comments Yes No action needed Yes No action needed		Version of the NP proposal	3 April 2013	Partly	10-50%
EWG COMMENTS   EWG judgement   EWG			EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
EWG COMMENTS EWG judgement EWG  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations  IX Comments, suggestions and reflections  Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?  Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?  Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?  No comments  Yes No action needed		Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%
Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?  Are there any comments, suggestions and reflections  Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?  X References  Is there a complete list of references?  Annexes  Some relevant recommendations made for the period 2011-2012 are missing No actions  No comments  No comments  No comments  Yes No action needed  No comments  Yes No action needed  No comments  Yes No action needed				NA	not applicable
Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?  No comments  No comments  Yes No action needed  Yes No action needed			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?  No comments  No comments  Yes No action needed  Yes No action needed			Some relevant recommendations made for the period		Yes, MS to update table including
VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?  No comments  Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?  X References  Is there a complete list of references?  No comments  No comments  Yes  No action needed  No comments  Yes  No action needed  Yes  No action needed  Annexes		Are the responsive actions described?		No	
Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?  Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?  X References  Is there a complete list of references?  No comments  No comments  Yes  No action needed		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?  Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?  X References  Is there a complete list of references?  No comments  No comments  Yes  No action needed	VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations	· '		•	•
Comments, suggestions and reflections  Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?  No comments  No comments  Yes  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed	•		No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?  X References  Is there a complete list of references?  No comments  No comments  Yes  No action needed  Yes  No action needed  Yes  No action needed	IX Comments, suggestions and reflec-				
X References  Is there a complete list of references?  No comments  Yes  No action needed  XI Annexes					
Is there a complete list of references?  No comments  Yes  No action needed  No action needed		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
XI Annexes	X References				
		Is there a complete list of references?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information	XI Annexes	•			
Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information					
to support statements made in the main text?  No comments  Yes  No action needed		Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No comments	Yes	No action needed

	Weiliber State.	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	4 June 2014	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	3 September 2012	Partly	10-50%
		rototon or the proposal	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
		O Totali Compilation		NA NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
General f	ramework		211 0 0021110	211 G Jacgomoni	Action needed?
		Are derogations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
National of	data collection organisation				
A		and participating institutes			
		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		described?	rto commonto		110 401011 1100404
		Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		(COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?			
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		meetings?	140 comments	103	No delien needed
		If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
В	Regional and Internationa		140 comments	103	140 delicit ficeded
_		nternational meetings			
	DI Attendance of it	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes, apart from two questionsmarks	Mostly	No action needed
		is rable ii.b.r complete:	res, apart from two questionsmarks	Wostry	No action needed
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	B2 Follow-up of rec	gional and international recommendations	NO COMMENTS	163	No action needed
	B2 Follow-up of reg		No commente	Yes	No action panded
		Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	No comments		No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	MS doesn't give any response on	No	Some explanations should be given
			recomendations		
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	No	No action needed
I Module o	f the evaluation of the fishi				
Α	General description of th	e fishing sector			
	•	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP	No changes in any areas.	NA	No action needed
		implementation well described?			<u> </u>
		Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	Information is provided in general,	No	MS should provide data by supra
		. 5. 5.	not spliting to supra regions.		region
			Therefore comments for evaluation		<u> </u>
			are repeated in each supraregion		
В	Economic variables		section.		
		ea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic			
CO. HATI		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Inactive vessels are missing.	Mostly	MS should provide information about
			g.		the inactive vessels and resubmit the
					table
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Clustered segments provided in	Yes	No action needed
		Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with Air guidelines.	single cells, not merged, difficult to	103	No delien needed
			follow table. Minor		
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	The data presented in the table is	Partly	MS should resubmit the Table
		is rable in b.o complete and consistent with Art guidelines.	confusing. The set of variables	1 ditty	according to the comments.
			presented in the Table is incomplete		according to the comments.
			e.g. unpaid labour, investments, debt		
			and data related to fishing rights and		
			quota value. Achieved sample rate		
			and response rate must be		
			presented in percentage. CV for all		
			segments is missing.		
			3		
	B1 Achievements: R	Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	2. //	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	The PIM method or other	Mostly	MS should improve the methodology to
		Are design and achievements consistent with the Ni proposal:	methodology have not been applied	Wostly	estimate capital values and
			to estimate depreciation costs and		depreciation cost
					depreciation cost
		A 11 1 1 1 10 10	capital value.		N. C. L.
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Mostly	MS should improve the methodology to
					estimate capital values and
					depreciation cost
	B2 Data quality: Res	sults and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	Improved data quality	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	B3 Follow-up of Reg	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			1
	Follow-up of Reg	ional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	Von	No action needed
				Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	B4 Actions to avoid	shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
SUPRA-R	REGION Mediterranean Sea	•	-		-
Sec ringin	Janon anoun oca	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Inactive vessels are missing.	Mostly	MS should provide information about
		and the second s		,	the inactive vessels and resubmit the
					table
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Clustered segments provided in	Yes	No action needed
			single cells, not merged, difficult to	100	30.0
			follow table. Minor		
		le Table III B 3 complete and consistent with AD avidelines?		Dorth	MS should resubmit the Table
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	The data presented in the table is	Partly	MS should resubmit the Table
			confusing. The set of variables		according to the comments.
			presented in the Table is incomplete		
			e.g. unpaid labour, investments, debt		
			and data related to fishing rights and		
			quota value. Achieved sample rate		
			and response rate must be		
			presented in percentage. CV for all		
			segments is missing.		
			'		
	B1 Achievements: R	Results and deviation from NP proposal	-		•
	. , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	The PIM method or other	Mostly	MS should improve the methodology to
		7.10 doorgin and domovements consistent with the Ni proposal?	methodology have not been applied	woody	estimate capital values and
			to estimate depreciation costs and		depreciation cost
			capital value.		doprediation 605t
		Are the deviations explained?		Vaa	No action peoded
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Mostly	MS should improve the methodology to
					estimate capital values and
					depreciation cost
	B2 Data quality: Res	sults and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	Improved data quality	Yes	No action needed
		, as the deviations explained:	provou data quanty	169	dollon nooded

Judgment levels

Member State:

Memi	ber State:	France			Judgment levels
		AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	4 June 2014 3 September 2012	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
		Overall compli		Yes	>90%
			L	NA	not applicable
		And the identifications to stiff all		WG judgement	EWG
В3	Follow-up of Rea	Are the deviations justified? ional and international recommendations	No comments	Yes	No action needed
20	. onon up or riog	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
В4	Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	res	No action needed
54	Actions to avoid	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
A-REGION C	Other regions	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Inactive vessels are missing.	Mostly	MS should provide information abo the inactive vessels and resubmit table
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Clustered segments provided in single cells, not merged, difficult to follow table. Minor	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	The data presented in the table is confusing. The set of variables presented in the Table is incomplete e.g. unpaid labour, investments, debt and data related to fishing rights and quota value. Achieved sample rate and response rate must be presented in percentage. CV for all segments is missing.	Partly	MS should resubmit the Table according to the comments.
B1	Achievements: R	esults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	The PIM method or other methodology have not been applied to estimate depreciation costs and	Mostly	MS should improve the methodologestimate capital values and depreciation cost
			capital value.	.,	·
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes No comments	Yes Mostly	No action needed  MS should improve the methodolo
		·			estimate capital values and depreciation cost
B2	Data quality: Res	sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	Improved data quality	Yes	No action needed
_		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
В3	Follow-up of Reg	ional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
B4	Actions to avoid		Naccomment	V	[No action modes]
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
					•
	cal metier related	Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	Yes - the information is given by region, however, France have used old tables in it's 2013 annual report.	Yes	France must use the most recent version of the standard tables as outlined in the latest version of the AR guidelines, when resubmitting tables
C1		c Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	France is using an out dated version of the standard III.C tables. Sampling frame codes is not consistent between Tables; codes for sampling frames in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 should match exactly. For a particular metier, sampling frame code MMHN_NS, which is not defined in the table, have been carried out 22 trips, but no information on this metier are provided both in the text and in the table (at least for this Region). There are inconsistencies in the number of trips achieved: 223 in the text, 220 in the table III.C.4 (see column Achieved number of trips). Also the total number of planned trips at sea and on shore reported in the taxt do not match with those reported in the table, as the 22 trips from the undefined sampling frame have not been included	Partly	MS to re submit Table III.C.3 with accompaning text and to describe fishery/fisheries covered by the sampling frame code MNHN_NS  MS to re submit Table III.C.4 with
			No. of trips during the Sampling year" are missing. Sampling frame codes is not consistent between Tables; Codes for sampling frames in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 should match exactly. For a particular metier, sampling frame code MNHN_NS, which is not defined in the table, have been carried out 22 trips, but no information on this metier are provided both in the text and in the table (at least for this Region). There		accompaning text and to describe fishery/fisheries covered by the sampling frame code MNHN_NS

Member Sta	te:

France			Ju	dgment levels
AR year		2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed		4 June 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal		3 September 2012	Partly	10-50%
		EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
	Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%
			NA	not applicable

	Version of the NP proposal	3 September 20
	Overall comp	EWO
	Overall comp	pliance
		EWG (
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	France has use
		version of table
		undersampled (
		planned to samp
		achieved 112) a
		over sampled qu
		text is provided situation. There
		reported in table
		incorrect. Table
		include all speci
		with the addition
		encountered du
		sampling.
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	The number of s
		specimens repo
		C5 and C6 is no
		table should be
		number of speci metier and area
		measured during
		given species (a
		and G3), fishing
		MS reported onl
		number of chone
		should revised t
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	MS should revis
		to ensure cohere
		consistencies be
		planned number
		CV's have not a
	Are the deviations explained?	See comments
		tables III.C.3 - II
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments
Data quality:	Results and deviation from NP proposal	
	Were CV estimates provided?	No comments
	Were CV targets met?	No comments
	Are the deviations explained?	No requirement
		volume of discar
		the latest versio
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments
Follow-up of	Regional and international recommendations	
up 01	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No comments
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments

#### Follow-up of R C3

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

### C4

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

# Region North Atlantic C1 A

C2

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal
Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
France has used an out dated version of table III.C.5. 3 species are undersampled (Pectir maximus, planned to sample 2,000, and achieved 112) and the others are over sampled quite significantly. No text is provided to explain either situation. There are less species reported in table III.C.6. this is incorrect. Table II.C.6 should also include all species included in III.C.5 with the addition of those species encountered during concurrent sampling.	Partly	MS to re submit Tables III.C.5 and III.C.6 with accompaning text
The number of species and specimens reported in the two tables C5 and C6 is not consistent. In this table should be reported all the total number of species sampled per metier and area: "Number of fish measured during the year for the given species (all species of G1 G2 and G3), fishing ground and metier." MS reported only the collected number of chondrychtians. MS should revised the two tables.	Partly	MS to re submit Tables III.C.5 and III.C.6 with accompaning text
MS should revise the text and tables to ensure coherency and consistencies between tables. The planned number of trips, species and CV's have not always been achieved	Partly	MS to re submit Tables III.C3, III.C.4, III.C.5 and III.C.6 with accompaning text
See comments above regarding tables III.C.3 - III.C.6	No No	MS to resubmit entire section text and tables.  MS to resubmit entire section text and
		tables.
No comments	Yes	No action needed

Mostly	No action needed
Partly	Use the most updated version of the tables in future reports.
No	MS to provide text on CV's, deviations etc
	Partly

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

No comments	No	MS to provide text on actions to avoid
		shortfalls.
No comments	No	MS to provide text on actions to avoid
		shortfalls.

Sampling frame codes is not consistent between Tables, codes for sampling frames in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 should match exactly. No information are provided (e.g. gear, metier) for the metier targeting all the chondrychtlans collected by the MNI+IN team. MS should add information.		MS to re submit Table III.C.3 with accompaning text and to descrip the fishery/fisheries covered by the sampling frame code MNHN_NS
The values under the column "Total No. of trips during the Sampling year" are missing. Sampling frame codes is not consistent between Tables. Codes for sampling frames in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 should match exactly. No information are provided (e.g. gear, metier) for the metier targeting all the chondrychtians collected by the MNHM team. In this latter case, as stated also by MS in the text, more information are needed.	Partly	MS to re submit Table III.C.4 with accompaning text and to describe the fishery/fisheries covered by the sampling frame code MNHN_NS
France has used an out dated version of table III.C.5. Region should respect the naming convention, i.e. North Atlantic. The number of species and specimens reported in the two tables C5 and C6 is not the same. MS should revise the two tables. Table II.C.6 should also include all species included in III.C.5 with the addition of those species encountered during concurrent sampling.	Partly	MS to re submit Tables III.C.5 and III.C.6 with accompaning text

Meml	ber State:	France			Judgment levels
		AR year Version of the AR reviewed	2013 4 June 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
		Version of the NP proposal	3 September 2012	Partly	10-50%
		Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
		CTOTAL COMPINATO	mostry	NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	The number of species and	Partly	MS to re submit Tables III.C.5 and
			specimens reported in the two tables C5 and C6 is not consistent. In this table should be reported all the total number of species sampled per metier and area: "Number of fish measured during the year for the given species (all species of G1 G2 and G3), fishing ground and metier". MS has reported only the collected number of chondrychtians. MS should revised the two tables.		III.C.6 with accompaning text
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	MS should revise the text and tables to ensure coherency and consistencies between tables. The planned number of trips, species and CV's have not always been achieved	Partly	MS to re submit Tables III.C3, III.C.4, III.C.5 and III.C.6 with accompaning text
		Are the deviations explained?	See comments above	No	MS to resubmit entire section text and
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	No	MS to resubmit entire section text and
C2	Data quality: Pa	esults and deviation from NP proposal			tables.
01	Data quality. The	Were CV estimates provided?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Partly	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Partly	Very little information is given to explain under or over sampling. MS to provide more specific explainations.
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Partly	Very little information is given to explain under or over sampling. MS to provide more specific explainations.
C3	Follow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations	Necessaria	V	No astino and al
		Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
C4	Actions to suci	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
C4	Actions to avoi	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Mostly	MS to provide more specific details on
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly. Where actions are given they are acceptable, however several non conformities were identified which have not been explained at all.	Mostly	actions to remedy shortfalls.  MS to provide more specific details on actions to remedy shortfalls.
Region Mediterran					
C1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Sampling frame codes are not consistent between Tables, codes for sampling frames in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 should match exactly. No information are provided (e.g. gear, metier) for the metier targeting all the chondrychtians collected by the MNHN team. MS should add information. MSs participating in sampling of tuna fishery are not mentioned. Name of the region should respect the naming convention, i.e. "Mediterranean and Black Sea". Sampling strategies are not consistent with the guidelines.	Partly	MS to re submit Table III.C.3 with accompaning text and to descrip the fishery/fisheries covered by the sampling frame code MNHN_NS
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Sampling frame codes are not consistent between Tables, codes for sampling frames in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 should match exactly. No information are provided (e.g. gear, metier) for the metier targeting all the chondrychtians collected by the MNHN team. MS should add information. MSs participating in sampling of tuna fishery are not mentioned. The values under the column "Total No. of trips during the Sampling year" are missing. Name of the region should respect the naming convention.	Partly	MS to re submit Table III.C.4 with accompaning text and to describe the fishery/fisheries covered by the sampling frame code MNHN_NS

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

The number of species and specimens reported in the two tables C5 and C6 is not consistent. MS should revise the two tables. In this table should be reported the total number of species (all species of G1 G2 and G3) and specimens achieved for all metier combined. No length data are reported for some species, where France has an obligation to sample, in the GSA 7 (see in the PGMed report 2012 the Percentage contribution (%) of landing per species eg. Eledone cirrhosa)

MS to re submit Tables III.C.5 and III.C.6 with accompaning text

Partly

IVICII	nber State:	France			Judgment levels
		AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	4 June 2014 3 September 2012	No Partly	<10% 10-50%
		• •	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall comp	liance Mostly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	EWG COMMENTS E Name of the region should respect	WG judgement Partly	MS to re submit Tables III.C.5 and
		is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AH guidelines?	Name of the region should respect the naming convention. The number of species and specimens reported in the two tables C5 and C6 is not consistent. In this table should be reported all the total number of species sampled per metier and area: "Number of fish measured during the year for the given species (all species of G1 G2 and G3), fishing ground and metier". MS reported only the collected number of chondrychtians. MS should revised the two tables.	<b>Р</b> апту	Mis to re submit 1 ables III.C.s and IIII.C.6 with accompaning text
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	MS should revise the text and tables to ensure coherency and consistencies between tables. The planned number of trips, species and CV's have not always been achieved	Partly	MS to re submit Tables III.C3, III.C.4, III.C.5 and III.C.6 with accompaning text
		Are the deviations explained?	Partly. They explain that sampling deviates from the planned targets in relation to changes in no of trips in the reference year, unfortunately, France has not included the number of trips in the tables, so it is not possible to evaluate this comment.	Partly	MS to resubmit entire section text and tables.
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	No	MS to resubmit entire section text and tables.
C2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Were CV targets met?	CV targets were reached for only one	No	No action needed
		-	species out of 10.		
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes for GSA 7 but not for GSA 8.	Mostly	MS to provide detailed explaination on deviations for GSA 8 when resubmitting this section.
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes for GSA 7 but not for GSA 8.	Yes	MS to provide detailed explaination on deviations for GSA 8 when resubmitting this section.
C3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?	No relevant derogations requested	NA	No action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
C4	Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
04	Actions to avoid	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
n Other reg C1		Results and deviation from NP proposal			
0.	Admicvements.	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments  Mostly. But the same number of	Yes Mostly	MS to confirm if they have implemented
			species are present on both tables, as France has on board observers it is expected to see additional spp in Table III.C.6 from the concurrent sampling. Inconsistencies in numbers and planned sampling between Tables III.C.5 and III.C.6	·	concurrent sampling in this region
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	No comments No comments	Mostly	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
C2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal			
		Were CV estimates provided?	CV's were not written in Table III.C. 5, instead there was a comment saying "Cf text". In the text, the quality of the data collected is expressed in terms of % coverage of effort or fishing sets, with a minor reference to cv's	Mostly	MS should in future provide the cv's in Table III.C.5 as requested in the guidelines.
		Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?	No comments  CV's were not written in Table III.C. 5, instead there was a comment saying "Cf text". In the text, the quality of the data collected is expressed in terms of % coverage of effort or fishing sets, with a minor reference to cv's	No Mostly	No action needed  MS should in future provide clearer explainations regarding sampling levels that do not allow the cv to reach the required target.
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes, minimum level of coverage of 5% as set by the RFMO has been reached.	Mostly	MS should in future provide clearer explainations regarding sampling levels that do not allow the cv to reach the
C3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations			required target.
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations requested	NA	No action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant RCM recommendations	NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
•	A-41 .	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
C4	Actions to avoid	d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	No	MS to provide details on actions to
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	avoid shortfalls  MS to provide details on actions to

	ate:	France	2012		dgment levels
		IR year 'ersion of the AR reviewed	2013 4 June 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
		ersion of the NP proposal	3 September 2012	Partly	10-50%
		Overall compliance	EWG Answer Mostly	Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
				NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
C1 Achiev		esults and deviation from NP proposal s Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Mostly	MS to use the latest version of the
		·		•	standard tables when resubmitting the tables.
	ls	Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly as an old version of the tables	Mostly	MS to use the latest version of the
			are used.		standard tables when resubmitting the tables.
		s Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
		s Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	A	re the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
00		re the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
C2 Data qu		ults and deviation from NP proposal Vere CV estimates provided?	No comments	No	
		Vere CV targets met?	CV's were not written in Table III.C.	Mostly	MS should in future provide clearer
			5, instead there was a comment saying "Cf text". In the text, the		explainations regarding sampling levels that do not allow the cv to reach the
			quality of the data collected is		required target.
			expressed in terms of % coverage of effort or fishing sets, with a minor		
			reference to cv's		
	A	are the deviations explained?	No comments	Mostly	More detailed explainations required in future reports.
	A	re the deviations justified?	Yes, minimum level of coverage of	Mostly	MS should in future provide clearer
			5% as set by the RFMO has been reached.		explainations regarding sampling levels that do not allow the cv to reach the
			reactied.		required target.
C3 Follow-		onal and international recommendations	No describes a second	NA	INIa askina mandad
		Vere the relevant derogations listed?  are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No derogations requested  No relevant RCM recommendations	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
		are the responsive actions described ? are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
C4 Actions	ns to avoid s		144.	101	
	A	are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	No	MS to provide details on actions to avoid shortfalls
	A	are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	MS to provide details on actions to
					avoid shortfalls
Other regions WEC C1 Achiev		esults and deviation from NP proposal			
7.0		a Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Sampling frame code is not	Partly	MS to resubmit the Table
			consistent between Tables, codes for		
			sampling frames in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 should match exactly (e.g.		
			Obs-OTBCRU it is not presnet in C3		
			but it is present in C4). In the table		
			C3 no planned trips are present for the metier FG-A1, whereas 50 are		
			planned in table C4. MS should		
			revised the two tables. Total No. of trips during the Sampling year is		
			missing		
	ls	s Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Sampling frame codes is not consistent between Tables, codes for	Partly	MS to resubmit the Table
			sampling frames in Tables III.C.3 and		
			III.C.4 should match exactly. Not all		
			the planned trips have been achieved. Total No. of trips during		
			the Sampling year is missing		
	ls	Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no data are reported for French	Partly	MS to resubmit the Table
		•	Guiana	•	MO to manufact the Table
	IS	s Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no data are reported for French Guiana	Partly	MS to resubmit the Table
	A	are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Not all the planned trips have been	Mostly	MS to resubmit the Table
	A	are the deviations explained?	achieved No comments	Yes	No action needed
		are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
C2 Data qu		ults and deviation from NP proposal Vere CV estimates provided?	No comments	No	MS to calculate cv's
		Vere CV targets met?	No comments	No	MS to calculate cv's
	A	re the deviations explained?	No comments	No	MS to calculate cv's
00 5-11		re the deviations justified?	NA	NA	MS to calculate cv's
C3 Follow-		onal and international recommendations Vere the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations requested	NA	No action needed
		are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant RCM recommendations	NA	No action needed
	Δ	are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
		are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Na	NI-	IMO to associate details an estimate
C4 Actions	ns to avoid s	are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	No	MS to provide details on actions to avoid shortfalls
C4 Actions				NIA	MS to provide details on actions to
C4 Actions	A	are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	
	A	are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	avoid shortfalls
C4 Actions	A sheries	are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? s information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	MS reported the informations for all	Yes	avoid shortfalls  AR2014: report according to guidelines
	A sheries	·	MS reported the informations for all fishing Regions together, although		avoid shortfalls  AR2014: report according to guidelines 'Insert here region header, according to
	A sheries	·	MS reported the informations for all		avoid shortfalls  AR2014: report according to guidelines 'Insert here region header, according to Appendix II of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU. For each region, sections
	A sheries	·	MS reported the informations for all fishing Regions together, although		avoid shortfalls  AR2014: report according to guidelines 'Insert here region header, according to Appendix II of Commission Decision
Recreational fisi	A sheries	·	MS reported the informations for all fishing Regions together, although		avoid shortfalls  AR2014: report according to guideline: 'Insert here region header, according t Appendix II of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU. For each region, sections
Recreational fish	A A Sheries k vements: Re	s information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	MS reported the informations for all fishing Regions together, although for species split up by region (stock)	Yes	avoid shortfalls  AR2014: report according to guideline: 'Insert here region header, according t Appendix II of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU. For each region, sections III.D.1-4 should be given.'
Recreational fist	A A Sheries k vements: Re	s information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	MS reported the informations for all fishing Regions together, although for species split up by region (stock)  Derogations apply for cod, eel,		avoid shortfalls  AR2014: report according to guideline 'Insert here region header, according t Appendix II of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU. For each region, sections
Recreational fist	A A Sheries k vements: Re	s information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	MS reported the informations for all fishing Regions together, although for species split up by region (stock)  Derogations apply for cod, eel, salmon. Sea bass not sampled in 2013. General comment: NP is not	Yes	avoid shortfalls  AR2014: report according to guideline: 'Insert here region header, according t Appendix II of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU. For each region, sections III.D.1-4 should be given.'
Recreational fish	A A Sheries Is	s information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	MS reported the informations for all fishing Regions together, although for species split up by region (stock)  Derogations apply for cod, eel, salmon. Sea bass not sampled in	Yes	avoid shortfalls  AR2014: report according to guideline 'Insert here region header, according Appendix II of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU. For each region, section III.D.1-4 should be given.'

Membe	er State:	France			Judgment levels
		AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	4 June 2014	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	3 September 2012	Partly	10-50%
		Overell compl	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compli	iance Mostly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
		Are the deviations explained?	NA EWG COMMENTS EW	G judgement NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
D2 I	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal			no dollon noodod
		Were data quality targets provided?	Information on data quality provided,	Yes	No action needed
			no specific targets		
		Were data quality targets met?	NA	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
D3 I	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No recommendation from RCM NS&EA or LM dressed to MS in 2012.	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	NA NA	NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
D4	Actions to avoid	d shortfalls			•
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Biologica	al stock-related v	variables			
		Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
Region North Sea ar					
E1 /	Acnievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly - Fishing Ground is not filled	Mostly	MS to fill in the table correctly and
		is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with An guidelines?	in, and inconsistencies in assigning the correct RFMO to the region.	Mostly	completely and resubmit Table III and the accompaning text
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	not all the planned number of species to be collected have been achieved (e.g. G. morhua, P. virens. D. labrax). There are three entries for Length@Age for one species, in	Mostly	MS to explain the triple entry for E labrax.
		Are the deviations explained?	one area, MS to clarify these entries  Not for all the deviations (e.g. length at age for <i>P. virens</i> ) explanations are given	Partly	MS to provide more specific explainations for species where sampling targets have not been
		Are the deviations justified?	Partly	Partly	achieved.  Explainations given for p. virens a perfect, however nothing has bee
E2 I	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal	N	N	provided for other species.
		Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?	No comments No comments	No No	MS to calculate cv's MS to calculate cv's
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	No	MS to provide more details on the deviations and their justification, v re submitting the text and tables
E3 I	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations	F		T
		Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments No comments	Yes No	No action needed  MS to provide a full list of relevant recommendations with responsive actions when re submitting the se
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	No	MS to provide a full list of relevant recommendations with responsive actions when re submitting the se
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	No	MS to provide a full list of relevant recommendations with responsive actions when re submitting the se
E4 /	Actions to avoid	d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Partly, the MS focuses on explaining that a quality focus is in place however this does not give any real detail about the actions to remedy	Partly	MS to resubmit text and tables for Module III.E.
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	shortfalls.  Partly, the MS focuses on explaining that a quality focus is in place however this does not give any real detail about the actions to remedy shortfalls.	Partly	MS to resubmit text and tables for Module III.E.
legion North Atlanti					
E1 .	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly, No cv's reported and no fishing ground entered.	Mostly	MS to fill in the table correctly and completely and resubmit Table III
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	not all the planned number of specimens for stock related variables species have been achieved (N.norvegicus, P.pollachius, Molva spp., D. labrax, Lophius spp, should be presented seperately, and there is	Partiy	and the accompaning text MS to fill in the table correctly and completely and resubmit Table III and the accompaning text
		Are the deviations explained?	no sampling achieved for maturity.  Not all the deviations are explained	Partly	MS to fill in the table correctly and completely and resubmit Table III
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	and the accompaning text  MS to fill in the table correctly and completely and resubmit Table III and the accompaning text
E2 I	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal			Janu the accompaning text
'	quanty. 110	Were CV estimates provided?	No comments	No	MS to calculate cv's
		Were CV targets met?	No comments	No	MS to calculate cv's
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	No	MS to fill in the table correctly and
					completely and resubmit Table II and the accompaning text

	iber State:	France			Judgment levels
		AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	4 June 2014	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	3 September 2012 EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
		Overall compl		Yes	>90%
				NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	No	MS to fill in the table correctly and
					completely and resubmit Table III.E.3 and the accompaning text
E3	Follow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations			and the accompaning text
	·	Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	NA	No action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
E4	Actions to avoi		No comments	103	no dellon needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Partly, action for calculating cv's but	Partly	MS to fill in the table correctly and
			no actions for achieved numbers		completely and resubmit Table III.E.3 and the accompaning text
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Partly, actions provided are	Partly	MS to fill in the table correctly and
			acceptable for CV's		completely and resubmit Table III.E.3
aditarra	nean Sea and Bla	ck Saa			and the accompaning text
E1		Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly, no cv's calculated. France's	Mostly	No action needed
			achievement for Tuna should be in table III.E.3, although the sampling is		
			planned at the regional level.		
			-		
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	only the planned numbers of	Yes	No action needed
			specimens for the estiamion of the Maturity @length for <i>P. elephas</i> has		
			not been achieved		
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	No	MS to explain the deviations
E2	Date muclimus	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	No	MS to explain the deviations
EZ	Data quality: H	esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?	No comments	No	MS to calculate cv's
		Were CV targets met?	No comments	No	MS to calculate cv's
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	No	MS to provide explainations for
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	No	deviations especially for tuna  MS to provide explainations for
		Are the deviations justified:	No comments	140	deviations especially for tuna
E3	Follow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations			
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation requested	NA NA	No actions needed  No actions needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant RCM recommendations	NA	ino actions needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No relevant RCM recommendations	NA	No actions needed
		And the recognition and the control of the control	No coloured DOM coloured delicate	NA	No setiment and all
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No relevant RCM recommendations	NA	No actions needed
E4	Actions to avoi	d shortfalls			
		And patients to consider the state of the st	No comments	No	MS to provide explicit explainations for
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments		shortfalls.  MS to provide explicit explainations for
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	shortfalls.
Other reg E1	ione (IOTC)				
E1		Deculte and deviation from ND proposal			
		Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No cv's reported	Mostly	MS to provide cv's
			almost all the planned number of	Mostly Partly	MS to explain deviations provide
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock		
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	almost all the planned number of		MS to explain deviations provide
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have		MS to explain deviations provide
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of		MS to explain deviations provide
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have		MS to explain deviations provide
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.	Partly	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling
<b>E</b> 2	Achievements:	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No comments	Partly No No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling the sampling
E2	Achievements:	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  seults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No comments	Partiy  No  No  No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling the sampling
E2	Achievements:	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No comments	Partly No No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling the sampling
E2	Achievements:	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments	Partly  No  No  No  No  No  No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to calculate cv's MS to calculate cv's MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets
E2	Achievements:	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? sesults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments	Partiy  No  No  No  No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to calculate cv's MS to calculate cv's MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets MS to calculate cv's, and explain any
E2	Achievements:  Data quality: R	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments	Partly  No  No  No  No  No  No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to calculate cv's MS to calculate cv's MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets
	Achievements:  Data quality: R	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? soults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments	Partly  No  No  No  No  No  No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to calculate cv's MS to calculate cv's MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets MS to calculate cv's, and explain any
	Achievements:  Data quality: R	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? seults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations instified?  Are the deviations justified?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments	Partly  No No No No No No No No No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to calculate cv's MS to calculate cv's MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets
	Achievements:  Data quality: R	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? seults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified? segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations From LM listed?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No relevant recuested  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM	Partly  No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to calculate cv's MS to calculate cv's MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  No action needed No action needed
	Achievements:  Data quality: R	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? soults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments	Partly  No No No No No NA No No No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling the sampling of the sam
	Achievements:  Data quality: R	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  seults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. Only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM	Partly  No No No No NA No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling the sampling of the sam
E3	Achievements:  Data quality: Reference of Reference	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  seults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM  NA  NA  No comments	Partly  No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to calculate cv's MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  No action needed
E3	Achievements:  Data quality: Reference of Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  seults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments	Partly  No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
E3 E4	Achievements:  Data quality: Reference of Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? soults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV estimates provided? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM  NA  NA  No comments	Partly  No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to calculate cv's MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  No action needed
E3	Achievements:  Data quality: Reference of Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  seults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved, only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM  NA  NA  NA  No comments  No comments  No comments	Partly  No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to calculate cv's MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  No action needed
E3 E4	Achievements:  Data quality: Reference of Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? soults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV estimates provided? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified?  Are the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations Were the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM  NA  NA  No comments	Partly  No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling  MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  No action needed
E3 E4	Achievements:  Data quality: Reference of Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? seults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Results and deviation from NP proposal	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved, only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM  NA  NA  NA  No comments  No comments  No comments	Partly  No Vo No Vo	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to calculate cv's MS to calculate cv's MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets No action needed MS to provide cv's MS to provide cv's
E3 E4	Achievements:  Data quality: Reference of Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Seults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM  NA  NA  No comments	Partly  No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling  MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  No action needed
E3 E4	Achievements:  Data quality: Reference of Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? seults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. Only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM  NA  NA  No comments  No comments  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM  NA  No comments	Partly  No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to calculate cv's MS to calculate cv's MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets No action needed MS to provide cv's MS to provide cv's MS to provide cv's MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling
E3 E4 ther reg E1	Achievements:  Data quality: Reference of Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  seults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations ignored in the deviations explained? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations Were the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM  NA  NA  No comments	Partly  No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling  MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  No action needed
E3 E4	Achievements:  Data quality: Reference of Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  south and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  sogional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  sesults and deviation from NP proposal	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM  NA  NA  NA  No comments	Partly  No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling  MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  No action needed  MS to provide cv's  MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling  No action needed  No action needed
E3 E4 ther reg E1	Achievements:  Data quality: Reference of Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  seults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations ignored in the deviations explained? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations Were the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. Only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM  NA  NA  No comments  No comments  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM  NA  No comments	Partly  No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to calculate cv's MS to calculate cv's MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets No action needed MS to provide cv's MS to provide cv's MS to provide cv's MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling
E3 E4 Other reg E1	Achievements:  Data quality: Reference of Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? sesults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM  NA  NA  No comments	Partly  No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling  MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to provide cv's  MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling  No action needed  MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling  No action needed  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any
E3 E4 Other reg E1	Achievements:  Data quality: Reference of Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? sesults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV estimates provided? Were CV stargets met? Are the deviations explained?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. Only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM  NA  NA  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM  NA  NA  No comments	Partly  No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling  MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  No action needed  MS to provide cv's  MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling  No action needed  No action needed  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets
E3 E4 Pither reg E1	Achievements:  Data quality: Reference of Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? seults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? seults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved, only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM  NA  NA  NA  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  No comments	Partly  No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling  MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  No action needed  MS to calculate cv's  MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling  No action needed  No action needed  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets
E3 E4 ther reg E1	Achievements:  Data quality: Reference of Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? seults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? de shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? segional and international recommendations	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. Only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM  NA  NA  No comments  No comments  No comments  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM  NA  NA  No comments   Partly  No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling  MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  No action needed  MS to calculate cv's  MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling  No action needed  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets	
E3  E4  tther reg E1	Achievements:  Data quality: Reference of Re	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  soults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations rom LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  seults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations syplained?	almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. Only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM  NA  NA  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No relevant recommendations made by the RCM  NA  NA  No comments	Partly  No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling  MS to explain deviations.  MS to explain deviations.  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets  No action needed  MS to calculate cv's  MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling  No action needed  No action needed  MS to calculate cv's  MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets

Region

Region

			_					
M	lember State:	France			udgment levels			
		AR year	2013 4 June 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%			
		Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	3 September 2012	Partly	<10% 10-50%			
		version of the fit proposal	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%			
		Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%			
	NA not applicable							
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG			
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No relevant RCM recommendations	NA	No actions needed			
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No relevant RCM recommendations	NA	No actions needed			
<b>E</b> 4	4 Actions to avoid	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed			
Region Other	r regions (WECAF)							
E1	1 Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No sampling achieved.	No	MS to resubmit both the text and tables			
		is rable III.E.3 complete and consistent with Art guidelines?	No sampling achieved.	INU	for the WECAF area			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	In the table is mentioned only a	No	MS to resubmit both the text and tables			
			species <i>Penaeus subtilis</i> and no data are reported (2000 specimens were planned). In the text France mentions three species and only one appears in the table.		for the WECAF area, and clarify these discrepancies			
		Are the deviations explained?	MS should better explain the situation in the WECAF area and why no stock data have been reported	No	MS to provide explainations for the WECAF area			
		Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA	MS to provide explainations for the WECAF area			
E2	2 Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?	No comments	No	MS to resubmit both the text and tables			
		•			for the WECAF area			
		Were CV targets met?	NA	NA	MS to resubmit both the text and tables			
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	for the WECAF area MS to resubmit both the text and tables			
					for the WECAF area			
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	MS to resubmit both the text and tables for the WECAF area			
E3	3 Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations						
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	NA	MS to resubmit both the text and tables for the WECAF area			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	NA	MS to resubmit both the text and tables			
		Ave the responsive actions described 2	NA	NA	for the WECAF area			
		Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA NA	MS to resubmit both the text and tables for the WECAF area			
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	MS to resubmit both the text and tables			
<b>E</b> 4	4 Actions to avoid	shortfalls			for the WECAF area			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	No	MS to provide explainations for the			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	WECAF area MS to resubmit both the text and tables			
					for the WECAF area			
-	r regions (Inland water							
E1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly, no cv's reported	Mostly	MS to calculate and report cv's			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly, eel sampling achievement	Mostly	MS to provide explaination for the			
			only reached 48%		deviation in achieved sampling for Eel.			
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	No	MS to provide explaination for the			
					deviation in achieved sampling for Eel.			
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	MS to provide explaination for the			
					deviation in achieved sampling for Eel.			
E2	2 Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal						
		Were CV estimates provided?	No comments	No	MS to calculate and report cv's			
		Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?	NA NA	NA NA	MS to calculate and report cv's  MS to provide explaination for the			
		The the deviations explained.			deviation in achieved sampling for Eel.			
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	MS to provide explaination for the			
		ruo ino deviatione justineu :	177	INA.	deviation in achieved sampling for Eel.			
	2 Falle	wienel and international recommendations						
E3	o rollow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations requested	NA	No action needed			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	NA	No action needed			
		Are the responsive actions described ?	proposed No comments	NA	No action needed			
		Are the responsive actions described ?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed			
<b>E</b> 4	4 Actions to avoid							
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	No	MS to provide explaination for the deviation in achieved sampling for Eel,			
					and actions to avoid in the future.			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	MS to provide explaination for the deviation in achieved sampling for Eel,			
					and actions to avoid in the future.			
F Tr	ransversal variables	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Achieved sample rate and response	Yes	No action needed			
		is rable in.r. r complete and consistent with Art guidelines:	rate have to be provided in	163	No action needed			
F-4	1 Canadity		percentage.					
F1	F1 Capacity F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal							
	Addie	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed			
		Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	Yes	No action needed			
	F13 Action	Are the deviations justified? s to avoid shortfalls	No comments	Yes	No action needed			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed			
	FI3 ACTION	The deticate to divoid enormalie in the retails decombed.						
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed			
F2	2 Effort	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed			
F2	2 Effort	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  vements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments  No comments	Yes	No action needed  No action needed			
F2	2 Effort	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  vements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed			
F2	2 Effort	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  vements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed			

				_		
	Memb	per State:	France AR year	2013		udgment levels
			Version of the AR reviewed	4 June 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
			Version of the NP proposal	3 September 2012	Partly	10-50%
			Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
			Overall compliant	mostly	NA NA	not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		F12 Dat	a quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No.	V	No action and de
			Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		F13 Foll	low-up of Regional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		F14 Act	Are the responsive actions acceptable? ions to avoid shortfalls	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		FI4 ACI	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F3	Landings		_		_
		F11 Ach	nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	<u> </u>	1 ,	IN COLUMN
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		F12 Dat	a quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		•	
			Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		F13 Foll	Are the deviations justified? low-up of Regional and international recommendations	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		113 101	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		F14 Act	ions to avoid shortfalls	No comment-	V	No action needs d
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
G	Researc	ch surveys at s	·	NO COMMENTS	163	No action needed
	G1		s: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
			Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	G2	Data quality:	Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	G3	Follow-up of	Regional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?	Recommendation by WGBEAM 2011 on upload data beam trawl survey	Mostly	Yes. MS to incorporate recommendation WGBEAM 2011, and
				still not implemented		put it into action: upload beam trawl
				·		survey data to DATRAS
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA NA	No action needed
	G4	Actions to av	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
	4	Actions to av	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
			economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry			
Α	Collection	on of data con	cerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	The CV's are missing	Mostly	Provide the cv's. MS should resubmit
	A1	Achievemente	:: Results and deviation from NP proposal			the Table.
	AI	Achievements	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes, e.g. Sea bass & Sea bream in	Yes	No action needed
				cages with too low response rate, small marine fish farm sector with		
				conidentiality problems.		
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	A2	Data quality: F	Results and deviation from NP proposal		1	
			Is respective data quality information given?	No CV's, maybe in some cases of low response necessary. MS states,	Mostly	Further information regarding the cv should be provided
				it will be provided during data call.		S. Sala Do provided
			And the desirations contain 10		.,	No action and the
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments No comments	Yes Partly	No action needed  More precise information about the cv
			. 25 2.0 domaiono juoninadi		1 ditty	should be given
	A3	Follow-up of F	Regional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?	No relevant recommendations NA	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
	A4	Actions to avo			101	no dollon noodod
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes, but maybe the mentioned	Mostly	MS should provide more information
				measures should be more specific		about the measures that will be applied
В	Collection	on of data con	cerning the processing industry			
			Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	<b>.</b>		Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	B1	Achievements	:: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	B2	Data quality: F	Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
	В3	Follow-up of F	Are the deviations justified? Regional and international recommendations	140 Comments	162	no action needed
		. 55** up 01 F	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed

Member State:	France		Judgment levels		
	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance leve	
	Version of the AR reviewed	4 June 2014	No	<10%	
	Version of the NP proposal	3 September 2012	Partly	10-50%	
		EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%	
	Overall complia	ance Mostly	Yes	>90%	
			NA	not applicable	
		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
B4 Actions to avoi					
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
Module of evaluation of the effect:	s of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem				
	and deviation from NP proposal				
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations apply	Yes	No action needed	
2 Actions to avoid shortfall		3	100	No delien needed	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
Module for management and use	•				
	and deviation from NP proposal				
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP				
	proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Details should be given in the annex			
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	section	Mostly	No action needed	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations explained?	No deviations indicated	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
2 Actions to avoid shortfal	ls				
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
Follow-up of STECF recommenda				•	
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
List of acronyms and abbreviation					
,	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
Comments, suggestions and refle				Louisi Noodod	
dila lene	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No comments	Vec	No action needed	

No comments

No comments

No comments

Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?

Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?

Is there a complete list of references?

X References

XI Annexes

Yes

Yes

Yes

No action needed

No action needed

No action needed

				-		
	Mem	ber State:	Germany AR year	2013	Judgement levels Compliance class	Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	27 May 2014	No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	28 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
				EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance	Yes	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
					INA	not applicable
	0			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
ı	General fran	nework	Are derogations listed?	No comments	Yes	Action needed?  No action needed
II		a collection of	organisation	TVO COMMENTE	100	TVO dollori ricoded
	A Natio	nal correspo	ndent and participating institutes			<u> </u>
			Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is the information provided on the website in line with legal	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)? Is there an overview and description of contents of national	140 COMMENTS	103	140 action needed
			coordination meetings?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			rnational coordination			
	B1	Attendance	of international meetings Is Table II.B.1 complete?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings		162	No action needed
			explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	B2	Follow-up o	of regional and international recommendations	Deterance not made to Licinan but to		
			Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting	Reference not made to Liaison but to RCM meetings. Seems to be OK		
			listed?	anyway.	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			A Control of the Cont			
III			of the fishing sector on of the fishing sector			
	- Gene	ar accompli	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact			
			on the NP implementation well described?	No changes are described	Yes	No action needed
	В Баси	amia variabl	a la information under III D1 4 for each curre version sixon?	Vac	Vaa	No action peopled
	B Econ	IOMIC Variable	e Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given? ea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR	Achieved sample rate should be		
			guidelines?	reported in percentage.	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			guidennes.	100	100	TVO GOLOT TICOGCO
			Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR	Achieved sample rate and response		
	D4	A - l-!	guidelines?	rate should be reported in percentage.	Yes	No action needed
	B1	Achievemen	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			i
			proposal?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	B2	Data quality:	Are the deviations justified?  Results and deviation from NP proposal	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	DZ	Data quality	Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	B3	Follow-up of	Regional and international recommendations	The second second		T
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recomendations	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
	В4	Actions to a	void shortfalls	ļ. v	INC	. 10 dollori ricodod
	= -		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
	SUPRA-REC	SION Other re	gions Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR			Ţ
			quidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR			
			guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	B1	Achievemen	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal		100	socion necucu
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
			proposal?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
	B2	Data quality:	: Results and deviation from NP proposal	IVA	IVA	No action needed
		, ,	Is respective data quality information given?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
	D0	Follow4	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
	В3	Follow-up 01	Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA NA	No action needed
	B4	Actions to a	void shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
	C Biolo	naical motio-	related variables			
	O BIOIC	yıcal metler i	related variables	According to table III.A.1 MS is		
				operating in Regions Baltic, NS&EA		
				and NA including NAFO. But according		
			Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	to III.C.3 also in other Regions CECAF ans South Pacific.	Yes	No action needed
				ians countracilie.	100	

Member State: Germany

Compliance class Compliance level Version of the AR reviewed 27 May 2014 No <10% Version of the NP proposal 28 October 2011 10-50% Partly EWG Answer Mostly 50-90% >90%

Overall compliance Yes

Baltic 2012 listed.

Improvement of the sampling programmes by implementing recommendations of DCF workshops

on sampling methods

Yes

NA

**EWG COMMENTS** EWG judgement **FWG** General framework Action needed?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Region Baltic Sea C1

> Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR auidelines?

> Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

> Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
> Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations СЗ

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

**Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic** 

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR

guidelines?

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR

guidelines?
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR

guidelines?
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?

Table is complete but not consistent		
with the AR guidelines. Table		
complete but difficult to analyse		
because two different rows for for		
concurrent at sea and on shore.		
Achievement rates are good even		
though some targets planned were not		
sampled at all for some metiers. Table		
III.C.3 is complete but not consistent		
with the AR guidelines for all metiers,		
as additional rows have been added.		
2 metiers out of 8 metiers have not		The MS need to clarify the reason
been sampled at all, and a third has no		for under or no sampling as the text
at sea sampling.	Moothy	is not clear.
	Mostly.	is not clear.
Table complete. Good achievement		MS to clarify the zero achievement
rates overall except for 2 sampling		rate of the OTB_DEF metier, as it
frames of small sizes which were not		would appear that their was
sampled at allOTB_DEF>90 trawlers		increased activity in this metier when
targeting whiting and flatfish has no		the average trips are compared with
achieved sampling, Derogation for		the achieved number of trips in the
GNS_FWS_0_0_0	Mostly.	reference year.
Table properly filled but precision level	•	,
targets are wrong. Achivement rates		
are good except for SPF and eel. 3 of		
the 7 stocks in Table III.C.5 have been		
significantly undersampled, explained		
by the move towards random		
sampling.	Yes	No action needed
Table complete and consistent with		
other tables III.C.	Yes	No action needed
Achievement rates mainly good. Some		
deviations in terms of numbers of trips		
achieved and for three species	.,	l
undersampled.	Yes	No action needed
Yes, for each metier.	V	Clarification required for
,	Yes	OTB_DEF>90_0_0
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Mostly	No action needed
NA	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	NA
		•
Yes. See section I and table III.C.3	Yes	No action needed
Two recommendations from RCM		
Poltic 2012 listed	Voo	No action peoded

Judgement levels

NA

not applicable

Table complete. Good achievement		
rates.	Yes	No action needed
Table complete. Good achievement		
rates.	Yes	No action needed
Table properly filled. Most of the		
species were oversampled except		
herring I,II undersampled.	Yes	No action needed
Table complete and consistent with		
other tables III.C.	Yes	No action needed
Achievement rates mainly good. See		
comments above.	Yes	No action needed
Detailed explanations provided for		
each metier even though no deviation		
was registered. Undersampling of		
herring due to the self sampling system		
implemented. Oversampling of other		
sepecies is a consequence of the		
observer on board system and without		
•		
financial impact on the NP costs.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Yes

Yes

NA

Yes

Yes

No action needed

No action needed

No action needed

No action needed

NA

Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

IVI	amhar '	State:	Cormany	1	Judgement levels	
	ember		Germany AR year	2013	Judgement levels Compliance class	Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	27 May 2014	No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	28 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
				EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
				,	NA	not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
General f	ramewo					Action needed?
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
C	3 Fol		f Regional and international recommendations	To	1	T
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			A 11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	No recommendation adressed by		la e i i
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	RCM NS&EA 2012.	NA NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
C4	1 Act		Are the responsive actions acceptable?  void shortfalls	NA	INA	No action needed
C.	+ ACI	ions to a	void Shortialis	Improvement of the sampling	I	
			Are estimate a quaid shoulfelle in the future described 2	programmes at sea for being more randomly implemented. No explanation regarding none access to	Yes,	No action peopled
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	certain commercial vessels	Vac	No action needed
Pagion N	orth Ast		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
Region N			to Populto and doviction from ND			
C1	ı Ach		ts: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Table complete Good ashiousment		
			Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?	Table complete. Good achievement	Yes	No action pooded
			ls Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR	rates. Table complete. Good achievement	res	No action needed
			guidelines?	rates.	Yes	No action needed
			ga.co100 .	Table properly filled. All species were	163	dollori riceded
			Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	hightly oversampled. Are the planned		
			guidelines?	targets in the NP relevant?	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR	Table complete and consistent with		
			guidelines?	other tables III.C.	Yes	No action needed
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Achievement rares good. See	Yes.See comment on	
			proposal?	comments above. Detailed explanations provided for	Random sampling	No action needed
				each metier even though no deviation		
				was registered. Exceeded lenght		
				measurements are a consequence of		
				the observer on board system and		
			Are the deviations explained?	without financial impact on the NP	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained:  Are the deviations justified?	cost. Yes	Yes	No action needed
C2	2 Dat		: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			,			MS to explore other methodologies
			Were CV estimates provided?	Yes, except for NAFO stocks.	Yes.	to report CV's from the NAFO area
			The second of th	1 11, GASSPE IST THE C STOCKS.	100.	12 report of a normalic fact o alea
						MS to explore other methodologies
			Were CV targets met?	Yes	Yes	to report CV's from the NAFO area
			-			
				COST tool does not allow NAFO		MS to explore other methodologies
			Are the deviations explained?	areas.	Yes	to report CV's from the NAFO area
						MO to sounds of the second
			And the devications tracks 10	N		MS to explore other methodologies
<u>.</u>			Are the deviations justified?	No	No	to report CV's from the NAFO area
C	3 Fol	•	Regional and international recommendations	h	T	The second
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes. See section I One recommendation adressed by	Yes	No action needed
				TO DE LECOTHINE IUALION AUTESSEU DV		
						MS to list other relevant PCM NA
				RCM NA 2012, None of the other		MS to list other relevant RCM NA
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been	Partly	2012 recommendations and
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	RCM NA 2012, None of the other	Partly.	
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.	Partly.	2012 recommendations and
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by	Partly.	2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed. Une recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.	Partly.	2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA
				RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by		2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.
				RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other		2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA
			Are the responsive actions described ?	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Une recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Une recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.	Partly.	2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and
			Are the responsive actions described ?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other		2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA
C4	4 Act		Are the responsive actions described ?	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.	Partly.	2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and
C4	4 Act		Are the responsive actions described ?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.	Partly.	2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and
C4	4 Act	ions to a	Are the responsive actions described ?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  void shortfalls	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Improvement of the sampling programmes at sea for being more	Partly. Partly.	2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.
C4	4 Act	ions to a	Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  void shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Compressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.	Partly. Partly.  Yes	2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.
		ions to a	Are the responsive actions described ?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  void shortfalls	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Improvement of the sampling programmes at sea for being more	Partly. Partly.	2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.
Region O	ther reg	ions to a	Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  void shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Compressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.	Partly. Partly.  Yes	2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.
	ther reg	ions to a	Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  void shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ts: Results and deviation from NP proposal	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendation have been addressed.  Improvement of the sampling programmes at sea for being more randomly implemented.	Partly. Partly.  Yes	2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.
Region O	ther reg	ions to a ions ions nievemen	Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  void shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Compressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.	Partly.  Partly.  Yes  Yes	2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  No action needed  No action needed
Region O	ther reg	ions to av ions nievemen	Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  void shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ts: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Improvement of the sampling programmes at sea for being more randomly implemented.  Yes  Table complete.	Partly. Partly.  Yes	2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.
Region O	ther reg	ions to a i <mark>ions</mark> nievemen	Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  void shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ts: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR  guidelines?  Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR  guidelines?	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendation have been addressed.  Improvement of the sampling programmes at sea for being more randomly implemented.	Partly.  Partly.  Yes  Yes	2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  No action needed  No action needed
Region O	ther reg	ions to a <sup>s</sup> i <mark>ons</mark> nievemen	Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  void shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  tts: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Une recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Une recommendations daressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Une recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Improvement of the sampling programmes at sea for being more randomly implemented.  Yes  Table complete.	Partly.  Partly.  Yes  Yes  Yes	2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
Region O	ther reg	ions to av i <mark>ions</mark> nievemen	Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  void shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  tts: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Improvement of the sampling programmes at sea for being more randomly implemented.  Yes  Table complete.	Partly.  Partly.  Yes  Yes  Yes	2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
Region O	ther reg	ions to a i <mark>ons</mark> nievemen	Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  void shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ts: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Improvement of the sampling programmes at sea for being more randomly implemented.  Yes  Table complete.  Table complete.	Partly.  Partly.  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  No action needed
Region O	ther reg	ions to a <sup>n</sup> i <mark>ons</mark> nievemen	Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  void shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ts: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Une recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Une recommendations daressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Une recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Improvement of the sampling programmes at sea for being more randomly implemented.  Yes  Table complete.	Partly.  Partly.  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
Region O	ther reg	ions to a <sup>,</sup> i <mark>ons</mark> nievemen	Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  void shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  tts: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Improvement of the sampling programmes at sea for being more randomly implemented.  Yes  Table complete.  Table complete.  Table complete.  NA. See below.	Partly.  Partly.  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  No action needed
Region O	ther reg	ions to av i <mark>ions</mark> nievemen	Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  void shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  tts: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Une recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Une recommendations daressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Une recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Improvement of the sampling programmes at sea for being more randomly implemented. Yes  Table complete.  Table complete.  Table complete.  NA. See below.  No fisheries occured in 2013.	Partly.  Partly.  Yes Yes Yes Yes  Yes NA NA	2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  No action needed
Region O	ther reg	ions to a i <mark>ons</mark> nievemen	Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  void shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ts: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendations daressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Improvement of the sampling programmes at sea for being more randomly implemented.  Yes  Table complete.  Table complete.  NA. See below.  No fisheries occured in 2013.	Partly.  Partly.  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  NA  NA  NA  Yes	2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  No action needed
Region O	other reg 1 Act	ions to a ions nievemen	Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  void shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ts: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Une recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Une recommendations daressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Une recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Improvement of the sampling programmes at sea for being more randomly implemented. Yes  Table complete.  Table complete.  Table complete.  NA. See below.  No fisheries occured in 2013.	Partly.  Partly.  Yes Yes Yes Yes  Yes NA NA	2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  No action needed
Region O	other reg 1 Act	ions to a ions nievemen	Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  void shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ts: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  One recommendations daressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.  Improvement of the sampling programmes at sea for being more randomly implemented.  Yes  Table complete.  Table complete.  NA. See below.  No fisheries occured in 2013.	Partly.  Partly.  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  NA  NA  NA  Yes	2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.  No action needed

				•		
	Memb	er State:	Germany	2012	Judgement levels	Compliance level
			AR year Version of the AR reviewed	<b>2013</b> 27 May 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
			Version of the NP proposal	28 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
			version of the Ni proposal	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		NA	not applicable
				EWO COMMENTO	FWO independent	FWO
Gene	ral frame	ework		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
GOILG		owork	Were CV targets met?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA NA	No action needed
	СЗ	Follow-up o	of Regional and international recommendations		101	110 dollori ricoded
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes. Derogation pending	Yes.	No action needed
			<b>3</b>	Several recommendations of		
				RCM_LDF from 2011 to 2013 on the		
				implementation of multilateral		
			And the coloured an expense of the colour LAA lints of C	agreements for sampling thes	V	No ordina annulud
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?	particular fisheries.	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
			·	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	C4	Actions to	Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls		162	INO action needed
	C4	ACTIONS TO 6	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA NA	No action needed
			and the second s			1 2222
D	Recrea	ational fishe	eries			
			The second secon	MS is operating in Region Baltic and		N
Doni-	n Baltic	Soc	Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	NS&EA	Yes	No action neeed
negio	n Baitic D1		nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	וט	Acmeverne	mes. nesuns and deviation nom proposal	Tor out, it o not oldar what is done for		MS to clarify the text regarding
				2013 and inconsistent with the text in		salmon and eel. MS to clarify and
				NP.		justify the inclusion of sea trout and
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	The pilot study undertaken for sea trout was not planned in NP and not in line		on what expenses.
			proposal?	with the list of species in Commission		
				decision 2010/93. In NP it is a		
				derogation for salmon but not		
				mentioned in AR.	Partly	
			Are obtained derogations mentioned?	Derogation for sharks, but not for	**	MS to clarify if a derogation for
			Are obtained derogations mentioned:	salmon (only in NP)	Mostly	salmon apllies
				eel.		MS to clarify the text regarding
				The pilot study undertaken for sea trout		salmon and eel. MS to clarify and
				was not planned in NP and not in line		justify the inclusion of sea trout and on what expenses.
			Are the deviations explained?	with the list of species in Commission		on what expenses.
				decision 2010/93. In NP it is a		
				derogation for salmon but not	5	
				mentioned in AR. Only for cod, for the other species see	Partly	MS to clarify deviations for other
			Are the deviations justified?	text above	Partly	species than cod
	D2	Data quality	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal	text above	rarry	Japonica marricou
		,	, ,	information is provided for cod, but not		
			Were data quality targets provided?	for eel	Mostly	MS to update text on eel
			Were data quality targets met?	No comments	NA	MS to update text on eel
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	MS to update text on eel
	_		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	D3	Follow-up o	of Regional and international recommendations	Describe for shorts but not for		
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	Derogation for sharks, but not for salmon (only in NP)	Mostly	MS to clarify
				ounter (only if Ni )	iviostly	ivio to ciamy
						No action needed. MS to consider in
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			AR 2014. Only recommendation
				No relevant recommendation adressed		from LM to be included in the list
			Are the recognition actions described 0	by RCM Baltic 2012.	NA NA	according to the guidelines
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
	D4	Actions to	Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls	NA	NA	No action needed
	54	ACTIONS TO S				MS to clarify actions for other
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Only explanation for cod	Partly	species than cod
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		•	MS to clarify actions for other
Dest	n Naut	Con and F		Only explanation for cod	Partly	species than cod
недіс	on North D1		Istern Arctic nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	וט	Acmeverne	mes. nesuns and deviation nom proposal	INP text available concerns actions		
				planned for 2012. So it is difficult to		
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	evaluate if the actions carried out in		
			proposal?	2013 and if there are consistent with		
			r rrand	the NP proposal. For cod the new national phone survey begun in 2013		MS to clarify the action taken in
				but no results presented.	Partly	2013
			Are obtained derogations mentioned?	no derogations mentioned	NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	no derogations mentioned	NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	no derogations mentioned	NA	No action needed
	D2	Data quality	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Were data quality targets provided?	No information provided by MS.	No	MS to update text
			Were data quality targets met?	No comments	NA	MS to update text
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	MS to update text
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	D3	Follow-up o	of Regional and international recommendations			
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	no derogations mentioned	NA	No action needed

		WEILID	ei State.	AD	0040	Oi	IOli
				AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
				Version of the AR reviewed	27 May 2014	No	<10%
				Version of the NP proposal	28 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
					EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
				Overall compliance	Yes	Yes	>90%
						NA	not applicable
					EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
ı	General	l frame	work			.,	Action needed?
							No action needed. MS to consider in
							AR 2014. Only recommendation
				Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			from LM to be
				Are the relevant recommendations from Livi listed?	No relevant recommendation adressed		included in the list according to the
							_
					by RCM Baltic 2012.	NA	guidelines
				Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
				Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		D4	Actions to a	void shortfalls			
		<b>D</b> 4	Actions to a		!	NIA	NI
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	no information of the results		No action needed
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	E 6	Biolog	ical stock-re	elated variables			
		Ŭ			According to table III.A.1 MS is		
					operating in Regions Baltic, NS&EA	Yes - multi latteral agreement	
					and NA including NAFO. But according	•	No action needed
							No action needed
				The second second second	to III.C.3 also in other Regions CECAF	South Pacific Regions	
				Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	and South Pacific.		
	Region	Baltic	Sea				
	ŗ	E1	Achievemer	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	-			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR			
				guidelines?	Table complete	Yes	No action needed
				guidoni 100 :	Yes. To noted that two stocks were		
							]
					added due to stock assessment	1	L
					needs. A specific section on eel in	Yes	No action needed
				Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	freswater inland is also given in an		
				proposal?	annex of the AR 2013.		]
					Most of the stocks oversampled.,		
					except for eel. It is a consequence of		
					the choice to sample at sea by	V	Nie astiau was dad
					observers on board commercial	Yes	No action needed
					vessels. Oversampling did not cause		
				Are the deviations explained?	significant additional eligible costs.		
				Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		E2	Data quality	: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Data quanty	. Hesuits and deviation from the proposal		No cv's are given for sex	I
					0 01		MS to report cv's as absolute
					Some CVs missing.	ratio for four species. CV's	number not % in future reports
				Were CV estimates provided?		are reported as a %	
					Sometimes for ALK. No for other	No	No action needed
				Were CV targets met?	parameters.	140	140 action needed
					Some compatibily difficulties for using		MC to investigate other
					Cost tool for all stocks. No specific		MS to investigate other
					comments on the quality of the CVs	Yes	methodologies to estimate cv's for
				Are the deviations explained?	estimated.		this region
				The the deviations explained:	estimated.		MS to investigate other
					No	No	methodologies to estimate cv's for
				Are the deviations justified?	INO	NO	
				Are the deviations justified?			this region
	,	E3	Follow-up o	f Regional and international recommendations			T
				Were the relevant derogations listed?	<ul> <li>three derogations were listed.</li> </ul>	Yes	No action needed
					One from DCM Politic 2010, Ture		
					One from RCM Baltic 2012. Two	.,	
					others from 2013. Recommendation	Yes.	No action needed
				Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	from WGBAST not required.		
				Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
				Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	F	E4	Actions to a	void shortfalls			
					Priority given by MS to sampling at		
					sea. For statistical reasons, the		
					achieved sampling intensities cannot		l., , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
					be considered too high. The	Yes	No action needed
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	occurrence of oversampling rather		]
					reflects conservative planning.	.,	
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Region	North	Sea and Eas	stern Arctic			
	ı	E1	Achievemer	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
				Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR			
				guidelines?	Table complete	Yes	No action needed
				guidelines :			
					Yes. To noted that several stocks were		
					added due to stock assessment		
					needs. A specific section on eel in	Yes	No action needed
						100	140 action needed
				Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	freshwater inland is also given in an		
				proposal?	annex of the AR 2013.		
				A Committee of the Comm	Most of the stocks correctly achieved		
					or lightly oversampled., three lightly		]
					undersamped. Cod and saithe badly		
					achieved for sex ratios and maturity	Yes	No action needed
					parameters.	. 55	
					Explanations given by stocks in the AR		
					text : too optimistic objectives planned,		
				Are the deviations explained?	less fish than expected		
					Yes	Yes	NI
	-	<b>-</b> 0	D-4	Are the deviations justified?	163	163	No action needed
	ı	E2	Data quality	: Results and deviation from NP proposal	165	165	INO action needed

Judgement levels

Member State:

Germany

				1		
	Mem	ber State:	Germany	0040	Judgement levels	Io ii i
			AR year Version of the AR reviewed	<b>2013</b> 27 May 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
			Version of the NP proposal	28 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
			version of the NF proposal	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
					NA	not applicable
ı	General fram	ework		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
				Some CVs missing or null. MS to clarify "0" and also no CV's were reported for several parameters and	Partly,	Some CV's reported as "0" - MS to clarify if this is in fact a "0" cv.
			Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?	species. Mostly for ALK. No for other parameters.	Partly.	Some CV's reported as "0" - MS to
			Word OV largets more	Some compatibily difficulties for using Cost tool for all stocks. No specific comments on the quality of the CVs	Yes	clarify if this is in fact a "0" cv.  MS to investigate other methodologies to estimate cv's for
			Are the deviations explained?	estimated.	No	this region  MS to investigate other methodologies to estimate cv's for
	E3	Follow-up o	Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations		-	this region
		•	Were the relevant derogations listed?	See section I.	Yes	No action needed
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	One from RCM NS&EA 2012.	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	E4	Actions to a	avoid shortfalls	Priority given by MS to compling at	T	1
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Priority given by MS to sampling at sea. For statistical reasons, the achieved sampling intensities cannot be considered too high. The occurrence of oversampling rather reflects conservative planning.	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Region North	Atlantic				•
	E1	Achievemen	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal		1	1
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table complete  Yes. To noted that three stocks were	Yes	No action needed
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	added due to stock assessment needs.	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Most of the stocks correctly achieved or lightly oversampled., but Greenlan halibut planned in NAFO hightly oversampled for weigth@age and not sampled at all for ALK. Blue whiting (stock added) undersampled for all the parameters.  Explanations given by stocks in the AR text. For halibut it is not possible to take otoliths for market reasons.	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained:  Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	E2	Data quality	: Results and deviation from NP proposal		100	The delicit flooded
			Were CV estimates provided?	Around 50 % of CVs provided in ICES areas but all CVs missing for NAFO.	Partly	MS to provide missing cv's
			Were CV targets met?	Only for few parameters*stock.	Partly	MS to provide missing cv's
			Are the deviations explained?	Some compatibily difficulties for using Cost tool for all stocks. No specific comments on the quality of the CVs estimated.	Yes	MS to investigate other methodologies to estimate cv's for this region
			Are the deviations justified?	No	No	MS to investigate other methodologies to estimate cv's for this region
	E3	Follow-up o	of Regional and international recommendations	See coation I	Vac	No action pooded
			Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	See section I. One from RCM NA 2012.	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described:  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	E4	Actions to a	avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Priority given by MS to sampling at sea. For statistical reasons, the achieved sampling intensities cannot be considered too high. The occurrence of oversampling rather reflects conservative planning.	Yes	No action needed
	Pagion Other	ragione	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Region Other E1	-	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal		<b>.</b>	T
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Table complete	Yes	No action needed
			proposal?	No fisheries occured in 2013.	NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
	E2	Data quality	: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Were CV estimates provided?	NA	NA NA	No action needed
			Were CV targets met?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed

	Member State:			0	1	1.1		
	weinber State.			Germany AR year	2013	Judgement levels Compliance class	Compliance level	
					Version of the AR reviewed	27 May 2014	No	<10%
					Version of the NP proposal	28 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
						EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
					Overall compliance	Yes	Yes	>90%
							NA	not applicable
	Conor	al fram	owork			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
•	Genera	ai ii aiii	ework		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
		E3	Follow-		Regional and international recommendations			
					Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes. See section I.	Yes	No action needed
					Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No recommendation adressed by RCM_LDF to MS.	NA	No action needed
					Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No action needed
					Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
		E4	Actions		void shortfalls		T	
					Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	NA NA	No action needed
	F	Trans	versal v		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
	•	mans	versar v	ariabi		Accuracy indicators should be		
					Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	provided in percentage	Mostly	No action needed
		F1	Capaci	-				
			F11	Acnie	evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			T T
					proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
					Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			E12		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			F13		ns to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
					Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		F2	Effort					
			F11		evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Γ	<u> </u>
					Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
					Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
					Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			F12		quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
					Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
					Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
			F13		w-up of Regional and international recommendations	No comments	163	INO action needed
					Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No recommendation adressed by RCM	Yes	No action needed
					Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
					Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			F14		ns to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
					Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		F3	Landin	gs	•			
			F11		evernents: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP		1	
					proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
					Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
					Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			F12		quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Vac	No action pooded
					Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
					Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			F13	Follov	w-up of Regional and international recommendations			
					Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recomendations	Yes	No action needed
					Are the responsive actions described?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
			F14		Are the responsive actions acceptable?  ns to avoid shortfalls	110 Sommonia	162	INO ACION NECUCU
					Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
					Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	G		rch sur	-				
		G1	Acmev	emen	ts: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Not clear what parameter is planned		
						and reported for some surveys, e.g in		
					In Table III C 1 complete and consistent with AD	acoustic surveys both Echo NM and Fish hauls should be presented in		
					Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?	table.	Mostly	MS to update table
					Are design and achievements consistent with the NP		,	
					proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
					Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
					Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling	colour indication on vessels is wrong in		THE GOLDT HEEGE
					activities?	Fig. III.G.8	Yes	No action needed
		G2	Data qu	uality:	: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g.		1	
					no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical			
					coverage etc.)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
					Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	NA NA	No action needed
		G3	Follow		Are the deviations justified?  Regional and international recommendations	No deviations	NA	No action needed
		<u></u>	. J.I.OW	•	-	rec.are seldom made by PGs		
					Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning	concerning performance as everything	A1A	No setion and the
					Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described?	is standard No comments	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
					The the responsive actions described !	140 SOMMONES	I INC	110 dollon needed

		,		_		
	Membe	er State:	Germany	0040	Judgement levels	Compliance level
			AR year Version of the AR reviewed	2013 27 May 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
			Version of the NP proposal	28 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
			• •	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance	Yes	Yes	>90%
					NA	not applicable
		_		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
ı	General frame			la.		Action needed?
	G4 A		Are the responsive actions acceptable?  void shortfalls	No comments	NA	No action needed
	G4 A	Actions to a	void shortians	shortfalls only due to bad weather and		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	tech. break downs	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
IV			of the economic situation of the aquaculture and proces	ssing industry		
	A Collecti		concerning the aquaculture		T	
			Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			quidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR			
			guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	<b>A</b> 1 /		s: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP		I	Г
			proposal?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
	<b>A2</b> [		Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
	•=		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
	<b>A3</b> F	-ollow-up of	Regional and international recommendations	No volovont va	V	No action page 4- 4
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	No relevant recomendations NA	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
	<b>A4</b> /		oid shortfalls	1.77.7		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	B Collecti	ion of data	concerning the processing industry		T	
			Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR			The delien needed
			guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	B1 /		s: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP		Т	
			proposal?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	<b>B2</b> [	Data quality:	Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	<b>D</b> 0 1		Are the deviations justified? Regional and international recommendations	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	<b>B3</b> F	-ollow-up of	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recomendations	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
	B4 /	Actions to av	oid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	NA	No action needed
v	Madela at a 1		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
٧			e effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem ults and deviation from NP proposal			
	i Acilieve	monto. Nest	and deviation from M. proposal			
			Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Note (*) is missing in table V.1.	Yes	No action needed
			Are the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations	NA	No action needed
	2 Actions	to avoid sho	rttalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
VI	Module for ma		and use of the data	140 dominonio	101	Tro dollor ricodod
			ults and deviation from NP proposal			
			In Table VII 4 consolida and considerativity AD middlines 0	No comments	V	NI
			Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent		Yes	No action needed
			with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well	No comments	NA	No action needed
			detailed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No deviation.	Yes	No action neededd
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action neededd
	2 Actions	to avoid sho	rtfalls		T	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes	No action neededd
\/II	Follow 4 0		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action neededd
VII	Follow-up of S	I ECF recor	nmendations Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
VIII	List of acronyr		reviations			
D.	0		Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
ΙX	Comments, su	ggestions a	ina retiections			

	Member State:	Germany		Judgement levels	
		AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	27 May 2014	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	28 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
			EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compliance	Yes	Yes	>90%
				NA	not applicable
ı	General framework		EWG COMMENTS	- 1- 3	EWG Action needed?
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Х	References				
		Is there a complete list of references?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
ΧI	Annexes				
		Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No comments	Yes	No action needed

			AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	Oct 2012? EWG Answer	Partly	10-50%
			Overall compliance		Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
			Overall compliance	raity	NA NA	not applicable
					INA.	пот аррпсаріе
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
Gen	eral framework	k			,	Action needed?
			Are derogations listed?	Only one derogation requested by MS on BFT recreational fisheries.	Mostly	All the derogations affecting the reference year should be clearly reported in the AR. MS stated that a pilot study on Recreational fisheries of eel has been conducted but thereafter there is no any mention, on the basis of the results, if a derogation on it has been requested or not. MS should clarify it
Natio	onal data colle	ction organisatio				
Α	Nationa	al correspondent a	and participating institutes			
			Are the partners involved in the national data collection and	No comments	Yes	No action needded
			their roles well described?	No comments	163	No action needded
			to the control of DOE control on a control of	The national DCF website is under construction.	No	MS is request to implement a DCF database and should provide the intended timeframe
			Is there a national DCF website available? Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	The website is not directed towards the DCF (under construction)	NA	No action needded
			Is there an overview and description of contents of national	•	.,	
			coordination meetings?	No comments	Yes	No action needded
			· ·			MS should report the National Coordination
				No comments	Partly	meeting in the right way, fullfilling all the
			If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?			requested columns, under table II.B.1
В		al and Internation				
	B1	Attendance of i	nternational meetings		1	
			la Table II D 4 accorde: C	No comments		Not all the planned meeting have been attended
			Is Table II.B.1 complete?		Yes	by MS
						MS should playify if the new newticination to the
			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings	No comments		MS should clarify if the non participation to the
			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?		Mostly	planned meetings (11 attended out of 48 planned) was linked only to financial problems
	P0	Follow up of	explained? gional and international recommendations		iviOStry	pianneu) was iinkeu oniy to iinanciai problems
	B2	rollow-up of re	Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting		1	<del> </del>
			listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needded
			Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needded
			Are the responsive actions described:  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needded
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	165	No action needded
Mad	ula af tha aval		in a neather			
A		uation of the fish				
А	General	I description of th	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on			1
			the NP implementation well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needded
В	Econon	nic variables	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	Yes (only Med & BS relevant)	Yes	No actions needed
		lediterranean Sea				
٠		iounon unoun oou	and Diagnost God			Information about inactive vessels should be
			Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Inactive vessels are not listed	Mostly	provided
			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	Yes	No actions needed
			Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Response rates appear to be incorrect	Mostly	Table should be corrected and resubmitted
	B1	Achievements: F	Results and deviation from NP proposal		,	
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
			proposal?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
	B2	Data quality: Res	sults and deviation from NP proposal			
						Text should be updated, if needed, according to
				Text refers to incorrect table III.B.3. and no information		the new table and some qualitative information
			Is respective data quality information given?	about data quality is given	Mostly	should be given about data
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No actions needed
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No actions needed
	В3	Follow-up of Red	gional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No actions needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA .	NA	No actions needed
	В4	Actions to avoid		•	•	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
С	Riologie	cal metier related				
J	Diologic	ouor relateu	Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	MS is operating only in Region MED&BS	Yes	No actions needed
Reci	ion Mediterren	ean Sea and Blac		The ic sperating only in region will bade	163	TTO GOSTOTIO TICOGGG
negi	ion Mediterran C1		Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	C1	Acmevernents:	ricourto and deviation from NF proposal	Table complete, except column total numbers of trips during	ı	<del> </del>
			Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	the year. All metiers are highly undersampled comparing to NP objectives (achievement under 35%), except metier targeting swordfish (achievement 82%). Although low, achievement rates are better for sampling at sea than on shore.	Partly	Greece is operating in very difficult circumstances, and the EWG appreciate the year on year improvements made, the action required is to fill in the "Total No. of Trips during the sampling year" in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4.
			le Table III C 4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table complete, except column total numbers of trips during the year. All activities appear highly undersampled comparing to NP objectives (achievement under 35%), except metier targeting swordfish (achievement 82%). Although low, achivement rates are better for sampling at sea than on shore.	Partly	Greece is operating in very difficult circumstances, and the EWG appreciate the year on year improvements made, the action required is to fill in the "Total No. of Trips during the sampling year" in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4.
			Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table complete but difficult to analyse because NP objectives are not defined. If it is the case, why not to report these species only in table III.C.6 ? For species really planned, targets in numbers of fish are mostly achieved for GSA22, very heterogeneous for GSA20, and bad for GSA23. In general species really sampled are oversampled, mainly swordfish with an achievement rate of 744%.		Under the heading "Planned min number of fish to be measured at National Level" MS should enter the planned number, and avoid acronyms which are not explained. MS to review sampling strategy and agree minimum planned numbers to allow for a proper assessment of
			Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table appears complete with a right implementation of the concurrent sampling method. Table consistent with III.C.5	Mostly Yes	achievements.  No action needed
			to table into to complete and consistent with Air guidelines?	1	1 100	The design flooded

Judgement levels

Compliance level

Member State:

II

Ш

	Memb	er State:	Greece	1		Judgement levels
	WEILD	ei State.	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	Oct 2012? EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
			Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
				l	NA	not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
				See abovementionned comments on tables III.C.3 to III.C.6.		Under the heading "Planned min number of fish to be measured at National Level" MS should
				After analysing the tables provided, it looks as MS allocated		enter the planned number, and avoid acronyms
				its 2013 data collection effort preferentially on longliners		which are not explained. MS to review sampling
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	targeting large pelagics and on opportunistic sampling at sea for other metiers.		strategy and agree minimum planned numbers to allow for a proper assessment of
			proposal?		Partly	achievements.
				Not really. Metiers are detailed but reasons explaining their		
				general undersampling justified only for some of them. MS confirms that sampling in length was carried out on an		
			Are the devictions evaluined?	opportunistic basis except for large pelagics.	Double	MS to provide clearer explainations for under
			Are the deviations explained?		Partly	sampling.  MS to provide clearer explainations for under
			Are the deviations justified?	Partly	Partly	sampling.
	C2	Data quality: Res	sults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	No action required
			were ov estimates provided:	For around 15% of the stocks for landings, several of them	163	TVO action required
				being estimated with samples of very small sizes. CV met		
				for swordfish. Concerning discards, CVs met only for some stocks with small samples. So not consistent except		
			Were CV targets met?	swordfish.	Mostly	No action required
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action required
	СЗ	Follow-up of Rec	gional and international recommendations	Yes	Yes	No action required
		р от по	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation requested	NA	No action required
			<del>-</del>			
				only one is listed, that is not actually addressed to the MS's		MS should be careful in future to ensure all relevant LM recommendations are listed, and
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	specifically	No	should only respond to those targeted at the MS.
						MS should be careful in future to ensure all
						relevant LM recommendations are listed, and
			Are the responsive actions described?	No	No	should only respond to those targeted at the MS.
						MS should be careful in future to ensure all
						relevant LM recommendations are listed, and
	C4	Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No	No	should only respond to those targeted at the MS.
	04	Actions to avoid	Siortais	Delayed start of the NP which resulted in reduced coverage		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	of fishing activities for 2013. But start on time in 2014.	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
)	Recreation	onal fisheries				
			Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	MS is operating only in Region MED&BS	Yes	No action needed
Region Me	editerrane	an Sea and Black		me to operating only in region message	100	The delicit Hooded
	D1	Achievements.	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes. Recreational fishing for BFT is banned in Greece. A pilot study carried out in 2012 howed that eel is not a target species for this tye of activity. According to recreational fishing associations, MS wrote in its AR that the capture of sharks and rays is rare and random.	Yes	No action needed
			Are obtained deverations mentioned?	Sharks and rays is rare and random.	res	No action needed
			Are obtained derogations mentioned?	BFT recreational fishing is not legally allowed in Greece.	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No deviation. No comments	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
	D2	Data quality: Res	sults and deviation from NP proposal	no commente		The delicit Hooded
			Were data quality targets provided?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
			Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained?	No comments No comments	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
	D3	Follow-up of Reg	gional and international recommendations			
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	No comments No recommendation adressed to MS by RCM MED&BS	Yes	No action needed
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	2012.	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
	D4	Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  I shortfalls	No comments	NA	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	MS plans to carry out in its NP 2015-20 a pilot study in order to investigate the existence of recreational fishery of sharks.	Yes	Yes. MS to implement planned pilot study on recreational fishery of sharks.
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Biologica	al stock-related v	ariables			
			Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	MS is operating only in Region MED&BS	Yes	No action needed
legion Me	editerrane	an Sea and Black				
	E1	Achievements: F	Results and deviation from NP proposal			MO should be seed of decision the seement DEMO
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	MS should be careful assign the correct RFMO to the various species.
			to face miles complete and considerit with All galactiness.	Partly. Achievement rates in numbers of fish sampled are mostly achieved for GSA22, except for trawlable secies like monkfish, hake, nephrops but are generally heavily low for GSA 20 and 23. To be noted that results for eel and swordfish are good. As written in the AR objectives are only achieved for 7 out of 23 species (30%). Nevertheless more	Partly	MS should try to improve the sampling achievements particularly for GSA 20 and GSA 23.
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	species/stocks updated than planned.  Note that a specific section of the AR is dedicated to eel monitoring.		
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	Note that a specific section of the AR is dedicated to eel	Yes	No actions needed
			proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	Note that a specific section of the AR is dedicated to eel monitoring.  Yes by stock (species by GSA). Mainly due to the late implementation of the Greek NP in 2013, only in the second semester which cannot give relevant access to fish.  Nevertheless progress in implementing the NP shall be	Yes Yes	No actions needed, as programme has begun on
	<b>E</b> 2	Data quality: Rev	proposal?	Note that a specific section of the AR is dedicated to eel monitoring.  Yes by stock (species by GSA). Mainly due to the late implementtation of the Greek NP in 2013, only in the second semester which cannot give relevant access to fish. Nevertheless progress in implementing the NP shall be supported.		

	ber State	AR year	2013	Compliance class	
		Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No Double	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	Oct 2012? EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
		Overall complian		Yes	>90%
				NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
			In general, samples sizes are too low for achieving		
		W 0\/ 440	precision targets. Only for the variable length@age the CVs	Partly	No actions needed
		Were CV targets met?	were most of time achieved.		More detailed explainations should be prov
		Are the deviations explained?	No	No	in future reports.
		Ave the deviations institled?	NA	NA	More detailed explainations should be prov
E3	Follow-un	Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations			in future reports.
	. 0011 - up	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation requested by MS	NA	No action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendation made by RCM Med	NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
E4	Actions to	avoid shortfalls	Delayed start of the NP which reduced samples collection in		L
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	2013. But start on time in 2014.	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Delayed start of the NP which reduced samples collection in 2013. But start on time in 2014.	Yes	No action needed
Transv	ersal variabl		2010. Dat start on time in 2014.		
					Resubmit the Table III.F.1 providing missin
	Oor!*	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines	CV is missing	Yes	quality indicator (CV)
F1	Capacity F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	FII	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No comments	1	No action mand-1-1
		proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needded
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needded
	E40	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needded
	F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	NA	No action needded
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA NA	No action needded
<b>-</b> 2	Effort	. To dottono to avoid onortiallo in the future acceptable?	50	INV	40.0
		Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No comments	W-	No action needded
		proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes NA	No action needded
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA NA	No action needded
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	CV is missing	Mostly	Provide CV
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needded
	F40	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needded
	F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No relevant recommendations	NA	No action needded
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?	No relevant recommendations No comments	NA NA	No action needded
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA NA	No action needded
	F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	NA	No action needded
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needded
=3	Landings	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No comments	1	No cotton provided
		proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needded
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needded
	E40	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needded
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	CV is missing for all collected variables	Mostly	Provide CV
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needded
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA NA	No action needded
	F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needded
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA NA	No action needded
	F14	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Actions to avoid shortfalls	No comments	NA	No action needded
	. 14	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needded
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA NA	No action needded
Resear	rch surveys a	·			•
31	Achievem	ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal		1	_
		Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines	? No comments	Yes	No action needed
		is rable in.c. r complete and consistent with An guidelines	MEDITS survey was only carried out in GSA 22, not in	res	MS to ensure that the MEDITS survey is ca
			GSAs 22 and 23 as planned. MEDIAS survey was carried		out in all the relevant GSAs, i.e. GSAs 20, 2
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	out in early autumn instead of early summer and fewer	D-mi	and 23 and that the MEDIAS is carried out
		proposal? Are the deviations explained?	stations were covered (79% of hauls).  No comments	Partly Yes	planned stations.  No action needed
		rate the deviations explained:	140 comments	res	MS to address delays in approving funding
			Deviations were due to financial contraints and delays in		future years by reviewing MS administrative
		Are the deviations justified?	funding.	Partly	processes.
		Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes (for Medias a comprehensive report of the results is mapped)	Yes	No action needed
32	Data qual	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		- P-P			
					The MEDITS survey should be carried out in the relevant GSAs, i.e. GSAs 20, 22 and 23
					to describe effects of only carrying out surv
					some GSAs. MS to ensure that the MEDIA
			T. MEDITO.		survey is carried out during the usual surve
		le the quality of the curvey indices likely to be kent (by a ~	The MEDITS survey was only carried out in GSA 22, not in		time for accoustic surveys in Greece to ma
		Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage	no GSAs 22 and 23 as planned. MEDIAS survey was carried out in early autumn instead of early summer and fewer		data comparable to the available time serie MS to ensure that all planned stations shou
		etc.)?	stations were covered (79% of hauls).	Partly	covered.
			No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?		1	MS to address delays in approving funding
		Are the deviations explained?	Deviations were due to financial contraints and delays in	D	
22	Eelle	Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	Deviations were due to financial contraints and delays in funding.	Partly	future years.
<b>3</b> 3	Follow-up	Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations		Partly	future years.
<b>3</b> 3	Follow-up	Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No action needed
<b>ì</b> 3	Follow-up	Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning	funding.		

		Iombor Ctoto	Grane	1		
	IV	Member State:	Greece AR year	2013	Compliance class	Judgement levels  Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	Oct 2012?	Partly	10-50%
			Overall compliance	EWG Answer Partly	Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
			Overall compliance	Partiy	NA NA	>90% not applicable
				•		
			And posture to excite the established follows deposits at 0		EWG judgement	EWG
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
IV	Module of th	ne evaluation of the eco	nomic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		165	No action needed
		ollection of data concer				
			Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
				Fixed panel type is not according to the guidelines. MS		
				should clarify wether this is probability or non probability		Table should be corrected and updated when the
			Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	sampling scheme. Quality information not available	Partly	relevant data are available
			Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Quality information not available	Partly	Table should be updated when the relevant data is available
	A <sup>-</sup>	1 Achievements: R	esults and deviation from NP proposal	addity information not available	1 0.09	io avanabio
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
			proposal? Are the deviations explained?	Data for 2012 not available Yes	No Yes	MS should clarify the issue about 2012 data  No actions needed
			Are the deviations explained:  Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
	A	2 Data quality: Res	ults and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given?	NA	NA	No actions needed
			Are the deviations explained?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed
	A:	3 Follow-up of Rea	Are the deviations justified? ional and international recommendations	NA	NA	No actions needed
	~		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	NA	No actions needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No actions needed
	_		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No actions needed
	A	4 Actions to avoid s	shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	NA	No actions needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA NA	No actions needed  No actions needed
1	в с	ollection of data concer	ning the processing industry			
				Voc	Vaa	No actions pooded
			Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes Achieved sample rate is not clear. If different achieved	Yes	No actions needed
				sample rates existed then segments should be separated in		L
	_	4 A-1-1	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	different lines	Mostly	Table should be corrected and resubmitted
	B.	1 Achievements: H	esults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			1
			proposal?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
	В	2 Doto quality: Poo	Are the deviations justified? ults and deviation from NP proposal	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
	В.	2 Data quality. Hes	Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
	В:	3 Follow-up of Reg	ional and international recommendations	NIA.	NIA.	No cations acaded
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed No actions needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA .	NA NA	No actions needed
	B	4 Actions to avoid s				
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
				Although shortfalls are identified, no actions to overcome		MS should clarify which actions are to be made
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	them are described	Partly	in order to avoid the identified shortfalls
<b>V</b>			of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem			
	IAU	unievenienis. nesuits and	I deviation from NP proposal  Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No information is given for Fuel efficiency of fish capture (code 9). Data for indicators 1-4 collected through surveys which were only partly carried out.	Partly	MS to clarify how indicators 1-4 can be calculated accurately when surveys (MEDITS/MEDIAS) were not carried out (i) at all planned stations / areas and (ii) in different time periods to the past (making comparison with time series difficult). MS to clarify status of indicator 9.
			-	No reference to derogations is made, not possible to judge	•	
	2 1	ctions to avoid shortfalls	Are the relevant derogations listed?	whether there are any relevant derogations.	No	No action needed
	2710	otions to avoid shortialis	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls given although there are shortfalls re indicators 1-4, 9. [To take into account results of other SGs. This only refers to shortfalls regarding module IIIG.]	Partly	MS to address problems with execution of surveys to ensure data availability for indicators 1-4. MS to indicate how shortfalls re indicator 9 will be addressed.
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
VI I		nanagement and use of				
	1 Ac	chievements: Results and	deviation from NP proposal			MS should provide in the table the missing
			Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Only providing data for processing industry and surveys for SGMED are mentionned in the table. Nothing about other data calls : SGMOS, Aquaculture, AER, PGMED, GFCM Task1 and assesment WG).	No	information (end users, data call, species, fleet segment etc etc) and/or should explain why the requested data have not been sent to the end users
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with	No comments		No action needded
			the NP proposal?		NA	In the text are reported only information
				No comments		regarding the development of the national
			Is progress in the "Management of data" section well	No comments		database, MS should add more information on
			detailed?	Only general information provided by MS on its national DB.	Partly	the use and management of data
				No specific work mentionned in the NP and AR for year		
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	2013.	Partly	see previous comment
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments No comments	NA NA	No action needded No action needded
	2 Ar	ctions to avoid shortfalls	Are the deviations justified?	INO COMMINGRIES	INA	110 delion needded
	- / (		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	NA	No action needded
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needded
VII	Follow-up of	STECF recommendation	ons	Only recommendations from STECF EWG 12-20 are listed.		
				Not clear if other relevant STECF meeting reports were		AR2014: MS to list all relevant recommendations
			Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	screened.	Mostly	in future.
			Are the responsive actions described?	No detailed responsive actions are described, MS states: 'MS supports the recommendation'	Mostly	AR2014: MS to include more details on responsive actions.
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
VIII	List of acron	yms and abbreviations				
			Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed

Member State:

Greece			Judgement levels
AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	Oct 2012?	Partly	10-50%
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
Overall compliance	Partly	Yes	>90%
		NΔ	not applicable

IX	Comments, suggestions and reflect	ions	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
v	References	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
XI	Annexes	Is there a complete list of references?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	Heading 'Annexes' is included in report although there are no annexes provided. No reference in text to information in annexes.	Yes	AR2014: MS to explicitly mention if no Annexes are being provided

	Mambar State	luctoral	1		
	Member State:	Ireland AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	29 May 2014	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	28 March 2013 EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
		Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
			L	NA	not applicable
	General framework		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
		Are derogations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
II	National data collection organisation  A National correspondent a	on and participating institutes			
	A National correspondent	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		their roles well described? Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is the information provided on the website in line with legal	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)? Is there an overview and description of contents of national			+
		coordination meetings?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	B Regional and Internation	If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines? al coordination	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		nternational meetings	Na samuanta	Yes	INIa astian mandad
		Is Table II.B.1 complete?  Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings	No comments		No action needed
	D0 5-11	explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	B2 Follow-up of reg	gional and international recommendations  Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting			
		listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
		·			
III	Module of the evaluation of the fish  A General description of the				
	Gonoral description of the	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact	[		
	B Economic variables	on the NP implementation well described? Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	No comments Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
		Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic	100	100	No delight needed
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Data for inactive vessels is missing. Target and frame population are very different. MS should explain why. Are the inactive vessels accounted on the target population for each gear? This is not according to the regulation, as inactive vessels should be explicited as INACTIVE. Planned sample number should be and integer. Some fleet segments are not covered by the sampling scheme. The number of sampled vessels appears to be not enough regarding to the low response rate. It is recommended a higher intensity of the sampling scheme for the next year. Some segments with 0 vessels have planned sample rate bigger than 0.	Partly	MS should provide explanations about the issues identified in the comments. Table should be completed with inactive vessels and corrected according to the explanations.
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Accordingly to the numbers of the most recent information, some clusters should disappear as they are relating to only one fleet segment. It appears that some clustering was made due to the low response rates, but target population was used instead of frame population. As it's unclear if the target population contains inactive vessels, it's not possible to analyse the table.  Data for segment Drift and fixed netters 0<10 m is	Partly	Clustering should be made only when it is not possible to provide information for individual fleet segments and there is statistical evidence of homogeneity between the clustered segments. Table should be updated with the relevant information
			missing. Some variables have 0 response rate on specific segments. Fleet segments with 0 vessels were included in		
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	the table.	Partly	Table should be corrected and updated
	B1 Achievements: R	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	It's not clear what type of data collection the MS is applying. The sample size is clearly not enough to calculate the estimates, due to low response rate. The sample size should be raised to take high non response into account. It's also not clear how the MS can calculate the estimates based on a non probability sampling scheme with only 6% coverage.	Partiy Yes	MS should consider revising their data collection strategy for the future. An adequate sampling scheme should be choosen before the start of the datacollection. Currently it's starts as PSS and then it's turned into a non probability sampling. This can turn into a lack of control of the data collection fron the MS.  No actions needed  MS should consider revising their data collection strategy for the future. An adequate sampling scheme should be choosen before the start of the datacollection. Currently it's starts as PSS and then it's turned into a non
			There is an effort from the MS to increase the response		PSS and then it's turned into a non probability sampling. This can turn into a
		Are the deviations justified?	rate. This action doesn't appear to be sufficient in order to	Dorth	lack of control of the data collection fron
	B2 Data quality: Res	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal	overcome all the short falls they have been facing.	Partly	the MS.
	an deanly (100	Is respective data quality information given?	MS refer to the tables, which need to be corrected	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	No actions needed No actions needed
	B3 Follow-up of Reg	pional and international recommendations		162	INO AUTORIS REPUBLIC
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Not relevant	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed No actions needed
	B4 Actions to avoid			INU	dollono necucu
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes There is a positive attitude toward the increase of the response rate, although the methodology to be used is not the best for a probability sampling scheme. The actions stated are unlikely to solve the MS problem with the data collection.	Yes	No actions needed MS should consider revising their data collection strategy for the future. An adequate sampling scheme should be choosen before the start of the data collection. Currently it's starts as PSS and then it's turned into a non probability sampling. This can turn into a lack of
	C Biological metier related	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? variables		Partly	control of the data collection from the MS.
	orgon monor rolated		AR text deals with NS&EA and NA regions in one section	5 "	MS should divide regions into separate
	Region North Sea and Eastern Arcti	Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?		Partly	sections
		Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR	Table complete and detailed by fishing grounds.	<del></del>	
		guidelines?	Objectives planned in NP mostly achieved.  Table properly filled. Planned no. of trips sampled on	Yes	No actions needed
		guidelines?  Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes Mostly	No actions needed  amend table

	ber State:	Ireland			ment levels
		AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	29 May 2014 28 March 2013	No Partly	<10% 10-50%
			EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS Table properly filled. But no species planned in NP 2013	EWG judgement	EWG
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	for the region and two found in AR tables ? Hering		
		guidelines?	undersampled and mackerel oversampled.	Mostly	No action needed
			Same results as in Table III.C.5 for only two species. Is it		MS to clarify why only the target spe (herring in I-II, mackerel in the North
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR	really concurrent sampling as specified in Tables III.C.3		Sea) were sampled. Delete commer
		guidelines?	and III.C.4? Internal comments in cell A 4-5 (Bloggs:).	Mostly	cell A 4-5.
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Sampling effort targets in numbers of trips by metiers are mostly achieved, even if the planned coverage by		
		proposal?	sampling strategy is not strictly complied.	Mostly	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	Weakness of the self sampling by skippers for herring.	Yes	No action needed
C2	Doto quality: Ba	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
62	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal		1	
			Only for mackerel. Hering sample too small for calculating consistent CV. CVs should be given in absolute numbers		
		Were CV estimates provided?	instead of percentages (cf. Guidelines).	Mostly	amend table (CVs in absolute numb
		Were CV targets met?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	NA NA	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
C3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations			
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA One recommendation from BCM NS SEA 2012 listed	NA Van	No action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?	One recommendation from RCM NS&EA 2012 listed. Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
C4	Actions to avoid	shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
lowb Att	antio	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
orth Atla C1		Paculte and daviation from ND proposal			
٠,	Admerenterits:	Results and deviation from NP proposal	Table complete and detailed by fishing grounds. Table		
			difficult to analyse by multiplying the lines (only one		
			sampling strategy by line). Objectives planned in NP		
			mostly achieved. Some metiers oversampled. Some others not sampled at all for some fishing grounds :		In the next AR, MS should organise
			SSC_DEF_100-119, TBB_DEF_70-99, FPO_CRU.		Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 in a
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR	Concurrent sampling on the market for pelagic trawlers		comparable way that facilitates
		guidelines?	shows also bad achievement rates.	Mostly	evaluation.
			Table properly filled. Table organised by sampling frames, which makes comparison with Table III.C.3 almost		
			impossible. Sampling frame NW3 missing. Column B was		
			masked and bilateral agreements given in AR text are not		
			reported. Inconsistencies on total numbers of trips in the		In the next AR, MS should organise
			year, numbers of trips planned and achieved between III.C.3 and III.C.4. For those provided objectives planned		Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 in a
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	in NP are mostly achieved.	Mostly	comparable way that facilitates evaluation.
		guidelines :	Table corectly filled. Planned targets are mostly achieved.	iviostry	evaluation.
			Some failures in VIIa and VIIbcjk for several stocks and for		MS to explain why herring and blue
			small pelagics or rays. Not clear why herring and blue whiting were sampled by unsorted catches and discards		whiting were sampled by unsorted catches and discards (normal case
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	(normal case is either sampling unsorted catches, or		either sampling unsorted catches, o
		guidelines?	landings and discards).	Mostly	landings and discards).
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR	Table complete and correct. Inconsistencies between Tables III.C.5 and III.C.6 in terms of the numbers of		see general comment on filling Tabl
		guidelines?	species and individuals reported.	Mostly	III.C.5 and III.C.6
			General oversampling, severe oversampling in some	,	
			cases (e.g. sampling frames W3 Concurrent at sea, S1		
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Other). Sampling effort targets in numbers of trips by metiers and sampling frames are mostly achieved. See		
		proposal?	comments on table III.C.5 for stocks.	Mostly	No action needed
		And the desiration of the do	Yes, detailed by metier and by stock. Many reasons but	.,	No college and de
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	relevant. Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
C2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal	165	Tes	No action needed
		p .p			
			Yes for landings, mostly for discards but samples size were sometime small. CVs should be provided in absolute		MS to amend table (CVs in sheet of
		Were CV estimates provided?	numbers instead of percentages (cf. Guidelines).	Yes	MS to amend table (CVs in absolut numbers)
			Mostly for landings but very good CVs for discards when	1	<u>'</u>
		Wara CV targets met?	provided (because here, CVs are given in absolute numbers?). With which reliabilty?	1.4	No action needed
		Were CV targets met?	Yes for landings, no explanation on the good results for	Mostly	dollon needed
		Are the deviations explained?	discards.	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
C3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations	See continu	V	No action non-de-d
		Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	See section I.  3 recommendations from RCM NA listed.	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		•	Implementation of the recommendation on boarfish found		
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	in the AR text was not applied in table III.C.5. Table III.C.6, in contrast, is listing Capros aper.	Mostly	No action needed
C4	Actions to avoid		o.o, in contrast, is listing Capitos aper.	ı ıvıosuy	p. to dollon needed
			MS intends to improve the monitoring of its subcontractors and to ensure the most representative coverage possible		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	of all target metiers and and their landings.	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	ational fisheries	•			
Recrea		Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Recrea		13 milormation on m.b. 1-4 given for each respective region?	Pro comments	162	pro action needed
	intic				
		Results and deviation from NP proposal			
orth Atla		· ·	A large part of Salmon recreational fisheries were closed		i
orth Atla		Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	in 2013. Monitoring of these fisheries by rivers well	Voc	No action needed
orth Atla		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	in 2013. Monitoring of these fisheries by rivers well detailed in the AR 2013.	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
orth Atla		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	in 2013. Monitoring of these fisheries by rivers well	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed
orth Atla D1	Achievements:	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	in 2013. Monitoring of these fisheries by rivers well detailed in the AR 2013. Derogations for sea bass, eel and sharks (section I)	Yes	No action needed
orth Atla	Achievements:	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are obtained derogations mentioned?  Are the deviations explained?	in 2013. Monitoring of these fisheries by rivers well detailed in the AR 2013.  Derogations for sea bass, eel and sharks (section I)  No comments  NA	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
orth Atla D1	Achievements:	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	in 2013. Monitoring of these fisheries by rivers well detailed in the AR 2013.  Derogations for sea bass, eel and sharks (section I)  No comments  NA   Data quality assurance imlemented by MS along its	Yes Yes NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed
orth Atla D1	Achievements:	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are obtained derogations mentioned?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal	in 2013. Monitoring of these fisheries by rivers well detailed in the AR 2013.  Derogations for sea bass, eel and sharks (section I)  No comments  NA	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed

Reg

D

MEII	ber State		0040		udgement levels
		AR year Version of the AR reviewed	<b>2013</b> 29 May 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
		Version of the NP proposal	28 March 2013	Partly	10-50%
		Overall complia	EWG Answer  Mostly	Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
		Overall complic	mostly	NA NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
D3	Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations	To the state of th		Fr
		Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments No recommendation by RCM NA 2012	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
D4	Actions to	avoid shortfalls	·		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfall raised by MS	Yes	No action needed
Dialas	.:	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
Biolog	jicai stock-re	ated variables	AR text: Sampling for widely distributed (small pelagic)		
			stocks extending into the NS&EA region is dealt with in the		
ion North Sea	and Factor	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective regi-	on? North Atlantic section	NA	NA
E1		ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			No information provided on NS&EA stocks	NA	No action needed
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelin Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	nes?		
		proposal?	No planned objectives in 2013 NP proposal.	NA	No action needed
			Yes. Several stocks sampled cover in fact both region	A1A	No cotton mondad
		Are the deviations explained?	NS&EA and region NA. So actions carried out by MS are resumed in region NA.	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA	No action needed
E2	Data qual	ty: Results and deviation from NP proposal	hia -		No cotton
		Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
E3	Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations	la l		INTO CONTRACT OF THE CONTRACT
		Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
E4	Actions to	avoid shortfalls	hu.	A1A	No college and deal
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
ion North Atl	antic	The delicite to divide chemicals in the letters decoptable.			TVO dollori riocaca
E1	Achieven	ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guideling	Strange naming of the biological parameters. Regional column P not filled in accordance with the guidelines.	Mostly	Revise and re-submit Table III.E.3
			Good achievement rates with many stocks oversampled.		
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Some deviations, mainly for sex ratio@age and	Mostly	No action needed
		proposal:	maturity@age. Availability of samples or scarcity of landings for some		
			species. For some stocks, samples were collected but not		
			yet analysed. Explanations given by stock. MS states in its AR that oversampling has not financial effect on foreseen	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	NP budget.		
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
E2	Data qual	ty: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Yes, except for stocks for which samples are not yet been		
			analysed : hake, anglerfish for example because age	Mostly	No action needed
		Were CV estimates provided?	reading was stopped at regional level.  In general yes for ALKs and weight@length. Mainly no for		
		Were CV targets met?	other parameters.	Partly	No action needed
			MS claimed that many of the precision targets are not		
			achievable. It is simply not cost-effective to obtain the excessively high number of samples (PSUs) required to	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	achieve all the precision targets.		
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
E3	Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation in section I.	NA	No action needed
			Relevant recomendations from RCM NS&EA and RCM		Stock related recommendations to be
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA 2012 are listed under III.C, but should be inserted in III.E.	No	shifted from III.C to III.E.
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes (but in III.C)	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
E4	Actions to	avoid shortfalls	MC intende to follow recommendation from MACA CCC		
			MS intends to follow recommendations from WKACCU (2008), WKPRECISE (2009), WKMERGE (2010),		
			WKPICS (2011), WKPICS2 (2012) and WKPICS3 (2013).		
			These recommendations might result in deviations from	Yes	No action needed
			the planned sample numbers. MS remains also focused on providing high-quality data to stock assessment		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	working groups.	٧.	No action was dark
Trans	versal variab	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
i i ai i Si	. or our varidD				
F-4	C '*	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guideling	nes? CV should not be indicated in percentage.	Yes	No action needed
F1	Capacity F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
		proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No deviations No comments	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
	F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls		IWI	into dollori ficodod
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No shortfalls	Yes	No action needed
E0	Effort	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F2	Effort F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
		proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments No comments	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
		, no mo devianorio justineu:	140 COMMITTERIA	INA	INO ACTION NECUCO
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F12	Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		Is respective data quality information given?			

	ber State:	Ireland	2013		udgement levels
		AR year Version of the AR reviewed	2013 29 May 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
		Version of the NP proposal	28 March 2013	Partly	10-50%
			EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall complianc	e Mostly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
				INA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
	F44 4.00	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	F14 Acti	ons to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls	NA	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described:  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
F3	Landings				
	F11 Ach	ievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Noncompanie	V	No selfen mended
		proposal? Are the deviations explained?	No comments No deviations	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
	F12 Data	a quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	F13 Follo	ow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recomendations	NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
	F14 Acti	ons to avoid shortfalls			•
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls	NA	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	rch surveys at se				
G1	Achievements	s: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR	No information provided on 'Upload in international	I	AR2014: MS to report on upload in
		guidelines?	database'	Mostly	international database in table IIIG
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
		proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		activities?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
G2	Data quality: I	Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g.			
		no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
G3	Follow-up of I	Regional and international recommendations			
			AR text "All recommendations received through the		AR2014: MS to list relevant
		Are the relevant recommendations from Comm. Pleasing	affiliated survey planning groups IBTS, WGIPS and		recommendations from survey plan
		Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?	SGNEPS were addressed." Those recommendations, however, were not listed.	Yes	groups
		Are the responsive actions described ?	Not in detail, could be more specific	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
G4	Actions to avo	oid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		conomic situation of the aquaculture and processing indu terning the aquaculture	stry		
Conco	tion of data cont	criming the aquaculture	Table is not filled according to the guidelines. MS should		
			use the table provided, without changing the lines and		MS is asked to replace the table ar
		Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?	filled with yes/no.	Mostly	resubmit
		Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
		guidelines:	100	103	MS should clarify about response re
		Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR	Some response rates are bigger than 100%, even in case		and CVs and it is asked to resubm
		guidelines?	of census. In one case, response rate is 64% but CV is 0.	Mostly	table.
A1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal		1	
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
A2	Data quality: R	esults and deviation from NP proposal			<u> </u>
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
40					No actions peeded
А3	Follow-up of R	egional and international recommendations	NA	K1 A	No actions needed
А3	Follow-up of R	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions peoded
А3	Follow-up of R	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No actions needed No actions needed
	Follow-up of R  Actions to avoi	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?			No actions needed No actions needed
A3		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls	NA NA	NA NA	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No actions needed
<b>A</b> 4	Actions to avoi	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? erning the processing industry	NA NA Yes	NA NA Yes	No actions needed  No actions needed
<b>A</b> 4	Actions to avoi	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? erning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR	NA NA Yes Yes	NA NA Yes Yes	No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed
<b>A</b> 4	Actions to avoi	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? erning the processing industry	NA NA Yes Yes	NA NA Yes	No actions needed  No actions needed
<b>A</b> 4	Actions to avoi	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? evening the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA NA Yes Yes Flesponse rate and achieved sample rate should be	NA NA Yes Yes	No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed
<b>A</b> 4	Actions to avoi	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? erning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR	NA NA Yes Yes	NA NA Yes Yes	No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed
<b>A</b> 4	Actions to avoi	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? evening the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Response rate and achieved sample rate should be presented as percentage. Response rate appears to be	NA NA Yes Yes Yes	No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  Table should be corrected and
A4 Collect	Actions to avoi	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? erning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Yes Response rate and achieved sample rate should be presented as percentage. Response rate appears to be incorrect because they are higher than 100%.	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Partly	No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  Table should be corrected and resubmitted
A4 Collect	Actions to avoi	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? erning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Response rate and achieved sample rate should be presented as percentage. Response rate appears to be incorrect because they are higher than 100%.  Yes	NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Partly  Yes	No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  Table should be corrected and resubmitted  No actions needed
A4 Collect	Actions to avoi	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? erning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Response rate and achieved sample rate should be presented as percentage. Response rate appears to be incorrect because they are higher than 100%.  Yes Yes	NA NA Yes Yes  Yes  Partly  Yes Yes	No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  Table should be corrected and resubmitted  No actions needed  No actions needed
A4 Collect	Actions to avoi	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? evening the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Response rate and achieved sample rate should be presented as percentage. Response rate appears to be incorrect because they are higher than 100%.  Yes	NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Partly  Yes	No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  Table should be corrected and resubmitted  No actions needed
A4 Collect	Actions to avoi	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? erning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations fustified? esults and deviation from NP proposal	NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Yes Response rate and achieved sample rate should be presented as percentage. Response rate appears to be incorrect because they are higher than 100%.  Yes Yes Yes	NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Partly  Yes Yes Yes	No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  Table should be corrected and resubmitted  No actions needed  No actions needed
A4 Collect	Actions to avoi	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? evening the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Response rate and achieved sample rate should be presented as percentage. Response rate appears to be incorrect because they are higher than 100%.  Yes Yes	NA NA Yes Yes  Yes  Partly  Yes Yes	No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  Table should be corrected and resubmitted  No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed
A4 Collect	Actions to avoi	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? erning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustfied? seults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Response rate and achieved sample rate should be presented as percentage. Response rate appears to be incorrect because they are higher than 100%.  Yes Yes Yes Yes	NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Partly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  Table should be corrected and resubmitted  No actions needed
A4 Collect	Actions to avoi	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? erning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustfied? seults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Response rate and achieved sample rate should be presented as percentage. Response rate appears to be incorrect because they are higher than 100%.  Yes Yes Yes Yes	NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Partly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  Table should be corrected and resubmitted  No actions needed  To actions needed  No actions needed
A4 Collect	Actions to avoi	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? erning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustfied? seults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Partly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  Table should be corrected and resubmitted  No actions needed  In actions needed  No actions needed
A4 Collect	Actions to avoi	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? erning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustlified? Seults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?	NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Yes  Response rate and achieved sample rate should be presented as percentage. Response rate appears to be incorrect because they are higher than 100%.  Yes Yes Yes Yes  Yes MS doesn't comment on the low response rate for	NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Partly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  Table should be corrected and resubmitted  No actions needed  Table should consider raising the san size for Companies <= 10, as the response rate is low and the plann
A4 Collect	Actions to avoid tion of data condition of data quality: Action of data condition of	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? erning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained?	NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Partly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  Table should be corrected and resubmitted  No actions needed  In actions needed  No actions needed
A4 Collect	Actions to avoid tion of data condition of data quality: Action of data condition of	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? derning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations justified? espective data quality information given? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations	NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Yes  Response rate and achieved sample rate should be presented as percentage. Response rate appears to be incorrect because they are higher than 100%.  Yes Yes Yes Yes  Yes MS doesn't comment on the low response rate for	NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Partly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  Table should be corrected and resubmitted  No actions needed  Mo actions needed  Mo actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  size for Companies <= 10, as the response rate is low and the planne sample is only 15% of frame popula
A4 Collect	Actions to avoid tion of data condition of data quality: Action of data condition of	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? erning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained?	NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Yes Response rate and achieved sample rate should be presented as percentage. Response rate appears to be incorrect because they are higher than 100%.  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  Yes  MS doesn't comment on the low response rate for companies <= 10	NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Partly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Mostly	No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  Table should be corrected and resubmitted  No actions needed
A4 Collect	Actions to avoid tion of data condition of data quality: Action of data condition of	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? erning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified? esults and deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified? esplonal and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Yes Response rate and achieved sample rate should be presented as percentage. Response rate appears to be incorrect because they are higher than 100%.  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes MS doesn't comment on the low response rate for companies <= 10	NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Partly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  Mostly NA	No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  Table should be corrected and resubmitted  No actions needed  Mo actions needed  No actions needed  In actions needed  No actions needed  Mo should consider raising the san size for Companies <= 10, as the response rate is low and the planne sample is only 15% of frame popula
A4 Collect	Actions to avoid tion of data condition of data quality: Action of data condition of	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? dranations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? dranations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? derning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations insuffied? esults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Response rate and achieved sample rate should be presented as percentage. Response rate appears to be incorrect because they are higher than 100%.  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes AMS doesn't comment on the low response rate for companies <= 10  NA NA	NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes  Partly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  Mostly  NA NA	No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  No actions needed  Table should be corrected and resubmitted  No actions needed  MS should consider raising the san size for Companies <= 10, as the response rate is low and the planne sample is only 15% of frame popula

Member State:	Ireland	]	Jud	gement levels
	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
	Version of the AR reviewed	29 May 2014	No	<10%
	Version of the NP proposal	28 March 2013	Partly	10-50%
		EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
	Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%
			NA	not applicable
		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
				MS should consider raising the sample size for Companies <= 10, as the response rate is low and the planned sample is only 15% of frame population.
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem	Yes, improvement compared to last year	Yes	
1 Achievements: Results and	d deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations identified	Yes	No action needed
2 Actions to avoid shortfalls				
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
VI Module for management and use of 1 Achievements: Results and				
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		MS mentioned progress made in year 2013 in terms of IT develoments for data storage, upgrading of the data quality procedures nd transmission of the data to end		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	users.	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No deviation.	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
2 Actions to avoid shortfalls	•			
		MS will continue its effort for improving the national IT system and for maintaining good relationships with the fishing industry, and the State authorities who have		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	primary responsibility for logbooks and VMS data.	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
VII Follow-up of STECF recommendation	ons			AR2014: MS to follow guidelines with
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	No comments	Ven	respect to STECF recommendations:  MS should summarise the follow-up given to STECF recommendations in a text table comprising on the left side the recommendations and on the right side the responsive actions.'
		No comments No comments	Yes Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described?			No action needed
VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
•	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
IX Comments, suggestions and reflect	ions	_		
w =.	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
X References	In there a complete list of references?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
XI Annexes	Is there a complete list of references?	No comments	res	INO ACTION NEEDED
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No comments	Yes	No action needed

		_	-	•		
	Memb	er State:	Italy AR year	2013	Ju Compliance class	dgement levels  Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	December 2010 EWG Answer	Partly	10-50% 50-90%
			Overall compliance		Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
			·		NA	not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
General f	ramework	ī.	And descriptions links 40	Tr. 10 II		Action needed?
National of	data colle	ction organisatio	Are derogations listed?	Yes. 13 derogations or exemptions listed.	Yes	No action needed
Α			and participating institutes		1	
			Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is there an overview and description of contents of national	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			coordination meetings?		100	
				Outline of main outcomes missing	Mostly	Please submit outline of main outcomes of national coordination meetings.
В	Pegions	I and Internation	If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?			of flational coordination freetings.
	B1		nternational meetings			
			Is Table II.B.1 complete?	For non attendance "no" is missing, if it is correct	Mostly	Yes, please complete table with the missing entries.
			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings	To from attendance no is missing, in it is correct	IVIOSITY	The reason for non-attendance should
	DO.	Fallow was of you	explained?	No (30 out of 53 planned meetings were not attended)	No	be indicated.
	B2	rollow-up of reg	gional and international recommendations  Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting	Yes - together with recommendations from the relevant		
			listed?	RCMs as well	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
					, 100	dollon noodod
		uation of the fishi				
Α	ueneral	description of th	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact			
_	_		on the NP implementation well described?	No major changes detected	Yes	No action needed
B SUPRA-R		ic variables editerranean Sea	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
SUPRA-R	TEGION W	euiterranean Sea	quidelines?	Reference year should be 2012	Yes	Update table with the correct year
			guidelines?	Reference year should be 2012	Yes	Update table with the correct year
			Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Nomenclature in col H inconsistent (e.g. sometimes 18-< 24 m, sometimes VL1824);	Mostly	Update table and resubmit
	B1	Achievements: F	Results and deviation from NP proposal	2111, 00110111100 12102 1/,	Wosty	opuate table and resubmit
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	.,	.,	
			proposal? Are the deviations explained?	Yes NA	Yes NA	No actions needed No actions needed
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA NA	No actions needed
	B2	Data quality: Res	sults and deviation from NP proposal			To a second
			Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?	Yes NA	Yes NA	No actions needed  No actions needed
			Are the deviations explained:  Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed
	В3	Follow-up of Reg	gional and international recommendations	[		In a second
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	NA NA	YES NA	No actions needed No actions needed
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed
	B4	Actions to avoid	shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA NA	YES NA	No actions needed
SUPRA-R	REGION O	ther regions	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA .	NA NA	No actions needed
			guidelines?	Reference year should be 2012	Yes	Update table with the correct year
			guidelines? Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR	Reference year should be 2012  Nomenclature in col H inconsistent (e.g. sometimes 18-<	Yes	Update table with the correct year
			guidelines?	24 m, sometimes VL1824);	Mostly	Update table and resubmit
	B1	Achievements: F	Results and deviation from NP proposal		1	
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No actions needed
	B2	Data quality: Boo	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal	NA	NA	No actions needed
		Data quanty. 1185	Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No actions needed
	В3	Follow-up of Door	Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations	NA	NA	No actions needed
	D3	i ollow-up of neg	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No actions needed
	D/	Actions to'	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No actions needed
	B4	Actions to avoid	shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	Yes	No actions needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed
•	Di-L		vertebles			
С	Biologic	al metier related	variables	According to table III.A.1 MS is operating in Region		
		_	Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	MED&BS and Other/CECAF	Yes	No action needed
Region M	lediterran C1	ean Sea and Blac	ck Sea Results and deviation from NP proposal			
				Table complete and consistent. Some differences in numbers of trips found between NP and AR tables III.C.3, respectively 1470 and 1245 trips to be sampled. Why GND_SPF sampling frame DS10_8 and FYK_DES samling frame DS17_8 disappeared in the AR table?  NP objectives mostly achieved both on shore and at sea.		
			Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Except for metiers PTM_SPF heavily undersampled and PS_LPF not sampled at all.	Mostly	MS to clarify if the metiers/sampling frames that have been listed in the NP but not in the AR have been sampled.
			Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table properly filled. Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 are consistent. NP objectives mostly achieved both on shore and at sea. Except for metiers PTM_SPF heavily undersampled and PS_LPF not sampled at all.	Mostly	No action needed
			<del></del>		iviosay	201011 1100000

		AR year	2013	Compliance class	dgement levels  Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	December 2010	Partly	10-50%
		Overall compliance	EWG Answer  Mostly	Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
		o rotali oonipilaloo	oouy	NA NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
			Table complete with relevant footnotes. Regional		
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	sampling programmes for large pelagics correctly included in the table. CVs should be given in absolute numbers		
		guidelines?	instead of percentages (cf. Guidelines).	Mostly	amend table (CVs in absolute nur
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table correctly filled according to AR guidelines.	Yes	No action needed
		guidennes:	Design and achievements rates are consistent with the	165	No action needed
			NP proposal, in terms of numbers of trips sampled. Only		
			purse seine and deepwater trawling metiers appear as undersampled.		
			Concerning stock sampling, if compared to national		
			targets, achievement rates are good. Most of species		
			appear as oversampled at national level (only the given reference) - up to 10000% for Trigla lucerna!		
			Nevertheless, some species were undersampled, even at		
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	national level: Lophius piscatorius, Todaropsis eblanae, large pelagics except sworfish and Sarda sarda.		
		proposal?	large peragics except swortistratio Sarda sarda.	Mostly	No action needed
			Text very detailed on metiers to be sampled for landings and for discards, justifying also how Italy filled the tables		
			III.C. Deviations for metiers PTM_SPF and PS_LPF are		
			explained, as well about some minor changes concerning		
			metiers and samling frames included in the NP 2013. But no specific comments on undersampling of some stocks		
			because it is impossible to identify real discrepancies		
			between objectives planned at national level and results		
		Are the deviations explained?	provided at GSA level.	Yes	No action needed
C2 Dat	ita quality: Ra	Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal	Yes	Yes	No action needed
Du		p. opour	Yes, when numbers of fish measured were consistent for		
			retained catches and discards.  CVs are provided by stock (by GSA). In the case of large		
			pelagics, well detailed in table and text. CVs should be		
		More CV estimates provided?	provided by absolute numbers instead of percentages (cf.	V	No action people
		Were CV estimates provided?	Guidelines). For some stocks only for landings and more rarely for	Yes	No action needed
			discards. Often big differences observed between GSAs		
			for the same species. Could be a consequence of planned objectives at natioal level and not at GSA one (i.e by		
		Were CV targets met?	stock) ?	No	No action needed
			Reasons given by MS are seasonality of catches for some metiers or some stocks and their low volumes of landings		
			or availibity for sampling. Well detailed by types of		
		Are the deviations explained?	species.	Yes	No action needed
C3 Fol	llow-up of Re	Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	.,	Were the relevant derogations listed?	See section I	Yes	Yes
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes, but only LM or RCM 2012 recommendations are regarded as relevant.	Mostly	Delete old recommendations
		Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
C4 Ac	tions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes Yes		No action needed No action needed
C4 Ac	ctions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF	Yes	
C4 Ac	ctions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and	Yes	
C4 Ac	ctions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activty	Yes	
C4 Ac	ctions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls	Yes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activty with the other Mediterranean countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at	Yes Yes	No action needed
C4 Act	ctions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activty with the other Mediterranean countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
n Other regions		Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activty with the other Mediterranean countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at	Yes Yes	No action needed
n Other regions		Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal	Yes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activty with the other Mediterranean countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
n Other regions		Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activty with the other Mediternaen countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level. Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables.	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
n Other regions		Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR	Yes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activty with the other Mediterranean countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on CECAF sampling frames,	Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
n Other regions		Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	Yes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activty with the other Mediternaen acountries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
n Other regions		Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activty with the other Mediterranean countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables.	Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
n Other regions		Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	Yes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activty with the other Mediternaen acountries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS	Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA	No action needed
n Other regions		Are the responsive actions acceptable? dishortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Yes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activty with the other Mediterranean countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on catches of CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on catches of CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables.	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes ANA NA NA NA NA	No action needed
n Other regions		Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activty with the other Mediternaen countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on catches of CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No quantitative information provided on CECAF fisheries in 2013 AR.	Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA	No action needed
n Other regions		Are the responsive actions acceptable? dishortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Wes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activty with the other Mediterranean countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on catches of CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on catches of CECAF fisheries in 2013 AR. MS states in its 2013 AR that RCM_LDF agreed in 2013 that Italian fishing activities in CECAF area can be	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes ANA NA NA NA NA	No action needed
n Other regions		Are the responsive actions acceptable? dishortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Wes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activty with the other Mediternaen countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on catches of CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No quantitative information provided on CECAF fisheries in 2013 AR. MS states in its 2013 AR that RCM_LDF agreed in 2013 that Italian fishing activities in CECAF area can be considered as negligeable. But this exemption was	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes ANA NA NA NA NA	No action needed
n Other regions		Are the responsive actions acceptable? dishortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	Wes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activty with the other Mediterranean countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on catches of CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF fisheries in 2013 AR. MS states in its 2013 AR that RCM_LDF agreed in 2013 that Italian fishing activities in CECAF area can be considered as negligeable. But this exemption was decided only in September 2013 and is not included in the tables of derogation in section I.	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	No action needed
n Other regions C1 Aci	chievements:	Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?	Wes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activity with the other Mediterranean countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Ves  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on catches of CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on catches of CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No quantitative information provided on CECAF fisheries in 2013 AR. MS states in its 2013 AR that RCM_LDF agreed in 2013 that Italian fishing activities in CECAF area can be considered as negligeable. But this exemption was decided only in September 2013 and is not included in the	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA	No action needed
n Other regions C1 Aci	chievements:	Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations syplained?  Are the deviations pustified?  Is the consistent with the NP proposal	Wes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activty with the other Mediterranean countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on catches of CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF fisheries in 2013 AR. MS states in its 2013 AR that RCM_LDF agreed in 2013 that Italian fishing activities in CECAF area can be considered as negligeable. But this exemption was decided only in September 2013 and is not included in the tables of derogation in section I.	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	No action needed
n Other regions C1 Aci	chievements:	Are the responsive actions acceptable? dishortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation synthesis and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?	Wes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activty with the other Mediternaen acountries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No quantitative information provided on CECAF fisheries in 2013 AR. MS states in its 2013 AR that RCM_LDF agreed in 2013 that Italian fishing activities in CECAF area can be considered as negligeable. But this exemption was decided only in September 2013 and is not included in the tables of derogation in section I.	Yes Yes Yes Yes  NA	No action needed
n Other regions C1 Aci	chievements:	Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  seuts and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?	Wes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activity with the other Mediterranean countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on catches of CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No quantitative information provided on CECAF fisheries in 2013 AR.  MS states in its 2013 AR that RCM_LDF agreed in 2013 that Italian fishing activities in CECAF area can be considered as negligeable. But this exemption was decided only in September 2013 and is not included in the tables of derogation in section I.	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  Yes  NA	No action needed
n Other regions C1 Aci	chievements: nta quality: Re	Are the responsive actions acceptable? dishortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets mel? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?	Wes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activty with the other Mediternaen acountries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No quantitative information provided on CECAF fisheries in 2013 AR. MS states in its 2013 AR that RCM_LDF agreed in 2013 that Italian fishing activities in CECAF area can be considered as negligeable. But this exemption was decided only in September 2013 and is not included in the tables of derogation in section I.	Yes Yes Yes Yes  NA	No action needed
n Other regions C1 Aci	chievements: nta quality: Re	Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  seuts and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?	Wes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activity with the other Mediterranean countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on catches of CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No quantitative information provided on CECAF fisheries in 2013 AR.  MS states in its 2013 AR that RCM_LDF agreed in 2013 that Italian fishing activities in CECAF area can be considered as negligeable. But this exemption was decided only in September 2013 and is not included in the tables of derogation in section I.	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  Yes  NA	No action needed
n Other regions C1 Aci	chievements: nta quality: Re	Are the responsive actions acceptable? dishortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  Is additional international recommendations	Wes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activty with the other Mediterranean countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF are can be considered as negligeable. But this exemption was decided only in September 2013 and is not included in the tables of derogation in section I.  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NO	Yes Yes Yes Yes  Yes  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  N	No action needed
n Other regions C1 Aci	chievements: nta quality: Re	Are the responsive actions acceptable? dishortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  Is additional international recommendations	Wes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activity with the other Mediterranean countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on CECAF fisheries in 2013 AR.  MS states in its 2013 AR that RCM_LDF agreed in 2013 that Italian fishing activities in CECAF area can be considered as negligeable. But this exemption was decided only in September 2013 and is not included in the tables of derogation in section I.  NA  NA  NA  NA  NO  Only one recommendation former to 2012. Nothing about the recommendation made by RCM_LDF 2013 proving	Yes Yes Yes Yes  Yes  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  N	No action needed
n Other regions C1 Aci	chievements: nta quality: Re	Are the responsive actions acceptable? dishortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  Is additional international recommendations	Wes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activity with the other Mediterranean countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No quantitative information provided on CECAF fisheries in 2013 AR. MS states in its 2013 AR that RCM_LDF agreed in 2013 that Italian fishing activities in CECAF area can be considered as negligeable. But this exemption was decided only in September 2013 and is not included in the tables of derogation in section I.  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NO  Only one recommendation former to 2012. Nothing about	Yes Yes Yes Yes  Yes  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  N	No action needed
n Other regions C1 Aci	chievements: nta quality: Re	Are the responsive actions acceptable? dishortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations justified?  Is gional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?	Wes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activty with the other Mediterranean countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF fisheries in 2013 AR. MS states in its 2013 AR that RCM_LDF agreed in 2013 that Italian fishing activities in CECAF area can be considered as negligeable. But this exemption was decided only in September 2013 and is not included in the tables of derogation in section I.  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NO  Only one recommendation former to 2012. Nothing about the recommendation made by RCM_LDF 2013 proving that MS has no more obligation regarding CECAF area.	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  NA	No action needed
n Other regions C1 Aci	ta quality: Re	Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  seults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Wes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activity with the other Mediterranean countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables.  No information provided on CECAF fisheries in 2013 AR.  MS states in its 2013 AR that RCM_LDF agreed in 2013 that Italian fishing activities in CECAF area can be considered as negligeable. But this exemption was decided only in September 2013 and is not included in the tables of derogation in section I.  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NO  Only one recommendation former to 2012. Nothing about the recommendation made by RCM_LDF 2013 proving that MS has no more obligation regarding CECAF area.	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  NA	No action needed  Action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
n Other regions C1 Aci C2 Dai	chievements: nta quality: Re	Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are shortfalls	Wes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activty with the other Mediterranean countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF fisheries in 2013 AR. MS states in its 2013 AR that RCM_LDF agreed in 2013 that Italian fishing activities in CECAF area can be considered as negligeable. But this exemption was decided only in September 2013 and is not included in the tables of derogation in section I.  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NO  Only one recommendation former to 2012. Nothing about the recommendation made by RCM_LDF 2013 proving that MS has no more obligation regarding CECAF area.	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  NA	No action needed
C1 Aci	ta quality: Re	Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  seults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Wes  MS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activity with the other Mediterranean countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No quantitative information provided on CECAF fisheries in 2013 AR. MS states in its 2013 AR that RCM_LDF agreed in 2013 that Italian fishing activities in CECAF area can be considered as negligeable. But this exemption was decided only in September 2013 and is not included in the tables of derogation in section I.  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NO  Only one recommendation former to 2012. Nothing about the recommendation made by RCM_LDF 2013 proving that MS has no more obligation regarding CECAF area.	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  NA	No action needed
C1 Aci	ta quality: Re	Are the responsive actions acceptable? dishortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Susults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets mel? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Sigional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions acceptable? dishortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	WS meets some difficulties with the sampling of LPF fisheries. MS will try, during the next RCM Med&BS and PGMed, to harmonize and improve the sampling activy with the other Mediterranean countries involved in these fisheries, in order to optimize the sampling "coverage" at regional level.  Yes  No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables. No quantitative information provided on CECAF fisheries in 2013 AR. MS states in its 2013 AR that RCM_LDF agreed in 2013 that Italian fishing activities in CECAF area can be considered as negligeable. But this exemption was decided only in September 2013 and is not included in the tables of derogation in section I.  NA  NA  NA  NA  NO  Only one recommendation former to 2012. Nothing about the recommendation made by RCM_LDF 2013 proving that MS has no more obligation regarding CECAF area.  No  No shortfall raised by MS	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  NA	No action needed

Mem	ber State:	Italy	1	los	dgement levels
WEITI	bei State.	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	31 May 2014 December 2010	No Partly	<10% 10-50%
		version of the NF proposal	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
				INA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	Yes. MS to implement GFCM data
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Mostly. Monitoring for the 3 required species BFT, eel and		collection framework for recreational
		proposal?	sharks are detailed but no specific data collection	Manthi	fisheries for coastal sharks and rays
		Are obtained derogations mentioned?	programme for sharks in place.  No reference made to derogations.	Mostly NA	once this framework is finalised.  No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	Impossible to evaluate because MS provided limited		
		Are the deviations justified?	quantitative data. No comments	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
D2	Data quality: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal	INO COMMENTS	IVA	No action needed
		Were data quality targets provided?			AR2014: MS to provide more detailed
			MS stated all is ok, but no quantitative data provided.  Impossible to evaluate because MS provided no	Mostly	information on data quality.
		Were data quality targets met?	quantitative estimates on recreational catches.	Mostly	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments No comments	NA NA	No action needed
D3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations	INO COMMENTS	IVA	No action needed
	·	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No reference made to derogations	NA	No action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No recommendation adressed to MS by RCM MED&BS 2012.	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
D4	Actions to avoid	i shortfalls			Yes. MS to implement GFCM data
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No shortfall raised by MS		collection framework for recreational
		The Leading to design character in the future described f	S. Main raided by 1910	Mostly	fisheries for coastal sharks and rays once this framework is finalised.
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
E Biologi	cal stock-related v	variables			
		Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	According to table III.A.1, MS is operating in Region MED&BS and Other/CECAF	Yes	No action needed
Region Mediterrar	nean Sea and Blac		INCORPORATION OF THE PROPERTY	i	
E1		Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table properly filled	Yes	No action needed
		gallouineo.	Table impossible to evaluate regarding NP objectives as		nto dello mocada
			AR results are not provided at the same scale. Most of the stocks listed in AR table III.E.3 appear as oversampled.		
			Few stocks were partly undersampled, all in GSAs 9 and	Mostly	
		And declare and a delaction and a second second second second second second	17 (why ?). Information on biological variables from		
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	collection of eel (see AR text section III.E.5) to be added to Table III.E.3.		add eel to Table III.E.3
			MS states in its AR that oversampling has not financial		
			effect on foreseen NP budget. For some species, it was	Yes	
			not possible to reach in 2013 a "consistent" number of specimens for udating biological arameters.		
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed  No action needed
E2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal			The detion needed
			Yes. CVs are provided by stock (by GSA). MS effort to	Yes	
		Were CV estimates provided?	estimte ome CVs for Elasmobranchs shall be underlined.	165	No action needed
			CVs were estimated by stock (GSA level). Precision target	Monthy	
		Were CV targets met?	is reached only for 87 parameters on the 482 updated.	Mostly	No action needed
			Reasons given by MS are seasonality of catches for some		
		Are the deviations explained?	metiers or some stocks and their low volumes of landings or availibity for sampling.	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
E3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?	See section I.	Yes	No action needed
		were the relevant derogations listed?	Only recommendations from RCM MED&BS and LM 2012	165	No action needed
			must be listed, not those given in the former years. No	Yes	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	recommandations on stock variables were adressed to MS by these bodies in 2012.		No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No action needed
E4	Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
E#	AUGUS (U AVOIC		MS will continue to investigate at National and Regional	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	level the best approach to estimate CVs.	Yes	No action needed
Region Other region	ons	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	162	No action needed
E1		Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No information provided on CECAF stocks, neither in NP nor AR tables.	NA	No action needed
			No information provided in NP 2013. In its AR 2013, MS		dollon needed
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	did not mention to have request a derogation for CECAF	NA	No action peeded
		proposal?	region.  MS catch is a small part of the EU landings in the CECAF		No action needed
			area. MS is ready to contribute to an international	NA	
		Are the deviations explained?	sampling programme implemented under the RCM_LDF umbrella.	***	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
E2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal			
		Were CV targets met?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
		Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA	No action needed
E3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations	No derogation was requested by MS	NA	No action pooded
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation was requested by MS.  No 2012 recommendation, even the 2013 one from		No action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	RCM_LDF on the international agreement.	NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
E4	Actions to avoid			INO.	INO AUTOIT HEEGEU
			MS is ready to contribute to an international sampling	AIA	Ma action manded
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	programme implemented under the RCM_LDF umbrella.	NA	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
F Transv	ersal variables	guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		guidenties :	No comments	res	No action needed

ме	mber State:	Italy AR year	2013	Ju Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	December 2010 EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
		Overall complianc		Yes	>90%
		·	-	NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
F1	Capacity			.,,	
	F11 Ach	ievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		T	<del></del>
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	=	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F13 Acti	ions to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
F2	Effort				
	F11 Ach	ievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP		Τ	Т
		proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F12 Dat	Are the deviations justified? a quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	FIZ Dat	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F13 Foll	ow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F14 Acti	ions to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Vaa	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
F3	Landings	•			
	F11 Ach	are design and achievements consistent with the NR		T	_
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	E40 0	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F12 Dat	a quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F13 Foll	ow-up of Regional and international recommendations	no valouest vacament dations	Yes	The estion product
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?	no relevant recommendations  No comments	Yes	No action needed  No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F14 Acti	ions to avoid shortfalls			The second second
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
G Rese	earch surveys at s	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	nto commonto	100	The detion record
G1	Achievement	s: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		guidelines? proposal?	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No major deviations	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Maps of hauls actually carried out are presented in Annex only.	Yes	No action needed
G2	Data quality:	Results and deviation from NP proposal	Unity.	165	No action needed
		Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g.			
		no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
					Yes. MS to ensure administrative and
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes. MEDITS in GSA 16 started in September due to administrative and bureaucratic difficulties.	Mostly	bureaucratic difficulties do not delay surveys in future years.
		The the deviations explained:		Iviostry	
		Are the deviations justified?	No details given on 'bureaucratic difficulties encountered'	Mostly	No action needed
G3	rollow-up of	Regional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning		1	Т
		Groups listed?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed
G4	Actions to av	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  oid shortfalls	Yes	res	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
IV Madela 19		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		economic situation of the aquaculture and processing indu- cerning the aquaculture	sıry		
	or duta cont	Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
		guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
A.4	Achious	guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
A1	Acrievements	: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
		proposal?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	No actions needed No actions needed
A2	Data quality: F	Results and deviation from NP proposal	[.55	100	nto dollono nocucu
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
А3	Follow-up of B	Are the deviations justified?  legional and international recommendations	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
	3 op 0/ //	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed
A4	Actions to avo	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No actions needed
A4	ACTIONS TO SAND	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
B Colle	ection of data cond	cerning the processing industry	Vee	V	Ne estima per de d
		guidelines? guidelines?	Yes have 12% achieved sample rate	Yes Mostly	No actions needed Table should be corrected
B1	Achievements	: Results and deviation from NP proposal	nate 1270 demoved sample rate	INIOSUY	Lable should be contected
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	V	.,	N
		proposal? Are the deviations explained?	Yes NA	Yes NA	No actions needed No actions needed
		Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed
			·	-	

ме	mber State:	Italy			ludgement levels
		AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	December 2010	Partly	10-50%
			EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%
				NA	not applicable
B2	Data quality: Par	sults and deviation from NP proposal	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
DZ	Data quality. Hes	Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No actions needed
		Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed
В3	Follow up of Poo	gional and international recommendations	IVA	INA	INO actions fleeded
В	rollow-up of neg	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA NA	NA	No actions needed
		Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed
B4	Actions to avoid		IVA	INA	INO actions needed
D4	Actions to avoid	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
V Module of evalu	ation of the offcets	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem	100	162	nao actions needed
		d deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Voc	No action needed
		is rable v. r complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes derogations are listed in text but under section	Yes	INO action needed
2 Actio	ns to avoid shortfalls	Are the relevant derogations listed?	'general framework'	NA	No action needed
Z Actio	ns to avoid shortians				AR2014: MS to provide more detailed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No relevant information provided; not possible to assess.	Mostly	information how to avoid shortfalls
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
VI Module for man	agement and use of			!	
		d deviation from NP proposal			
			Mostly. SGMOS or Processing call are for example not		
		Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	listed. What is about the MAREA project?	Mostly	Please provide missing information.
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Not relevant. Table VI.1 is only a sheet to be filled in AR. Data calls are mandatory.	Yes	No action needed
		Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Only general information provided by MS on its national DB in its NP. AR mentionned progress made in year 2013,		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	under a concise but precise form.	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
2 Actio	ns to avoid shortfalls				
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
VII Follow-up of ST	ECF recommendation				
		Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
VIII List of acronym	s and abbreviations				
IX Comments, sug	gestions and reflect	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	-	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
X References			N. AEDITO Handlerd, During and A. Seeds	ı	IADOOL 4. MO to asset to the second
		Is there a complete list of references?	No (MEDITS-Handbook. Revision n. 6, April 2012, MEDITS Working Group: 92 pp. is not included)	Mostly	AR2014: MS to ensure complete list of references is provided.
XI Annexes				ı	_
		Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information		Yes	
			1		
		to support statements made in the main text?	No comments		No action needed

			_		
Men	nber State:	Latvia			Judgement levels
		AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	5 June 2014 October 2011? (amended for 2012)	No Partly	<10% 10-50%
		version of the NF proposal	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
		·		NA	not applicable
I General framew	ork		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
	•••				In the future MS should move
					derogations table to chapter I.
			Yes (in section II.A, though)		Moreover, In the text, MS should
		Annual constitution of Posts alo		V	consistently refer to 'Annual Report'
II National data co	ollection organisat	Are derogations listed?		Yes	instead of 'Technical Report'
		t and participating institutes			
		Are the partners involved in the national			
		data collection and their roles well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		described:			
		Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments	No	MS should install a DCF website
		Is the information provided on the website	L		
		in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	No comments	No	MS should install a DCF website
		Is there an overview and description of			MS should provide requested
		contents of national coordination	No comments	No	information
		meetings?			
		If yes, is the list filled in according the	No comments	No	MS should provide requested
D Donie	and and Internation	guidelines?	110 001111101110		Iinformation
B Regio	nal and Internation	international meetings			
ы	Accordance Of	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at			
		planned meetings explained?	Attendance at all planed meetings	Yes	No action needed
B2	Follow-up of r	egional and international recommendation	ns -	1	
		Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		The are respensive assent assoptable.	The commente	100	THE delicit Heeded
	valuation of the fis				
A Gener	ral description of	the fishing sector		1	T
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any)			In the future MS should apply
			Only general description of fishery. No changes are		guidelines and describe major chang
		well described?	described.	Partly	in the fishing sector, where applicable
		Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra	-		
	omic variables	region given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
SUPRA-REGION	l Baltic Sea, North	Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlanti Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent	C	1	
		with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent		100	
		with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent	No comments	.,	
D4	A = l=:	with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
B1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent			
		with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
B2	Data quality: R	esults and deviation from NP proposal		1	
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA NA	No action needed
В3	Follow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations	·		
	•	Are the relevant recommendations from			
		LM listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
54	A officers to the state of the	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
B4	Actions to avoi	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future		1	
		described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future			
		acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
SUPRA-REGION	l Other regions	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent		1	
		with AR quidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent		100	
		with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent	No. and and an analysis of the second	.,	No service and the
<b>D</b> 4	A . I	with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
B1	Acnievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent		1	
		with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
B2	Data quality: R	esults and deviation from NP proposal			
	,	Is respective data quality information			
		given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
D0	Ealler	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
В3	rollow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from		1	1
		LM listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed

No comments No comments

No comments

No comments

No comments

Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

В4

Yes Yes

Yes

NA

NA

No action needed No action needed

No action needed

No action needed

No action needed

Member State:

С

C1

C2

C3

C4

Region North Atlantic C1

C2

C3

C4

**Region Other regions** C1

with AR guidelines?
Are design and achievements consist

with the NP proposal?

Judgement levels 2013 Compliance level Compliance clas June 2014 Version of the AR reviewed No <10% Version of the NP proposal ober 2011? (amended for 2012) Partly 10-50% **EWG Answer** Mostly 50-90% Overall compliance Yes >90% not applicable **EWG COMMENTS** EWG judgement EWG Biological metier related variables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? Yes Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Yes No action needed Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Yes No action needed table. There is no need to calculate precision for volume of discards. CVs should be reported in absolute numbers (e.g. 0.11) instead of percentages (e.g. 11%), see guidelines p. 15. Not clear what the Latvian planned sample numbers are from Table III.C.5, as there are two different sampling intensities/levels given at the regional Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent MS to provide the National Planned evel and no National planned numbers appear in this with AR guidelines?
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent Mostly Sample numbers Γable Yes, but no evidence of concurrent sampling from this table. AR text mentions added metier 'GNS\_DEF\_>=157' or with AR guidelines? Yes No action needed turbot, but in the tables, it only occurs in Table III.C.6. To be added to Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4. Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Mostly No action needed to clarify if the excess sampling, is extreme oversampling of FYK\_FWS\_0\_0\_0 and at National expense or is being GNS\_FWS\_0\_0\_0. MS argues that many trips had to be charged to the DCF? sampled to reach sufficient numbers per species, but much more perch, pike-perch, sea trout and whitefish nave been measured by MS than planned at regional level (Table III.C.5). Does this excess sampling have Are the deviations explained? inancial implications? Mostly Are the deviations justified? Yes NA Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Yes Yes No action needed Were CV targets met? Mostly Mostly No action needed Are the deviations explained? No action needed Are the deviations justified? Yes No action needed Follow-up of Regional and international recommendati Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from NA No action needed Yes No action needed Are the responsive actions described? Yes No action needed Are the responsive actions acceptable? Yes Yes No action needed Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Yes No action needed Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Yes No action needed Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 comp with AR guidelines? No comments Yes No action needed Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? No comments Yes No action needed CVs should be reported in absolute numbers (e.g. 0.11) Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent instead of percentages (e.g. 11%), see guidelines p. 15 Yes, but no evidence of concurrent sampling from this Yes No action needed with AR guidelines? able Yes No action needed Are design and achievements consiste with the NP proposal? edfish: 5-times higher length sampling than planned Yes No action needed Are the deviations explained? Yes Yes No action needed Are the deviations justified? No action needed Yes Yes Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Yes Yes No action needed Were CV targets met? Yes Yes No action needed Are the deviations explained NA NA No action needed NA Are the deviations justified? NA No action needed Follow-up of Regional and international recommendation Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from NA No action needed No LM listed? Yes No action needed Yes Are the responsive actions described ? Partly, the MS simply states "acomplished" Partly, the MS simply states "acomplished", so not able Partly No action needed Are the responsive actions acceptable? to judge the action Partly No action needed Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future No action needed described? NA Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the futur acceptable? NA No action needed Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and con vith AR guidelines? Region should be 'Other regions', and RFMO 'CECAF' Yes No action needed Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent Region should be 'Other regions', and RFMO 'CECAF' Yes No action needed with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent Region should be 'Other regions', and RFMO 'CECAF' Yes No action needed

Region should be 'Other regions', and RFMO 'CECAF'

MS refers to multilateral agreement

Yes

Yes

No action needed

No action needed

Version of the AR reviewed         5 June 2014         No           Version of the NP proposal         October 2011? (amended for 2012)         Partly           EWG Answer         Mostly           Overall compliance         Mostly	ed e
Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal Cobober 2017 (amended for 2012) — Partly Wersion of the NP proposal Cobober 2017 (amended for 2012) — Partly West No. (action needs NA — Are the deviations explained? Are the repossive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the responsive actions described? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the deviations explained? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent which the NP proposal? Are the deviation explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are the deviation explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are the deviation from NP proposal Are the deviation is subtlied? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are the deviation from NP proposal Are the deviation is subtlied? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are the deviation is subtlied? Are the responsive actions described? A	<10% 10-50% 50-90% >90% applicable  ad
Version of the NP proposal Overall compliance   Nose   N	10-50% 50-90% 50-90% >90% applicable  add add add add add add add add add a
Comparison   Com	50-90% >90% >90% applicable  ad
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations published? Are the deviations published? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV setsmates provided? Are the deviations substified? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations applained? Are the deviations published? Are the deviations applained? Are the deviations published? Are the deviations applained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations published? Are the deviations pu	applicable  ad  ad  ad  ad  ad  ad  ad  ad  ad  a
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustfied? Are the deviations pustfied? Are the relevant decreations listed? Are the relevant decreations listed? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Begion Battic Sea D1  Actions to avoid shortfalls Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustfied? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustfied? Are the responsive actions acceptable? A	ed e
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations gustified?  C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pusitified?  D Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided? Are the deviations explained?	ed e
Are the deviations explained?  C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the relevant recommendations from LM isted? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations are plained? Are the deviations is published? Are the deviations is published? Are the deviations explained?	ed e
Na	ed e
C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Mere CV estimates provided? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations is tested? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are declarated from the proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the relevant derogations from LM listed? Are the relevant derogations from LM listed? Are the relevant deviations explained? A	ed ded ded ded ded ded ded ded ded ded
Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations from LM listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM is term of the deviations justified?  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Are the responsive actions of acceptable?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are deviations explained? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations suplained? Are the deviations suplained? Are the deviations pusitised? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pusitised? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the relevant deviations acceptable?  No comments No comme	ed ded ded ded ded ded ded ded ded ded
Were CV targets met? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations pustified?  C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations  Were the relevant devogations isled? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  D1 Recreational fisheries Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are deaign and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations systified?  D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations from LM listed? Are the deviations systified? Are the deviations systified? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Are the relevant derogations international recommendations from LM listed? Are the relevant derogations international recommendations from LM listed? Are the relevant deviations acceptable? Are the relevant derogations acceptable? Are the relevant deviations pustified? Are the relevant deviations acceptable? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Ar	ed ded ded ded ded ded ded ded ded ded
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pusitified?  Regional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future  Are the deviations explained? Are the d	ed e
Are the deviations justified?  Region Baltic Sea  D1  Actions to avoid shortalls Are design and achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations sustlied? Are the deviations acceptable?  D2  D3  Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations isted? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions on succeptable?  C4  Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  D3  Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations  No  NA  NA  NA  No action needs  No  NA  NA  NA  No action needs  NA  NA  No action needs  No  No  No  Na  NA  No  No  Na  No  No  Na  No  No  Na  No  No	ed e
C3   Follow-up of Regional and International recommendations   Na Na No action needs   No Na Na No action needs   No Na Na No action needs   No Na Na Na action needs   No Na Are the responsive actions acceptable?   Na Na Na action needs   Na Na Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal Are deviations explained?   Na Na Na action needs	ed e
Were the relevant derogations islade? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  D Recreational fisheries  Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?  Region Baltic Sea  D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pusified? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pusified?  D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets mer? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pusified?  D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions ac	ed ded ded ded ded ded ded ded ded ded
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the deviation size in formation on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets movider? Are the deviations pustified? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsiv	ed ded ded ded ded ded ded ded ded ded
Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Beginn Baltic Sea  D1  Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are deviations and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustfied? Are the deviations explained? Are the relevant derogations listed? No comments No comm	ed e
Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  D Recreational fisheries  Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the referent recommendations from LM isted? Are the refevant recommendations from LM isted? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive action	ed e
Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  D Recreational fisheries Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?  Are design and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  D Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations justified?  D Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations pustified?  D Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations pustified?  D Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations pustified?  D Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets met? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future  Ves (Shaustive sampling)  Ves (Shau	ed e
Actions to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Described Part actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Described Part Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Described Part Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Described Part Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Described Part Actions to avoid shortfalls  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations international recommendations  Were data quality targets mer?  Are the deviations justified?  No comments  No comm	ed e
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  D. Recreational fisheries Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?  Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  D. Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets provided? Are the deviations justified?  Are the deviations justified?  No comments No	ed
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  NA No action needs  Part Region Baltic Sea  Bi information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?  Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations justified?  Are the deviations explained? Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  No comments No c	ed
acceptable?    NA	ed ed ed ed
Region Baltic Sea  D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? No comments No comment	ed ed ed ed
Region Baltic Sea D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation systified?  D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations from NP proposal Were data quality targets met? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations Were the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future  Actions to avoid shortfalls  Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Achievements: As a selevant Sea is relevant Yes No action needs No comments No comments Yes No action needs No comments Yes No action needs No comments No com	ed ed ed
Region Baltic Sea  D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	ed ed ed
Region Baltic Sea D1	ed ed ed
D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets provided? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations pustified? No comments No c	ed ed
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations pustified?  D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future  Are the deviations prom LM isted? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future  Are the deviations pustified?  No comments  No comments  Yes No action needs Are (derogation on cod sampling) Yes No action needs No comments NA NA No action needs No comments NA NA No action needs No comments No comments No comments Yes No action needs No comments No comments Yes No action needs No comments Yes No action needs No comments No comments Yes No action needs No comments No comments No comments Yes No action needs No comments	ed ed
with the NP proposal? Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? No comments  No comments  Ves (exhaustive sampling)  No comments  No commen	ed ed
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets mer? Are the deviations justified?  No comments   ed ed	
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	ed
Are the deviations justified?  Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  No comments  N	
D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? No comments No	<u>,                                    </u>
Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? No comments	
Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls  Were data quality targets met? No comments No comment	ed
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Pollow-up of Regional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Actions to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	
Are the deviations justified?  No comments  No comments  No comments  No action needs  No comments  No action needs  No action needs  No comments  No action needs	
PGRES/WGRFS recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Actions to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	
Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  PGRFS/WGRFS recommendations mentioned No comments Pess No action needed No comments Poss No action needed No comments Pess No action needed No comments Poss No action needed No comments	<u> </u>
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	-d
LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future  PGRFS/WGRFS recommendations mentioned Yes No action needed No comments Yes No action needed No co	
Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	ed
Are the responsive actions acceptable?  No comments  Yes  No action needs  Actions to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	
D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	
described? No shortfalls NA No action needs	
The determination of the deter	ed De
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	
acceptable? NA NA No action neede	ed .
Region North Atlantic	
D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent	
with the NP proposal? NA (no recreational fisheries in this region) NA No action needs	ad
Are obtained derogations mentioned?  NA No action needs  NA No action needs	
Are the deviations explained? NA NA No action needs	
Are the deviations justified? NA NA No action neede	ed De
D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
Were data quality targets provided?  NA  NA  No action needs	
Were data quality targets met?  NA  No action needs	
Are the deviations explained? NA No action needs Are the deviations justified? NA NA No action needs	
Are the deviations justified? IVA IND action needs  D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	
Were the relevant derogations listed? NA NA No action needs	ed
Are the relevant recommendations from	
LM listed? Yes, but no recreational fisheries is undertaken by Latvia NA No action needs	
Are the responsive actions described ? NA NA No action needs	
Are the responsive actions acceptable? NA NA No action needs	#d
D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? NA NA No action neede	2d
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	
acceptable? NA No action needs	ed
Biological stock-related variables	
Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each res Yes Yes Yes Yes No action needs	ed
Region Baltic Sea	_
E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent	
with AR guidelines?	iu .
As design and exhibit annual considerable oversampling of maturity@age for herring	
Are design and achievements consistent in SD 25-27, 28.2, 29, 32; eastern Baltic cod, perch, Yes No action needs	a a
with the NP proposal? <u>Iflounder and turbot</u> Are the deviations explained? Yes Yes No action neede	
	nd.
Are the deviations justified?  Yes  Yes  No action needs	
E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	ed
Were CV estimates provided? Yes Yes No action neede	ed
Were CV estimates provided?     Yes     Yes     No action needs       Were CV targets met?     in less than half of the cases     Partly     No action needs	ed ed
Were CV estimates provided?     Yes     Yes     No action needed       Were CV targets met?     in less than half of the cases     Partly     No action needed       Are the deviations explained?     Yes     Yes     No action needed	ed ed ed
Were CV estimates provided?       Yes       No action needed         Were CV targets met?       in less than half of the cases       Partly       No action needed         Are the deviations explained?       Yes       Yes       No action needed         Are the deviations justified?       Yes       Yes       No action needed	ed ed ed
Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations  Yes  Yes  Partly No action neede Yes Yes Yes No action neede	ed ed ed ed
Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pusified?  Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Wes  Yes  Yes  No action neede Yes  Yes  Yes  No action neede Yes  Yes  Yes  No action neede Yes  Yes  Yes  No action neede	ed ed ed ed
Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from  Were the relevant recommendations from  No action neede  Yes  Yes  No action neede  Yes  Yes  No action neede  Yes  No action neede	ed ed ed ed ed
Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Were CV targets met? In less than half of the cases Partly No action needs Yes Yes No action needs Yes No action needs Yes No action needs No relevant recommendations made by RCM Baltic NA No action needs	ed e
Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?  NA  Wes  Yes  Partly No action neede Yes  Yes No action neede Yes No action neede Yes No relevant actions made by RCM Baltic NA No action neede	ed e
Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	ed e
Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the	ed bed bed bed bed bed bed bed bed bed b

		<b>.</b>		1		
M	/lemb	er State:		0010		idgement levels
			AR year Version of the AR reviewed	<b>2013</b> 5 June 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
			Version of the NP proposal	October 2011? (amended for 2012)	Partly	10-50%
			Overall compliance	EWG Answer Mostly	Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
			Overall compliance	Mostly	NA NA	not applicable
				EWO COMMENTO	FWO in december	FWO
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
			acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
Region Nortl						
E1	1	Achieveme	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent	MS has reported length only as a stock related variable,	ı	IMC to compat this year atting a great in
			with AR guidelines?	as opposed to length@age	Partly	MS to correct this reporting error in future reports.
			Are design and achievements consistent	redfish: oversampling >500%	Yes	No action needed
			with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
E2	2	Data quality	: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Were CV estimates provided?	Yes, but for length so not for any stock related variable	No	MS to correct this reporting error in
			were CV estimates provided:			future reports.  MS to correct this reporting error in
			Were CV targets met?	No	No	future reports.
				Yes, MS does not have age reading expertise, so cannot	Yes	MS should make an effort to collect
			Are the deviations explained?	age the otoliths collected.	162	weights at sea, when otoliths are being extracted by the contractor.
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
E	3	Follow-up o	of Regional and international recommendation			To a contract of
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA One RCM North Atlantic recommendation listed, others	NA	No action needed MS to ensure all relevant LM
			Are the relevant recommendations from	were also made by the RCM 2012, but these have not	Partly	recommendations are addressed in
			LM listed?	been included.		future.
				Only for one recommendation	Partly	MS to ensure allrelevant LM recommendations are addressed in
			Are the responsive actions described?	Only for one recommendation	rainy	future.
						MS to ensure allrelevant LM
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Acceptable for the one recommendation listed	Partly	recommendations are addressed in future.
E4	4	Actions to a	avoid shortfalls		I	lature.
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future			
			acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
Region Othe	_					
E1	1	Achieveme	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent		ı	T
			with AR guidelines?	Region should be 'Other regions', and RFMO 'CECAF'	Yes	No action needed
			Are design and achievements consistent		Yes	No action needed
			with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	MS refers to multilateral agreement MS refers to multilateral agreement	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
E2	2	Data quality	: Results and deviation from NP proposal		•	•
			Were CV estimates provided?	MS refers to multilateral agreement	NA NA	No action needed
			Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?	MS refers to multilateral agreement MS refers to multilateral agreement	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA NA	No action needed
E3	3	Follow-up o	of Regional and international recommendatio	ns	'	
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation required, as only one metier involved	NA	No action needed
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations from RCM LDF	NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
E4	4	Actions to a	avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	Nie wooded oo een kilettevel oover ook is in wheel to	ı	
			described ?	No needed as a multilatteral agreement is in place to cover this sampling.	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	The state of the s	Yes	No action needed
F Tr	rancva	rsal variable	acceptable?	cover this sampling.		
. "	.a.isve	Jai vai läule	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent			MS should apply footnote c in the
			with AR guidelines?	Yes. Footnote is not applied	Yes	future
F1	1	Capacity F11 A	phiovements: Possilte and deviation from NB	pageal		
		TII A	chievements: Results and deviation from NP pro Are design and achievements consistent	pusai		
			with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	NA NA	No action needed
		F13 A	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		A	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future			
			described?	No shortfalls	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F2	2	Effort	•			
		F11 A	chievements: Results and deviation from NP pro	posal	T	
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		<b>F12</b> D	ata quality: Results and deviation from NP propo	osal		1
			Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		<b>F13</b> Fo	ollow-up of Regional and international recommen Are the relevant recommendations from	ndations		1
			LM listed?	No relevant recomendations	NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		F14 A	ctions to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future		<u> </u>	<u></u>
			described?	No shortfalls	NA	No action needed

MEIII	ber State:	Latvia AP year	2012		dgement levels
		AR year	<b>2013</b> 5 June 2014	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	October 2011? (amended for 2012)	No Partly	<10% 10-50%
		rototon of the proposal	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%
				NA	not applicable
			EWC COMMENTS	EWC independent	EWC
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F3	Landings				
	•	evements: Results and deviation from NP pro	posal		
		Are design and achievements consistent			
		with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	F12 Data	quality: Results and deviation from NP proportion is respective data quality information	sal	1	
		given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
	F13 Follo	w-up of Regional and international recommer		10/1	140 dollori ricodod
		Are the relevant recommendations from			
		LM listed?	No relevant recomendations	NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	F14 Action	ons to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	No shortfallo	NIA	No action non-de-d
		described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	No shortfalls	NA	No action needed
		acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
Resear	rch surveys at se	•	rio commonto	1 19/5	p. 15 dollori ricodoù
G1		:: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent	Number of hauls planned and achieved in Acoustic		Yes. MS to update table with num
		with AR guidelines?	surveys are missing	Mostly	fish hauls
		Are design and achievements consistent	Number of hauls planned and achieved in Acoustic		Yes. MS to update table with num
		with the NP proposal?	surveys are missing in AR but presented in NP	Mostly	fish hauls
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments  Maps put in annex 2 instead of in the main body text	Yes	No action needed
		Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	according to the Guidelines.	Mostly	AR2014: Maps to be put in main b
G2	Data quality: F	Results and deviation from NP proposal	decoraing to the daldennes.	iviostry	text of the report.
<b>-</b>	zata quanty	Is the quality of the survey indices likely to		1	
		be kept (by e.g. no change in gear			
		settings, sufficient geographical coverage			
		etc.)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
-00	F-11	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
G3	Follow-up of F	Regional and international recommendation Are the relevant recommendations from	18		
		Survey Planning Groups listed?	No relevant recommendations exists	NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
G4	Actions to avo			•	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future			
		described?	No shortfalls identified	NA	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
of the ev	aluation of the e	conomic situation of the aquaculture and			110 000011100000
		erning the aquaculture	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		
		Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?	No data collection due to derogation, only freshwater	NA	No action needed
		Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent			
		with AR guidelines?	no comments	NA	No action needed
		Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent			
		with AR guidelines?	no comments	NA	No action needed
A1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent	<del> </del>		
		with the NP proposal?	no comments	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	no comments	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained:  Are the deviations justified?	no comments	NA NA	No action needed
A2	Data quality: D	esults and deviation from NP proposal	no sommento	I INA	n.o dollon needed
~-	Data quality. In	Is respective data quality information			
		given?	no comments	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	no comments	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	no comments	NA	No action needed
A3	Follow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from			No contract of the
		LM listed?	no comments	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	no comments	NA NA	No action needed
64	Actions to avoi	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments	NA	No action needed
A4	Actions to avol	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	no comments	NA	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future		NA NA	No action needed
Collect	tion of data cond	erning the processing industry	and dominionid	I INA	I COUCH HOUSE
301166		Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent	Yes, but according to text and table.IV.B.2 scheme A		
		with AR guidelines?	and B have been used. This should be indicated.	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent			
		with AR guidelines?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
B1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent			
		with the NP proposal?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>.</b>	D-1	Are the deviations justified?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
B2	Data quality: R	esults and deviation from NP proposal		T	
		Is respective data quality information given?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
			pro commonto	100	aonon needed
		- <del>-</del>	no comments	Vac	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	no comments no comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed

IV

Member State:	Latvia		.1	udgement levels
mombor otator	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
	Version of the AR reviewed	5 June 2014	No	<10%
	Version of the NP proposal	October 2011? (amended for 2012)	Partly	10-50%
	version of the IVI proposal	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
	Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
	Overall Compliance	MOSTLY	NA NA	not applicable
			INA	not applicable
		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
	Are the relevant recommendations from			
	LM listed?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
B4 Actions to av				
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future			
	described ?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future			
	acceptable?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
Module of evaluation of the effe	cts of the fishing sector on the marine ecos	vstem		•
	and deviation from NP proposal	,		
1 Nomevernents, riesand	and deviation from M. proposal	Only Baltic Sea is presented in table. For areas CECAF	1	AR2014: MS to include indicators 5, 6
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with	and North Atlantic the indicators 5,6,7 should be	Mostly	7 for CECAF and North Atlantic. MS
	AR guidelines?	included	iviostiy	also to include this in NP
	•		NIA.	
	Are the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations	NA	No action needed
2 Actions to avoid shortf			•	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future		NA	
	described?	No shortfalls identified	101	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future		NA	
	acceptable?	NA	101	No action needed
I Module for management and us	e of the data			
<ol> <li>Achievements: Results</li> </ol>	and deviation from NP proposal			
	• •	Yes, apart from: Redfish data should also go to ICES		MS should implement amendments in
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with	North-Western Working Group (NWWG). Table should		the future
	AR guidelines?	also contain aquaculture as column header	Yes	and ratare
	Are the "Transmission of data"			
	achievements consistent with the NP			
	proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Is progress in the "Management of data"		1	
	section well detailed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the			
	NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained:  Are the deviations justified?		NA NA	No action needed
	•	No comments	INA	ino action needed
2 Actions to avoid shortf			1	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	l.,	1	
	described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	l.,		h
	acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
II Follow-up of STECF recommen				
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations			
	listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
III List of acronyms and abbreviat	The state of the s			
List of actoriyins and appleviat	Is there a list of acronyms and		1	_
	abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		INO COMMENTS	1	INO ACION NECUCO
Comments, suggestions and re				
	Are there any comments, suggestions	l.,	Yes	
	and/or reflections ?	No comments	100	No action needed
References				
			No	AR2014: MS to include list of
	Is there a complete list of references?	No reference list available	INO	references
I Annexes	The second secon			
	Do the provided annexes contain the			
	relevant information to support statements		Yes	No action needed

	Memb	er State:	Lithuania	1	lu	dgement levels
	Went	oei State.	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	5 June 2014	No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2012? EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
			Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
				L	NA	not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
I	General framework	(				Action needed? MS should provide a table of
				No comments		derogations or a sentence, that no
II.	National data calls	-41	Are derogations listed?		No	derogations have been asked for.
"	National data collect  A National		ion It and participating institutes			
			Are the partners involved in the national data collection and	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			their roles well described? Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments	No	MS to create a DCF website
			Is the information provided on the website in line with legal	No comments	No	MS to provide necessary content
			requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)? Is there an overview and description of contents of national			MS is asked to provide outlime of main
			coordination meetings?	The outline of outcomes are missing, no annex 2 provided	Mostly	outcomes
			If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?	No comments	No	MS to provide information according the quidelines.
			onal coordination	1		gardennes.
	B1	Attendance of	f international meetings			Ms should provide information about
				Not all necessary cells are filled in (Attendance at National		attendance or non-attendance at
			Is Table II.B.1 complete?  Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings	Correspondent meeting 2013-2 and 2012-04?)	Yes	mentioned NC meetings.
			explained?	All planed meetings were attended	Yes	No action needed
	B2	Follow-up of r	regional and international recommendations	Missing recommendations and actions: RCM Baltic 2012		1
				Métier related variables: Routines for establishing		
				bilatereal agreement, RCM Baltic 2012 - Métier related		
				variables: Routines for establishing bilatereal agreements, RCM Baltic - Sampling of Métier related variables		
				including foreign landings : Requirement of on-line		
			Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting	information on fleet behavior, Métier variables: Metier Descriptions, Stock related variables: Setting up of		Please provide relevant
			listed?	Bilateral agreements	No	recommendations.
			Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	No	Please provide information on actions taken
				No comments		Can only be evaluated after submission
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?		No	of necessary information.
III	Module of the evalu					
	A General	description of	the fishing sector Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact			
			on the NP implementation well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	B Econom	ic variables	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic			
			guidelines? quidelines?	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	No actions needed No actions needed
			Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR	MS should identify clustered sgements with *. Some		Table should be completed and
	B1	Ashiousmantou	guidelines?	variables missing (investment, fin. Pos)	Mostly	resubmitted
	ы	Achievements.	: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
			proposal?	Yes NA	Yes NA	No actions needed No actions needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed
	B2	Data quality: R	lesults and deviation from NP proposal			In
			Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?	Yes NA	Yes NA	No actions needed  No actions needed
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No actions needed
	В3	Follow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed
	D4	A - 1 1	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No actions needed
	B4	Actions to avoi	id shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA I	Yes	No actions needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No actions needed
	SUPRA-REGION O	ther regions	guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	MS should identify clustered segments with *. Some variables missing (investment, fin. Pos)	Mostly	Table should be updated and resubmitted
	B1	Achievements:	: Results and deviation from NP proposal		wiostry	p ====================================
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Vec	Vaa	No actions needed
			proposal? Are the deviations explained?	Yes NA	Yes NA	No actions needed No actions needed
	_		Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA	No actions needed
	B2	Data quality: R	lesults and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA NA	No actions needed
		F. 0	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No actions needed
	В3	rollow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No actions needed
	В4	Actions to avoi	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No actions needed
	D4	notions to avoi	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	Yes	No actions needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No actions needed
	C Biologic	al metier relate	ed variables			
	- Biologic	mouer reidle		Yes (but sampling in ICES V, VI, XII, XIV and NAFO		
				should be described in the AR text under 'North Atlantic',		MS to ensure the text for the different
	Region Baltic Sea		Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	not 'North Sea and Eastern Arctic')	Yes	regions is clearly separated in the text
	C1	Achievements	s: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			guidelines? guidelines?	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
			g=	Column K (Planned minimum no. of fish to be measured	100	no action necueu
				at national level): only length sampling should be included. CVs should be reported in absolute numbers		
			Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	(e.g. 0.11) instead of percentages (e.g. 11%), see		
			guidelines?	guidelines p. 15.	Yes	No action needed

C2		AR year Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal Overall compliance	2013 5 June 2014 31 October 2012? EWG Answer Del Mostty	Compliance class  No Partly  Mostly  Yes	Compliance level <10% 10-50% 50-90%
C2		Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2012? EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
C2		Overall compliance			
<b>C</b> 2		Overall compliance	ne Mostly	Vac	
<b>C2</b>			ccu)		>90%
C2			L	NA	not applicable
C2			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
<b>C2</b>			Mostly as the same species are reported in both tables III.C.5 and III.C.6, with no indication that concurrent		
<b>C</b> 2		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	sampling actually took place. Concurrent sampling at sea is highlighted for 2 metiers, in which case we would expect to see more species listed in Table III.C.6	Mostly	MS to ensure this is addressed in future AR's.
<b>C2</b>		guicomot.	PTM_SPF_16-31_0_0: 8 trips achieved while only 5 were planned. AR text: "Extra trips to gather samples did not require any additional costs." Sprat and herring length	Wodiy	Tuture Aird.
<b>C2</b>		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	sampling, however, was approx. double as high as	Van	
C2		proposal? Are the deviations explained?	planned.	Yes	No action needed
C2		Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed
02	Data quality: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal	res	162	No action needed
	Duta quanty. Th	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Were CV targets met?	Yes (only slightly missed for eel in Fyke nets)	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
C3	Follow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations			
		Mare the relevant development listed?	No deventions listed as we assume more have been year	Ne	MS to clarify if any derogations have
		Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No derogations listed, so we assume none have been required.  RCM Baltic 2012 recommendations listed.	No Yes	been requested  No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
C4	Actions to avoi				
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
ion North Sea ar					
C1 .	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal guidelines?	Vos	Yes	No action pooded
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR	Yes	res	No action needed
		guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	CVs should be reported in absolute numbers (e.g. 0.11) instead of percentages (e.g. 11%), see guidelines p. 15. Species name for pelagic redfish in ICES I-II is Sebastes		
		guidelines?	mentella (instead of S. marinus).	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR	Yes. Species name for pelagic redfish in ICES I-II is		No antique and de
		guidelines?	Sebastes mentella (instead of S. marinus).  OTB_CRU_32-69_0_0, OTM_DEF_100-119_0_0:	Yes	No action needed
			Oversampling (2 trips achieved while only 1 trip was planned. AR text: "Sampling was performed in order to		
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	cover high season of fishery. However, this action did not require extra costs."	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
C2	Data quality: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal			
		Were CV estimates provided?	Mostly, cv not provided for P. borealis	Mostly	MS to provide all cv's in future repo
		Were CV targets met?	Mostly, cv not provided for P. borealis	Mostly	MS to provide all cv's in future repo
		Are the deviations avalained?	No, deviations explained for numbers of trips achieved only and not for cv's	Ne	MS to provide details relating to cv's future reports.
		Are the deviations explained?	No,deviations explained for numbers of trips achieved	No	MS to provide details relating to cv's
<b>C3</b>	Follow-up of Re	Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations	only and not for cv's	No	future reports.
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations listed, so we assume none have been requ	No	MS to clarify if any derogations have
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	RCM Baltic 2012 recommendations listed.	Yes	been requested  No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
C4	Actions to avoi			100	No dettori riceded
					MS to provide actions to adress
					shortfalls (e.g in this year, no information was provided on the lac
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No	No	cv's) in future reports
		7.10 delicite to distribute in the relative december :	110		MS to provide actions to adress
					shortfalls (e.g in this year, no
		Are actions to avoid chartfalls in the fature assents 1.1.0	No	No	information was provided on the lac
ion North Atlanti	tic	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No	No	cv's) in future reports
		Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			CVs should be reported in absolute numbers (e.g. 0.11) instead of percentages (e.g. 11%), see guidelines p. 15.		
			The AR text is a little confusing as it combines the North		
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	sea & Eastern Artic with the North Atlantic, under the		MS to ensure the text for the differ
		guidelines?	same section.	Yes	regions is clearly separated in the t
			Yes, as the same species are reported in both tables III.C.5 and III.C.6, with no indication that concurrent		
			sampling actually took place. Concurrent sampling at sea		
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR	is highlighted for 2 metiers, in which case we would expect	V	MS to ensure this is addressed in
		guidelines?	to see more species listed in Table III.C.6  Oversampling (2 trips achieved while only 1 trip was	Yes	future AR's.
			planned. AR text: "Sampling was performed in order to		
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	cover high season of fishery. However, this action did not		
		proposal?	require extra costs."	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Data quality: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal	Ves	V	No action wood - 1
C2		Were CV targets met?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
C2		Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?	Yes NA	Yes	No action needed
C2		Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
C2					
	Follow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations		165	1.40 detion needed

	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
	Version of the AR reviewed	5 June 2014	No	<10%
	Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
	Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
		-	NA	not applicable
		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	RCM North Atlantic 2012 recommendations have not been listed		MS to provide all RCM recommendations and actions tak future reports. This happened as result of both the NS&EA and NA regions being reported under the heading. Ms to avoid this confusi
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	iisted	No No	MS to provide all RCM recommendations and actions tak future reports. This happened as result of both the NS&EA and NA regions being reported under the heading. Ms to avoid this confusion
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No	No No	MS to provide all RCM recommendations and actions tal future reports. This happened as result of both the NS&EA and NA regions being reported under the heading. Ms to avoid this confusi
C4 Actions to avoi	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	the future.
C4 Actions to avoi	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
Other regions				•
C1 Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal	W	.,	- Tr
	guidelines? guidelines?	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
	guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	CECAF: MS refers to multilateral agreement. SPRFMO: no trip achieved (1 trip planned)  Yes	Partiy Yes	MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi - latteral agreements with other countries could take up the sampling obliga in SPRFMO MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi - latteral agreements with other countries could take up the sampling obligatin SPRFMO
C2 Data quality: R	Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal	Yes	Yes	MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi - latteral agreements with other countries could take up the sampling obliga in SPRFMO
	Were CV estimates provided?	MS refers to multilateral agreement which covers the CECAF region. No sampling, therefore no cv's calculated for SPRFMO	Partly	MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi - latteral agreements with other countries could take up the sampling obliga in SPRFMO, and then report cv's.
	Were CV targets met?	MS refers to multilateral agreement which covers the CECAF region. No sampling, therefore no cv's calculated for SPRFMO	Partly	MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi - latteral agreements with other countries could take up the sampling obliga in SPRFMO, and then report cv's.
	Are the deviations explained?	MS refers to multilateral agreement which covers the CECAF region. No sampling, therefore no cv's calculated for SPRFMO	Partly	MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi - latteral agreements with other countries could take up the sampling obliga in SPRFMO, and then report cv's.
C3 Follow-up of R	Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations	MS refers to multilateral agreement which covers the CECAF region. No sampling, therefore no cv's calculated for SPRFMO	Partly	MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi - latteral agreements with other countries could take up the sampling obliga in SPRFMO, and then report cv's.
		No derogations listed, so we assume none have been		MS to clarify if any derogations ha
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	requested RCM LDF 2012 did not make any relevant	No	been requested
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	recommendations.	Yes	No action needed
		RCM LDF 2012 did not make any relevant	162	action recueu
	Are the responsive actions described ?	recommendations.	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions assentable?	RCM LDF 2012 did not make any relevant	Vaa	No action readed
C4 Actions to avoi	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	recommendations.	Yes	No action needed
OT ACTIONS to avoi	M. STOCKERIS			MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi - lattera agreements with other countries could take up the sampling oblige

Member State:		Lithuania	<b>1</b>					
		AR year	2013	Compliance class	udgement levels  Compliance level			
		Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	5 June 2014	No Partly	<10% 10-50%			
		version of the NP proposal	31 October 2012? EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%			
		Overall compliance		Yes	>90%			
			L	NA	not applicable			
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG			
					MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi - latteral			
					agreements with other countries who			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	could take up the sampling obligations in SPRFMO			
		Are actions to avoid shortians in the future acceptable:	165	163	III 3F KI WO			
D Recre	ational fisheries				The second second			
Region Baltic Se	a	Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region	only Baltic Sea is relevant	Yes	No action needed			
D1		Results and deviation from NP proposal						
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Not clear which data (apart from estimated total annual catch weights) have been collected e g Number of boats		Yes. MS to clarify the achievment for the data collected in 2013 for the			
		proposal?	involved etc.	Mostly	different species.			
		Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No derogations	NA	No action needed  Yes. MS to describe deviations in the			
		Are the deviations explained?	No, only brief text on activities	Mostly	report			
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed			
D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Yes. MS to provide information on data								
		Were data quality targets provided?	No clear text provided on data quality	Partly	quality			
		Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed No action needed			
		Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed			
D3	Follow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations						
		Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no derogation listed No comments	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed			
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed			
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed			
D4	Actions to avoid	d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	NA	No action needed			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed			
E Biolog	gical stock-related							
Region Baltic Se	•	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	Yes	Yes	No action needed			
E1		Results and deviation from NP proposal						
			Yes, but the species name for Baltic herring is presented					
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?	as Clupea harengus in Tables III.E.1 - III.E 2 but as Harengus membras in Table III.E.3.	Yes	No action needed			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Undersampling for all four species, especially for cod (42-	Partly	The MS should revise it's planned			
		proposal?	46%) and sprat (62%).	· any	numbers for the biological variables.  The MS should provide detailed			
			General explaination for undersampling, but nothing specific to explain the undersampling of cod and sprat.	Partly	explanations for the low achievement			
		Are the deviations explained?	specific to explain the undersampling of cod and sprat.		rates for cod and sprat. The MS should provide detailed			
			General explaination for undersampling, but nothing specific to explain the undersampling of cod and sprat.	Partly	explanations for the low achievement			
	D-1 D-	Are the deviations justified?	specific to explain the undersampling of cod and sprat.		rates for cod and sprat.			
E2	Data quality: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	No action needed			
			Yes, apart from a few (length@age for eel, weight@age	Yes	No action needed			
		Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?	and sex-ratio@age for sprat) Yes	Yes	No action needed			
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed			
E3	Follow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations	No described Patrick and American		INO to also if a if any day and in a base			
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations listed, so we assume none have been requested	No	MS to clarify if any derogations have been requested			
		· ·	No relevant recommendations proposed by the RCM					
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations proposed by the RCM	Yes	No action needed			
		Are the responsive actions described ?	Baltic	Yes	No action needed			
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No relevant recommendations proposed by the RCM Baltic	Yes	No action needed			
E4	Actions to avoid			100	dollow record			
					MS to provide a description of what			
			No	No	actions they will take to solve the general undersampling of all species,			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?			especially for cod and sprat.			
			N		MS to provide a description of what actions they will take to solve the			
			No	No	general undersampling of all species,			
Region North Se	a and Eastern Arct	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			especially for cod and sprat.			
E1		Results and deviation from NP proposal						
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes. Species name for pelagic redfish in ICES I-II is Sebastes mentella (instead of S. marinus).	Yes	No action needed			
			Shrimp weight@length oversampled, redfish not aged but		MS to provide details of otoliths and			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	otoliths collected (which should be reported in Table III.E.3 according to AR guidelines).	Mostly	associated lengths in Table III.E.3			
			Reason for oversampling shrimps not explained. AR text:	Yes	No action needed			
		Are the deviations explained?	"Oversampling did not require extra costs."	Yes				
E2	Data quality: Re	Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal	Yes	168	No action needed			
	4	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	No action needed			
		Were CV targets met?	For shrimp, but not for redfish.  Yes, highly variable individual weights of redfish.	Mostly Yes	No action needed No action needed			
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes, nignly variable individual weights of redfish.	Yes	No action needed			
E3	Follow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations			•			
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations listed, so we assume none have been requested	No	MS to clarify if any derogations have been requested			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	Yes	No action needed			
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	Yes	No action needed			
E4	Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed			
E <del>4</del>	Actions to avoid	o onormalia	N <sub>2</sub>		MS to provide details on shortfalls for			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No	No	redfish in the NS&EA			
		Are actions to avoid chartfalls in the fature account?	No	NI.	MS to provide details on shortfalls for			
Region North Atl	antic	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		No	redfish in the NS&EA			
gion North Atl								

Member State:		Lishuania	1		
		Lithuania AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	5 June 2014	No No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
		Overall complianc	EWG Answer  Mostly	Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
		Overall compliance	e Mostry	NA NA	not applicable
			<u> </u>		
		guidelines?	Yes Ves	EWG judgement Yes	EWG No action needed
		guidelines:	res	res	Redfish not aged but otoliths collected
			Shrimp and demersal fish in NAFO areas not sampled		(which should be reported in Table
			due to fisheries moratorium. Redfish not aged but otoliths	Yes	III.E.3 according to AR guidelines). MS
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	collected (which should be reported in Table III.E.3 according to AR guidelines).		to take care of this issue in future
		proposal?	according to Art guidelines).		reports
		Are the deviations explained?	in section 'North Sea and Eastern Arctic'	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
E2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal			
		Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Were CV targets met?	No	No	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	in section 'North Sea and Eastern Arctic' Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
E3	Follow-up of Pe	gional and international recommendations	Tes	162	No action needed
	ronow-up or ric	gional and international recommendations	No derogations listed, so we assume none have been		MS to clarify if any derogations have
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	requested	No	been requested
					MS to provide all RCM
					recommendations and actions taken in
					future reports. This happened as a
					result of both the NS&EA and NA
					regions being reported under the same
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	RCM North Atlantic 2012 recommendations have not been listed	No	heading. Ms to avoid this confusion in the future.
		The the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	noted	INU	me ruture.
					MS to provide all RCM
					recommendations and actions taken in
					future reports. This happened as a
					result of both the NS&EA and NA
					regions being reported under the same
					heading. Ms to avoid this confusion in
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No	No	the future.
		The the responsive details described :	140	INO	the ruture.
					MS to provide all RCM
					recommendations and actions taken in
					future reports. This happened as a
					result of both the NS&EA and NA
					regions being reported under the same
					heading. Ms to avoid this confusion in
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	the future.
E4	Actions to avoid	i shortfalls			•
					MS does not have age reading
			in section 'North Sea and Eastern Arctic'. MS does not		expertise in readfish, so cannot age the
			have age reading expertise in readfish, so cannot age the otoliths collected. MS should endeavour to agree for	No	otoliths collected. MS should
			another MS with expertise in reading redfish, to read their	110	endeavour to agree for another MS with
			otoliths.		expertise in reading redfish, to read their otoliths, or request a derogation.
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?			their otolitis, or request a derogation.
					MS does not have age reading
					expertise in readfish, so cannot age the
			No	No	otoliths collected. MS should endeavour to agree for another MS with
					expertise in reading redfish, to read
		Are estimate avaid aboutfalls in the future acceptable?			their otoliths, or request a derogation.
n Other region	ine	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			<u> </u>
E1		Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
					MS to continue to follow up on
					possibilities of signing bi - latteral
					agreements with other countries who
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	CECAF: MS refers to multilateral agreement. SPRFMO:	Danie.	could take up the sampling obligations
		proposal?	no sampling achieved	Partly	in SPRFMO  MS to continue to follow up on
					possibilities of signing bi - latteral
					agreements with other countries who
					could take up the sampling obligations
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	in SPRFMO
		The second secon			MS to continue to follow up on
					possibilities of signing bi - latteral
					agreements with other countries who
					could take up the sampling obligations
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	in SPRFMO
E2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal			<u> </u>
	,	• • •			
					MS to continue to follow up on
					possibilities of signing bi - latteral
			MS refers to multilateral agreement which covers the		agreements with other countries who
			CECAF region. No sampling, therefore no cv's calculated		could take up the sampling obligations
		Were CV estimates provided?	for SPRFMO	Partly	in SPRFMO, and then report cv's.
					MS to continue to follow up on
					possibilities of signing bi - latteral
			MS refers to multilateral agreement which covers the		agreements with other countries who
			CECAF region. No sampling, therefore no cv's calculated		could take up the sampling obligations
		Were CV targets met?	for SPRFMO	Partly	in SPRFMO, and then report cv's.
					MS to continue to follow up on
					possibilities of signing bi - latteral
			MS refers to multilateral agreement which covers the		agreements with other countries who
			CECAF region. No sampling, therefore no cv's calculated		could take up the sampling obligations
		Are the deviations explained?	for SPRFMO	Partly	in SPRFMO, and then report cv's.
			,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•

	per State	: Lithuania AR year	2013	Compliance class	Udgement levels  Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	5 June 2014	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
		Q	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compl	ance Mostly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
				IVA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
					MS to continue to follow up on
					possibilities of signing bi - latte
			MS refers to multilateral agreement which covers the		agreements with other countri
		And the advisoration of the MC	CECAF region. No sampling, therefore no cv's calculated	5	could take up the sampling obl
F0	Falless	Are the deviations justified?	for SPRFMO	Partly	in SPRFMO, and then report cv
E3	rollow-up	of Regional and international recommendations	No derogations listed, so we assume none have been		MS to clarify if any derogations
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	requested	No	been requested
			RCM LDF 2012 did not make any relevant		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	recommendations.  RCM LDF 2012 did not make any relevant	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	recommendations.	Yes	No action needed
			RCM LDF 2012 did not make any relevant	100	To dettor recueu
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	recommendations.	Yes	No action needed
E4	Actions to	avoid shortfalls			
					MS to continue to follow up on
					possibilities of signing bi - latter
					agreements with other countrie
					could take up the sampling obli
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	in SPRFMO
					MS to continue to follow up on
					possibilities of signing bi - latter
					agreements with other countrie
					could take up the sampling obli
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable	Yes	Yes	in SPRFMO
Transvei	rsal variab	es	IIII E 1 in provided in 0 and (shorts) 8 and and		
		Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR	III.F.1 is provided in 2 parts (sheets), fleet segments should be described (instead of "none" either "all		MS should resubmit table III.F.1
		guidelines?	segments" or "no sampling applied")	Mostly	table with the necessary adaptic
F1	Capacity	- -		,	
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No comments		
		proposal?		Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F13	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	FIS	Actions to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable		Yes	No action needed
F2	Effort	The actions to avoid shortialis in the rature acceptable	NO COMMENS	103	140 delion needed
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Na commente		
		proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	=46	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	.,	http://www.neters.com/
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
	F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		100	p. to dollon needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable	No comments	Yes	No action needed
F3	Landings	Ashierramenta, Deculta and decidation 6 122			
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			T
		proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	E10	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed  No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls			,
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable		Yes	No action needed
		it sea			
Researc		ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal			T
Researc		Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR	Number of fish hauls in the BIAS is mentioned in text but		AR2014: MS to report number of
Researc			not in the table.	Mostly	hauls in table
Researc		guidelines?		Voo	No action needed
Researc		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No comments		
Researc		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes Yes	No action needed
Researc		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No comments No comments No comments		No action needed  No action needed
Researc		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	No comments No comments	Yes	
Researc	Achievem	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No comments	Yes	
Researci G1	Achievem	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  It is the activities? It is the activities? It is the activities?	No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed
Researc	Achievem	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  y: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by	No comments No comments No comments e.g.	Yes Yes	No action needed
Researci G1	Achievem	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  y: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical	No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
Researci G1	Achievem	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Yes Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
Researc	Achievem	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Y: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?  Are the deviations explained?	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments NA	Yes Yes Yes NA	No action needed
Researci G1 G2	Achievem	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  y: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
Researci G1 G2	Achievem	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Yes Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planni	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments NA NA NA	Yes Yes Yes NA NA	No action needed
Researci G1	Achievem	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  ye: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planni Groups listed?	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments NA NA NA NA No recommendations relevant to surveys	Yes Yes Yes NA NA Yes	No action needed
Researci G1	Achievem	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Its the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planni Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described?	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments NA NA NA NA No recommendations relevant to surveys NA	Yes Yes Yes NA NA Ves NA	No action needed
Research G1 G2 G3	Achievem  Data qual  Follow-up	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  ye: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planni Groups listed?	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments NA NA NA NA No recommendations relevant to surveys	Yes Yes Yes NA NA Yes	No action needed

				_		
	Men	nber State:	Lithuania			udgement levels
			AR year Version of the AR reviewed	<b>2013</b> 5 June 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
			Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
				EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance	e Mostly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
				<u> </u>	101	пот аррисавіс
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
' N A			onomic situation of the aquaculture and processing indus	stry		
А	Collec	tion of data conce	rning the aquaculture	Even if freshwater aquaculture is not mandatory, filling in		
				table IV.A.1 is mandatory and has not been done. No cells		MS should fill the table according to the
			Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?	shall be removed from the table	No	guidelines
			guidelines? quidelines?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed No actions needed
	<b>A</b> 1	Achievements: F	Results and deviation from NP proposal	IVA	IVA	No actions needed
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
			proposal?	NA	NA	No actions needed
			Are the deviations explained?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed
	A2	Data quality: Po	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal	NA	NA	No actions needed
	AL.	Data quality. 110	Is respective data quality information given?	NA	NA	No actions needed
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No actions needed
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No actions needed
	A3	Follow-up of Reg	gional and international recommendations	F		1
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed No actions needed
	A4	Actions to avoid		r 1	1971	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	NA	No actions needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No actions needed
В	Collec	tion of data conce	rning the processing industry	Voc	V	No actions pooded
			guidelines? guidelines?	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	No actions needed No actions needed
	B1	Achievements: F	Results and deviation from NP proposal		100	
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
			proposal?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
	B2	Data quality: Re	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
	DZ	Data quality. He	Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No actions needed
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No actions needed
	В3	Follow-up of Reg	gional and international recommendations	F		1
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA NA	Yes NA	No actions needed
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed No actions needed
	В4	Actions to avoid		IVA	IVA	INO actions needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
M			of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem			
	1 Achiev	rements: Results ar	nd deviation from NP proposal			T
			Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations apply	Yes	No action needed
	2 Action	s to avoid shortfalls		F		T
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls identified	Yes	No action needed
ı M	lodule for mana	gement and use of	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
			id deviation from NP proposal			
				STECF (DG MARE) data calls missing		MS should provide information on
			Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent	· , ,	Mostly	missing data calls.
			with the NP proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed
			• •			MS to provide details in progress in the
				No description, same text as last year provided.		management of data according to the updated AR guidelines. Same was
			Is progress in the "Management of data" section well	nto description, same text as last year provided.		already asked for in last years
			detailed?		No	evaluation.
			And the confidence of the conf	No comments		No selfer and the
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	2 Action	s to avoid shortfalls	The tile deviations justified.			
	2 Action	s to avoid shortfalls	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
II F		s to avoid shortfalls	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments		
II F			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments  Only 4 recommendations from 2012 STECF-EWG 12-01 and STECF-EWG 12-20 are listed . In total 10		No action needed
II F			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ons	No comments  Only 4 recommendations from 2012 STECF-EWG 12-01 and STECF-EWG 12-20 are listed . In total 10 recommendations from 2012 and 2013 are assumed	Yes	No action needed  Yes. MS to update the list of
II F			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments  Only 4 recommendations from 2012 STECF-EWG 12-01 and STECF-EWG 12-20 are listed . In total 10		No action needed  Yes. MS to update the list of recommendations made for 2011.
II F			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ons	No comments  Only 4 recommendations from 2012 STECF-EWG 12-01 and STECF-EWG 12-20 are listed . In total 10 recommendations from 2012 and 2013 are assumed	Yes	No action needed  Yes. MS to update the list of
II F			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	No comments  Only 4 recommendations from 2012 STECF-EWG 12-01 and STECF-EWG 12-20 are listed . In total 10 recommendations from 2012 and 2013 are assumed relevant for Baltic countries by the pre-screener.	Yes Partly	No action needed  Yes. MS to update the list of recommendations made for 2011.  Yes. MS to update the list of
	ollow-up of STE		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments  Only 4 recommendations from 2012 STECF-EWG 12-01 and STECF-EWG 12-20 are listed . In total 10 recommendations from 2012 and 2013 are assumed relevant for Baltic countries by the pre-screener.  Yes for the recommendations listed  NA	Yes Partly Partly NA	Ves. MS to update the list of recommendations made for 2011. Yes. MS to update the list of recommendations made for 2011. No actoin needed
II L	ollow-up of STE	CF recommendati	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments  Only 4 recommendations from 2012 STECF-EWG 12-01 and STECF-EWG 12-20 are listed . In total 10 recommendations from 2012 and 2013 are assumed relevant for Baltic countries by the pre-screener.  Yes for the recommendations listed	Yes Partly Partly	Yes. MS to update the list of recommendations made for 2011. Yes. MS to update the list of recommendations made for 2011.
II L	ollow-up of STE	ECF recommendati	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments  Only 4 recommendations from 2012 STECF-EWG 12-01 and STECF-EWG 12-20 are listed . In total 10 recommendations from 2012 and 2013 are assumed relevant for Baltic countries by the pre-screener.  Yes for the recommendations listed  NA	Yes Partly Partly NA	Ves. MS to update the list of recommendations made for 2011. Yes. MS to update the list of recommendations made for 2011. No actoin needed
II L	ollow-up of STE	CF recommendati	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments  Only 4 recommendations from 2012 STECF-EWG 12-01 and STECF-EWG 12-20 are listed . In total 10 recommendations from 2012 and 2013 are assumed relevant for Baltic countries by the pre-screener.  Yes for the recommendations listed NA  No comments	Yes Partly Partly NA	Ves. MS to update the list of recommendations made for 2011. Yes. MS to update the list of recommendations made for 2011. No action needed  No action needed
II L	ollow-up of STE	CF recommendati	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments  Only 4 recommendations from 2012 STECF-EWG 12-01 and STECF-EWG 12-20 are listed . In total 10 recommendations from 2012 and 2013 are assumed relevant for Baltic countries by the pre-screener.  Yes for the recommendations listed  NA  No comments  No comments	Yes Partly Partly NA Yes	Ves. MS to update the list of recommendations made for 2011. Yes. MS to update the list of recommendations made for 2011. No actoin needed
II L	ollow-up of STE	CF recommendati	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations? tions  Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No comments  Only 4 recommendations from 2012 STECF-EWG 12-01 and STECF-EWG 12-20 are listed . In total 10 recommendations from 2012 and 2013 are assumed relevant for Baltic countries by the pre-screener.  Yes for the recommendations listed  NA  No comments  No comments  only ref to WGBFAS report 2009 (description od survey	Partly Partly NA Yes	No action needed  Yes. MS to update the list of recommendations made for 2011. Yes. MS to update the list of recommendations made for 2011. No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
III L	ist of acronyms comments, sugg	CF recommendati	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments  Only 4 recommendations from 2012 STECF-EWG 12-01 and STECF-EWG 12-20 are listed . In total 10 recommendations from 2012 and 2013 are assumed relevant for Baltic countries by the pre-screener.  Yes for the recommendations listed  NA  No comments  No comments	Yes Partly Partly NA Yes	Ves. MS to update the list of recommendations made for 2011. Yes. MS to update the list of recommendations made for 2011. No action needed  No action needed
IIII L	ollow-up of STE	CF recommendati	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations? tions  Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No comments  Only 4 recommendations from 2012 STECF-EWG 12-01 and STECF-EWG 12-20 are listed . In total 10 recommendations from 2012 and 2013 are assumed relevant for Baltic countries by the pre-screener.  Yes for the recommendations listed  NA  No comments  No comments  only ref to WGBFAS report 2009 (description od survey	Partly Partly NA Yes	No action needed  Yes. MS to update the list of recommendations made for 2011. Yes. MS to update the list of recommendations made for 2011. No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
IIII L	ist of acronyms comments, sugg	CF recommendati	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations? tions  Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No comments  Only 4 recommendations from 2012 STECF-EWG 12-01 and STECF-EWG 12-20 are listed . In total 10 recommendations from 2012 and 2013 are assumed relevant for Baltic countries by the pre-screener.  Yes for the recommendations listed  NA  No comments  No comments  only ref to WGBFAS report 2009 (description od survey	Partly Partly NA Yes	No action needed  Yes. MS to update the list of recommendations made for 2011. Yes. MS to update the list of recommendations made for 2011. No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  AR2014: MS to put annexes in the
III L ∵ C R	ist of acronyms comments, sugg	CF recommendati	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ons  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations? tions  Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No comments  Only 4 recommendations from 2012 STECF-EWG 12-01 and STECF-EWG 12-20 are listed . In total 10 recommendations from 2012 and 2013 are assumed relevant for Baltic countries by the pre-screener.  Yes for the recommendations listed  NA  No comments  No comments  only ref to WGBFAS report 2009 (description od survey	Partly Partly NA Yes	No action needed  Yes. MS to update the list of recommendations made for 2011.  Yes. MS to update the list of recommendations made for 2011.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed

I۷

AR year Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal mpliance class 27 May 2014 **EWG Answer** Overall complia t applicat EWG COMMENTS EWG judgement General framework Are derogations listed? No comments Yes National data collection organis ondent and participating institutes

Are the partners involved in the national data collection an No comments Yes their roles well described? No action needed MS is request to implement a DCF No No comments database and should provide the Is there a national DCF website available? Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)? Is there an overview and description of contents of national intended timeframe NA No comments ee previous comment No formal meeting takes place as only one institute are NA olved. Regional and Internation
B1 Attendance of MS should list all the DCF meetings in the table II.B.1 even MS has not partecipated and/or the meetings are not relevant for the MS Is Table II.B.1 complete?
Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned in For relevant meetings which was carried out non-participance was explained by "administartive issues" Follow-up of regional and international recommendations MS should list all the recommendations Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting No comments No comments see previous comment No action needed Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector General description of the fis shing sector **te fishing sector**Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?

Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given? No significant changes Yes No action needed Economic variables Yes (only Med&BS relevant and Black Sea Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR Only 2012 numbers should be provided. Achieved sample Table should be corrected and umber is higher than Frame Population Mostly Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR Only one year should be listedas reference year in col C No actions needed Only 2012 numbers should be provided. Some CV's are missing. For cases of census with less than 70% response rate, CV should be provided Table should be corrected and Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR Mostly resubmitted В1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Achievements: Hesuits and deviation from NP propos

Are design and achievements consist proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal. No actions needed No actions needed Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Yes Yes No actions needed Yes No actions needed Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?
Are the responsive actions described? No actions needed No actions needed Are the responsive actions acceptable? NA No actions needed Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future des Yes Yes No actions needed No actions needed actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Biological metier related variables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? Yes Yes No actions needed Sea and Black Sea C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal MS should strictly follow the metier naming convention as MS should strictly follow the metter naming convention as agreed at Regional level. The Metter LVL fe reported in the table do not correspond to the RCMMed&BS agreement (e.g. OTB\_DEMSP\_>=40\_0\_0 LLS\_DEMF\_0\_0\_0 OTB\_DEMSP\_>=40\_0\_0 etc). In the text it is reported that there is a bilateral agreement between Malta and Cyprus. Following this agreement (see also Cyprus AR) Malta should collect the data for OTB\_MDD\_>=40\_0\_0 but no data on OTB MDD are reported and no trips have been carried out. MS should also mention this bilateral agreement in the AR. In all the tables of the AR 2013, MS been carried out. III. All the tables of the AR 2013, MS should report only the sampling year. RCM Med&BS recommendation "the planned minimum number of fish to be measured for metter related variables will not be required" mentioned in the text it's a request for the future NP 2014-2016 Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR Partly guidelines?
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR Yes, MS should complete the table Yes, MS should report only the MS should report only the sampling year CV is not reported and there is a mismatch between Mostly sampling year Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR number of specimens sampled between table IIIC5 and IIIC6 Yes, MS should complete the table Partly Only half of the planned trips have been achieved and there is a mismatch between the number of specimens sampled between table IIIC5 and IIIC6. No discards data Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Partly have been collected Yes, MS should complete the table Yes, MS should provide all missing In this section the CV should be reported for each species No action needed Yes, MS should provide missing NA No comments information Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal C2 No Yes, MS should provide all missing CVs NA Yes, MS should provide all missing CVs Yes, MS should clarify why CVs are NA MS should report CV or clarify better why the values have Are the deviations explained? not been reported No action needed NA NA Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations C3 Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Yes No action needed NA NA NA No action needed Actions to avoid shortfalls C4 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Yes Yes No action needed Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? nal fisherie Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective Yes Yes No action needed D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achieve proposal?

No comments

Yes

No action needed

Member State:

	ber Stat		Malta AR year	2013	Compliance class	Judgement levels  Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	27 May 2014 March 2013	No Partly	<10% 10-50%
				EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance	Partly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
				Mentioned in other section of AR. With regards to shark	Live judgement	Liid
				recreational fishery, MS stated that there is no recreational fishery for sharks but no additional		
			Are obtained derogations mentioned?	informations are provided. MS should provide any		
				references concerning the absence of recreational fishery for sharks (e.g. papers, pilot studies, survey, laws		AR2014: MS to information on sh recreational fishery should be incl
				forbidden this fishery etc)	Mostly	in the report
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
D2	Data qua		sults and deviation from NP proposal		163	140 detion needed
			Were data quality targets provided?	Recreational fishery data for tuna are collected through a census approach	Yes	No action needed
			Were data quality targets met?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
D3	Follow-u	p of Re	gional and international recommendations		•	
			Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	listed in other section of AR NA	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
D4	Actions		Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA NA	NA	No action needed No action needed
Biologi	ical stock-r		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
9				Yes	Yes	No action needed
Mediterra	nean Sea a		Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region? k Sea	/		
E1		ments: I	Results and deviation from NP proposal		Г	
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
E2	Data aua		Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal	NA	NA	No action needed
	⊳ata qua	-	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Were CV targets met?	No Yes	Mostly Yes	No action needed No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
E3	Follow-u	p of Re	gional and international recommendations	NA	NA	No action needed
			Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	NA	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
E4	Actions		Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
Transv	ersal varia		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
F1	Capacity F11	,	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  ements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Malta provided all results for 3 reference years: 2011- 2013. The reporting period is 2013 so it would be preferable in the future if MS provides the result only for the reporting period.	Yes	No action needed
	•••		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No comments	.,	
			proposal? Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
	=		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	F13		to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F2	Effort		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
FZ	F11	Achiev	ements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
	F12		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	FIZ		uality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	CV is missing	Yes	Provide CV for survey conducted
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments No comments	NA	No action needed
	F13		Are the deviations justified?		NA	No action needed
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	NA NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments No comments	NA NA	No action needed No action needed
	F14	Actions	to avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments No comments	NA NA	No action needed No action needed
F3	Landings	s				
	F11	Achiev	ements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	According to the AR all landings data is collected on		
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	census basis. However sample survey is mentioned in the NP for vessels <10 m and no results reported in the		MS should report the results of the Small scale fishery sampling sur-
			proposal?	AR	Mostly	separately
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments No comments	NA NA	No action needed No action needed
	F12	Data q	uality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			<u> </u>
			Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?	CV is missing for 2013 reference year No comments	Mostly NA	No action needed No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Eco.		up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	NA	No action needed
	F13		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	F13		Are the responsive actions acceptable? to avoid shortfalls	No comments	NA	No action needed
	F13			No comments	NA NA	No action needed
		Actions	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA	No action needed
Resear		Actions		No comments		
Resear G1	F14	Actions at sea ments: I	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Results and deviation from NP proposal		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	No. of the
	F14	Actions at sea ments: I	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments  No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F14	Actions at sea ments: I	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Results and deviation from NP proposal guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F14	Actions s at sea ments: I	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Results and deviation from NP proposal guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations iustified?	No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
	F14	Actions s at sea ments: I	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are suits and deviation from NP proposal guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed
	F14 rch surveys Achiever	Actions s at sea ments: I	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations isustlifed?  Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Sults and deviation from NP proposal	No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
G1	F14 rch surveys Achiever	Actions at sea ments: I	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Results and deviation from NP proposal guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? sults and deviation from NP proposal is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g.	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed
G1	F14 rch surveys Achiever	Actions s at sea ments: I	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations isustlifed?  Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Sults and deviation from NP proposal	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed

	Memb	per State:	Malta	1	lui.	dgement levels
	Weilik	Jei State.	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	27 May 2014 March 2013	No Partly	<10% 10-50%
				EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance	Partly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
			Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
			Groups listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
	G4	Actions to avoi			INC.	INO action record
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	MS described some issues on age readings which is related to stock biological variables	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA NA	No action needed
IV			conomic situation of the aquaculture and processing ind	ustry		_
	A Collecti	on of data conce	erning the aquaculture	Table should refer only to the reference year for which		1
			Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?	data is collected	Yes	No actions needed
			Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	No	MS should update the table as soon as they have the final data
					140	Table should be completed and
			Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	MS should complete the table with the relevant indicators according to the guidelines	No	resubmitted as soon as the final data is available
	A1	Achievements: F	Results and deviation from NP proposal	according to the galdonnes	110	avanabio
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
	A2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal			Text should be updated when the
			Is respective data quality information given?	No	No	relevant table is filled
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed No actions needed
	А3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations	[	INA.	pro deliena nedutu
	-	- 10-7	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed  No actions needed
	A4	Actions to avoid		[1975	INA	pro actions needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
	B Collecti	on of data conce	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
	2 Collecti	on or data CONCE	erning the processing industry			Table should be updated and
			Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table should refer only to the reference year for which data is collected	No	resubmitted as soon as the data is available
				Table should refer only to the reference year for which	INO	Table should be updated and
			Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	data is collected. Data quality indicators are missing. Achieved sample rate should be provided	No	resubmitted as soon as the data is available
	B1	Achievements: F	Results and deviation from NP proposal	Achieved Sample rate Should be provided	INO	available
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No	No	Text should be updated when data is
			proposal? Are the deviations explained?	No NA	NA NA	available No actions needed
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No actions needed
	B2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal			Text should be updated when data is
			Is respective data quality information given?	No	No	available
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
	В3	Follow-up of Re	Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed  No actions needed
	B4	Actions to avoid		IVA	INA	INO actions needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
v	Module of evaluati	ion of the effects	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? s of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
•			nd deviation from NP proposal			
			Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the relevant derogations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	2 Actions t	to avoid shortfalls				
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
VI	Module for manage		of the data			
	1 Achiever	ments: Results ar	nd deviation from NP proposal			
			Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed
					INA	MS is requested to implement a DCF
			Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?		Mostly	database and should provide the intended timeframe
					Modify	MS is requested to implement a DCF
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Mostly	database and should provide the intended timeframe
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		to oval - I - I - ' "	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	2 Actions 1	to avoid shortfalls	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
VII	Follow-up of STEC	F recommendat	ions			
						AR2014: MS to only list the actual
			Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	MS lists only older recommendations	Yes	recommendations or explicitly state that there are no relevant recommendations
			Are the responsive actions described?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
,		and the second	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
۷III	List of acronyms a	and abbreviation	s Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
IX	Comments, sugge	stions and reflec		no community	163	no dollon needed
	. 33		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
х	References		and there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	ino commento	<u>I</u>	pro action needed
			Is there a complete list of references?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
ΧI	Annexes					
			Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information		Yes	No action needed
			to support statements made in the main text?	no comments		

		MEILID	er State:	The Netherlands			Igement levels
				AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
				Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
				Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
					EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
				Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%
						NA	not applicable
					EWG COMMENTS		EWG
•	General fr	amework		And demonstrate links dO			Action needed?
	M-411			Are derogations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
II			ction organisatio				
	A	National	correspondent a	and participating institutes  Are the partners involved in the national data collection and			1
				their roles well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
				Is there a national DCF website available?	No commente	Vee	No action peopled
				Is the information provided on the website in line with legal	No comments	Yes	No action needed
				requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	Maybe DCF material availble if logged in. Other wise not.	Mostly	Should be clarified by MS
				Is there an overview and description of contents of national			
				coordination meetings?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
				If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	В	Regional	I and Internation		No comments	103	140 delion needed
	_	B1		nternational meetings			
			/oaaoo o	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
				Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings			
				explained?	No, but very few meetings were not attended (4 out of 34)	Mostly	No action needed
		B2	Follow-up of rec	gional and international recommendations	, (· )		
				nonal and international recommendations	No, All STECF/ICES recommendations are listed in sec		MS should in future AR follow guidelines
				Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting	VII. Only reference to the relevant recommendation in sec		and separte recommendeations in
				listed?	VII are given in this section.	Mostly	correct section.
				Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes in section VII	Yes	No action needed
				Are the responsive actions described:  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
				The the responsive delicins acceptable?	no sommente	100	. to dollon nooded
ш	Modulo of	the evel-	uation of the fishi	ing sector			
•11	Module of		lation of the fishi description of th				
	^	General	acacription of th	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on			
				the NP implementation well described?	No significant changes	Yes	No action neded
	В	Fconomi	ic variables	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	Yes	Yes	No action needed No action needed
				ea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic	166	162	THE ACTION NEEDED
	JUFNA-RI	LOION BE	anto oca, North S	ca ana Lastern Arono, and North Additic			
				Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
				is rable in.b. i complete and consistent with An guidelines?	100	1 68	MS needs to clarify the clustering
							scheme, since there are fleet segments
							that have sufficient number of vessels
					According to NP, segments, smaller than 10 vessels		clustered together. In the future MS
					needs to be clustered for confidentiality ensurance,		should use a clustering scheme
					however segments with high number (from 12 to 60) of		according to guidlines, separating
					vessels were clustered without clear explanation in the		segments which have sufficient number
				Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	text of AR.	Partly	of vessels
				is Table III.b.2 complete and consistent with Art guidelines:	text of Art.	1 artiy	OI VESSEIS
				Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		B1	Achievemente: D	esults and deviation from NP proposal	165	163	No action needed
		ы	Achievements. h	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			1
				proposal?	Von	Yes	No action needed
				Are the deviations explained?	Yes Yes	Yes	No action needed
				Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		DO.			165	res	No action needed
		B2	Data quality. nes	ults and deviation from NP proposal	V	V	Ni
				Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
				Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
				Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		B3	Follow-up of Reg	ional and international recommendations			
				Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recomendations	Yes	No action needed
				Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No action needed
				Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
		B4	Actions to avoid s	shortfalls			
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes		No action needed
	CURRA DI	ECION O	than madama	Are actions to avoid shortialis in the future acceptable:	res	res	No action needed
	SUPHA-RI	EGION O	ther regions				T
				Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	NA	No action needed
				.5 . ab.o m.b. i complete and consistent with An guidelines?	13/1	IVA	dollon nooded
				Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	NA	No action needed
				.5 . ab.o m.b.z complete and consistent with An guidelines?		ING	dollon necatu
				Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	NA	No action needed
		D1	Achievement	esults and deviation from NP proposal	140.1	IVA	no action needed
		B1	Authevernents: H	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			1
				proposal?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
				Are the deviations explained?	Yes Yes	Yes	No action needed  No action needed
				The state of the s			
		B0	Data continue	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		B2	Data quality: Hes	ults and deviation from NP proposal	NIA.	***	Ni
				Is respective data quality information given?	NA	NA	No action needed
				Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
				Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
		B3		ional and international recommendations			
				Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	NA	No action needed
				Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No action needed
				Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
		B4	Actions to avoid s				
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
				rue actions to avoid shortialis in the future acceptable?	par c	IVA	THE ACTION NEGUEU
	^	Diolos!	al mation value	variables			
	С	DIVIOGIC	al metier related		Von	Vaa	No antion panel!
				Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Region No		ind Eastern Arcti				
		C1	Achievements: I	Results and deviation from NP proposal			
					L.		Yes, MS should use the official Metier
				Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Mostly	LVL6 codes
				Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
							Yes, MS should correct the name of
							turbot (Scophthalmus maximus)
					L.		according to commission decision
				Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Mostly	2010/93/EU
					L.		
				Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
				Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	L		l
				proposal?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
				Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed

Judgement levels

The Netherlands

Member State:

	ber State:	The Netherlands AR year	2013	Compliance class	Judgement levels  Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2011 EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
		Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
				NA NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
C2	Data quality: He	sults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Mostly	Yes, MS should privide missing CV
		Were CV targets met?	Yes	Partly	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
СЗ	Follow-up of Re	Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations	Yes	Yes	No action needed
00	rollow up of the	Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes, in section VIIb	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
C4	Actions to avoid		103	103	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
orth Atla	entic	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
C1		Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			OTM ORE 00.00.0 Or supported trips at any about the		
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	OTM_SPF_32-69_0_0: expected trips at sea should be zero (the entered value '36' is an error, cf. Table III.C.4)	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	100		
		proposal?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
C2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal			
					Yes, MS should provide CV estimated for blue whiting as >10000
					measurements can not accepted a
		Were CV estimates provided?	only few cells with 'N/A' due to low no. of samples	Mostly	few samples"
		Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?	only in a few cases the target was met data quality is considered to be good (AR text)	Partly Partly	No action needed  No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
C3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations	les.		<u> </u>
		Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes Yes, in section VIIb	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
C4	Actions to avoid	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
ther regi					·
C1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal		1	Yes, MS should use correct the na
					region according to commission
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes (region for CECAF areas should be 'Other regions')	Mostly	decision 2010/93/EU Yes, MS should use correct the na
					region according to commission
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes (region for CECAF areas should be 'Other regions')	Mostly	decision 2010/93/EU Yes, MS should use correct the na
					region according to commission
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes (region for CECAF areas should be 'Other regions')	Mostly	decision 2010/93/EU Yes, MS should use correct the na
					region according to commission
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes (region for CECAF areas should be 'Other regions')	Mostly	decision 2010/93/EU
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	4 trips sampled out of 12 planned trips. no length samples		Yes, MS should provide missing le
		proposal?	included in Table III.C.6, whereas Table III.C.5 lists them	Partly	samples in Table III.C.6
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
C2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal		162	ino dollori fiecucu
		Were CV estimates provided?	No	No	Yes, MS should provide CVs
		Were CV targets met?	NA MS states that the data quality is not determined and has	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	not been evaluated yet.	NA	No action needed
C2	Follow of D	Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations	No	No	No action needed
C3	rollow-up of He	Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes, in section VIIb	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
C4	Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	tional fisheries				
Recrea		In information on III December 2	NL only has recreational fisheries in one region	v	No setting 1 1
Recrea		Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	,	Yes	No action needed
	and Eastern Arcti	Results and deviation from NP proposal		T	1
	and Eastern Arcti Achievements:	And design and estimated to the ND	No comments	Yes	No action needed
orth Sea		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP		Yes	No action needed
orth Sea		proposal? Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No derogations apply		
orth Sea		proposal? Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
orth Sea	Achievements:	proposal? Are obtained derogations mentioned?			No action needed  No action needed
lorth Sea D1	Achievements:	proposal? Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal	No comments No comments Descriptive targests such as area and species coverage,	Yes Yes	No action needed
orth Sea D1	Achievements:	proposal? Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided?	No comments No comments  Descriptive targests such as area and species coverage, precision of length data	Yes	No action needed
lorth Sea D1	Achievements:	proposal? Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained?	No comments No comments Descriptive targests such as area and species coverage, precision of length data Not specified in text NA	Yes Yes Yes NA	No action needed
orth Sea D1	Achievements:  Data quality: Re	proposal? Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets met?	No comments No comments Descriptive targests such as area and species coverage, precision of length data Not specified in text	Yes Yes Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed

	Memb	er State:	The Netherlands			Judgement levels
	Wichila	ci Otato.	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	30 May 2014 31 October 2011	No Partly	<10% 10-50%
			• •	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS		
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	WGRFS recommendations referred to	EWG judgement Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	D4	Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
	Biologic	al stock-related		No comments	res	INO action needed
	ū			Yes	Yes	No action needed
egion N	North Sea a	and Eastern Arcti	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?			
•	E1		Results and deviation from NP proposal		1	T
				columns E, G and L are hidden	Yes	Yes, MS should unhide columns before
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			submission of next year's report
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	most stocks oversampled, a few stocks undersampled	Mostly	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Eo	Doto quality: Po	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	E2	≥ata quality: He	esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?	Yes, for some stocks	Partly	Yes, MS should CV for all stocks
			Were CV targets met?	in about one third of the cases	Partly	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
	E3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations		100	-10 401011110000
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	No in costion VIIIs	Yes	No action needed
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	in section VIIb Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	E4	Actions to avoid		Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed  No action needed
egion N	North Atlan					•
	E1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal		I	
				columns E, G and L are hidden	Yes	Yes, MS should unhide columns before submission of next year's report
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			Submission of flext year's report
			proposal?	some stocks are undersampled	Partly	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
	E2	Data quality: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal	res	162	INO action needed
			• •	for few stocks, some CVs provided where zero individuals	Mostly	Yes, MS should explain provided CVs
			Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?	were sampled in 3 out of 9 cases	Partly	for stocks without samples  No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	E3	Fallow up of Do	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	E3	rollow-up of he	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	Yes	No action needed
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	in section VIIb	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
	E4	Actions to avoid		100	1.00	THE GOLDST HOUSES
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
eaion (	Other regio	ns	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	E1		Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no achievements included, while Table III.C.5 lists length samples	No	Yes, MS should complete Table III.E.3
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Not clear, as AR text mentions achievements that are not	No	Yes, MS should make Table III.E.3
			proposal?	included in Table III.E.3		compatible with the AR text Yes, MS should make Table III.E.3
			Are the deviations explained?	No	No	compatible with the AR text
			Are the deviations justified?	No	No	Yes, MS should make Table III.E.3 compatible with the AR text
	E2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal		1	,
			Were CV estimates provided?	No	No	Yes, MS should complete Table III.E.3
			•	No	No	Yes, MS should complete Table III.E.3
			Were CV targets met?			
			Are the deviations explained?	No	No	Yes, MS should complete Table III.E.3
			Are the deviations justified?	No	No	Yes, MS should complete Table III.E.4
	E3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations	No.		Nonethern
			Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No in section VIIb	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	F.	Antin	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	E4	Actions to avoid	a snortrails			Yes, MS should complete Table III.E.3,
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Partly	EWG can't check what has been achieved
			And actions to avoid situitians in the iditife described?			Yes, MS should complete Table III.E.3,
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	EWG can't check what has been
	Transve	rsal variables	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		<u>l</u>	achieved
						MS must resubmit the correct form filled
						in with the requested parameters. As it is not clear in the table if the MS actually
						achieved what was stated in the NP
			Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NP template used instead of template for AR.	No	(eventhough we are talking about census data)
	F1	Capacity		<u> </u>		
		F11 Achiev	vements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP		1	
			proposal?	This is only expressed in the text.	Yes	No action neded
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action neded

Mem	nber Stat		2012	Compliance class	Judgement levels
		AR year Version of the AR reviewed	<b>2013</b> 30 May 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
		Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
		Overall complia	EWG Answer nce Mostly	Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
				NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action neded
	F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls	No. 1. of B. 11. of B.	T	The second second
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Ni shortfalls identified No comments	Yes Yes	No action neded No action neded
F2	Effort				
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP		1	
		proposal?	This is only expressed in the text.	Yes	No action neded
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action neded
	F12	Are the deviations justified?  Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action neded
		Is respective data quality information given?	This is only expressed in the text.	Yes	No action neded
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action neded
	F13	Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No comments	Yes	No action neded
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recomendations	Yes	No action neded
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action neded
	F14	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls	No comments	Yes	No action neded
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Ni shortfalls identified	Yes	No action neded
<b>-</b> 0		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action neded
F3	Landings F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	This is such assessed at 10 to 10.	,	No order of the
		proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	This is only expressed in the text.  No comments	Yes Yes	No action neded  No action neded
		Are the deviations explained:  Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action neded
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	This is only averaged in the total		No ostion rested
		Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?	This is only expressed in the text.  No comments	Yes Yes	No action neded No action neded
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action neded
	F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No. 1	T	The second second
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?	No relevant recomendations  No comments	Yes Yes	No action neded  No action neded
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action neded
	F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls	NI -baf-II- idaffd	V	No saking and ad
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Ni shortfalls identified No comments	Yes Yes	No action neded  No action neded
Resea	rch surveys				
G1	Achiever	nents: Results and deviation from NP proposal		1	
		Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guideline	s? No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Ashiovement - 000/ in two oursess	Marsh	No asking and de
		proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	Achievement < 90% in two surveys  No comments	Mostly Yes	No action needed  No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
G2	Data qua	lity: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage	. no		
		etc.)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
G3	Follow-u	Are the deviations justified? p of Regional and international recommendations	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?	No reference to recommendations made in Survey Planning group.	Partly	AR2014: MS to list relevant recommendations from survey plannir groups (available at http://community.ices.dk/admin/Recorndations/_layouts/15/start.aspx#/Sitefoss/Home.aspx)
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
G4	Actions 6	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  o avoid shortfalls	No comments	NA	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
of the -	voluetie: *	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing ind concerning the aquaculture	usuy		
			Yes, but MS should follow the guidelines and not erase		
		Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?	Table lines	Yes	No action needed
			s? Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guideline		1	MS has to provide all the cv's or explanation on why some cv's are
		Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guideline	For some variables the cv is missing and no explanation is provided	Mostly	missing
A1	Achieven	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guideline rents: Results and deviation from NP proposal	provided	Mostly	
A1	Achieven	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guideline ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Mostly	
A1	Achieven	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guideline tents: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	sectors  provided  Low achieved sample rate for the oyster and the farm-eels sectors  Yes	Mostly  Mostly  Yes	missing  No action needed  No action needed
		Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guideline tents: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	sectors  provided  Low achieved sample rate for the oyster and the farm-eels sectors	Mostly Mostly	missing  No action needed
A1 A2		Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guideline tents: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified? ity: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Low achieved sample rate for the oyster and the farm-eels sectors Yes Yes For most important sector mussels yes, for oysters also but stated as not reliable due to low number of respondents, for land based-eel no information given due to estimation of figures from previous years and expert	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes	missing  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
		Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guideline tents: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	Elements of the content of the conte	Mostly  Mostly  Yes	missing  No action needed  No action needed
A2	Data qua	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guideline tents: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ity: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Low achieved sample rate for the oyster and the farm-eels sectors Yes Yes  For most important sector mussels yes, for oysters also but stated as not reliable due to low number of respondents, for land based-eel no information given due to estimation of figures from previous years and expert knowledge.	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Mostly	nissing  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed  No action needed
	Data qua	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guideline tents: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ity: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	sectors Yes Yes For most important sector mussels yes, for oysters also but stated as not reliable due to low number of respondents, for land based-eel no information given due to estimation of figures from previous years and expert knowledge. Yes Yes	Mostly Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes	No action needed
A2	Data qua	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guideline tents: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ity: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Elements of the content of the conte	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes	nissing  No action needed
A2	Data qua Follow-սբ	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guideline rents: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ity: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Even provided  Low achieved sample rate for the oyster and the farm-eels sectors Yes Yes Yes  For most important sector mussels yes, for oysters also but stated as not reliable due to low number of respondents, for land based-eel no information given due to estimation of figures from previous years and expert knowledge. Yes Yes  No relevant recommendations	Mostly Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed
A2	Data qua Follow-սբ	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guideline tents: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ity: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations are plained? of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Low achieved sample rate for the oyster and the farm-eels sectors Yes Yes Yes For most important sector mussels yes, for oysters also but stated as not reliable due to low number of respondents, for land based-eel no information given due to estimation of figures from previous years and expert knowledge. Yes Yes No relevant recommendations NA NA	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  NA  NA	missing  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed  No action needed  No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
A2	Data qua Follow-սբ	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guideline rents: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ity: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Elevator sample rate for the oyster and the farm-eels sectors Yes Yes Yes For most important sector mussels yes, for oysters also but stated as not reliable due to low number of respondents, for land based-eel no information given due to estimation of figures from previous years and expert knowledge. Yes  No relevant recommendations NA	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  NA	No action needed

I۷

				AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
				Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
				Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
					EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
				Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%
						NA	not applicable
					EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
	В	Collection	on of data concer	rning the processing industry			
					Yes, but the reference year is 2011. The segment 50-249		MS should clarify why the reference
				Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	is not correctly named	Yes	year is 2011
					Yes, but the reference year is 2011. The segment 50-249		MS should clarify why the reference
				Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	is not correctly named	Yes	year is 2011
		B1	Achievements: R	Results and deviation from NP proposal			<u> </u>
				Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
				proposal?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
				Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
				Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA NA	No action needed
		B2	Data quality: Res	sults and deviation from NP proposal			TTO GOLOTI HOOGOG
		D2	Data quality. Hes	Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
				Are the deviations explained?	NA NA	NA	No action needed
				•			
				Are the deviations justified?	N.A.	N.A.	No action needed
		B3	Follow-up of Reg	ional and international recommendations			,
				Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	NA	No action needed
				Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No action needed
				Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
		B4	Actions to avoid	shortfalls			
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	NA	No action needed
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
v	Module of	evaluatio	on of the effects	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem	<u>                                     </u>		
•				d deviation from NP proposal			
		Achieven	nents. Hesuits and	a deviation nom ni proposal			Yes. MS to update table including
				Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Indicators 1-4 is not listed in table	Mostly	indicators 1-4
				Are the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations	NA	No action needed
	•	Antiona t	a avaid abautfalla	Are the relevant derogations listed:	ivo derogations	INA	140 action needed
	2	ACTIONS I	o avoid shortfalls	And a strong to a social about the first of the strong described to	NI In	NA	No astronous de d
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls identified		No action needed
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No shortfalls identified	NA	No action needed
VI			ment and use of				
	1	Achieven	nents: Results and	d deviation from NP proposal			
					Yes (minor typo: latin name for plaice is Pleuronectes		
				Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	platessa)	Yes	No action needed
				Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with	No	V	No astisa assista
				the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well	No comments	Yes	No action needed
				detailed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
				detailed:		163	MS must resubmit the section refereing
				Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	AR text not updated (refers to 2012)	Partly	to the correct year(s)
				Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	Yes	No action needed
				Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	_	Antion- +	a accald aboutf-II-	nie trie deviations justilieu :	NO COMMENTS	162	INO action fleeded
	2	Actions to	o avoid shortfalls		MS claims to have has identified conflict between control		
					regulation and DCF which prevent MS to submit VMS		
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	data.	Yes	No action needed
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	NA NA
W	Follow	of STEC	F recommendation		1973	INM	147
VII	rollow-up	013150	r recommendatio	ons	MS should summarise the follow-up given to STECF		
					recommendations in a text table comprising on the left		AR2014: MS to update table and put the
					side the recommendations and on the right side the		recommendation only in one chapter
					responsive actions. Section is separated in VIIa and VII b		and follow the setup described in the
				Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	which is not in line with the guidelines	Mostly	guidelines.
				Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
				Are the responsive actions described:  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
\/J!!	List of car	onumo -	nd abbreviations		140 comments	162	140 dollori liecucu
VIII	LISE OF SCI	onyms ar	iu appieviations		No comments	V	No action panded
	_			Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
ίX	Comments	s, sugges	tions and reflect	tions	Finding attended to the ground O		,
					Explanations to the report. Comments that need for follow-		
				Are there any comments are continue and/or fight-	up have been passed on to Commission by adding them	Yes	No cotion was dead
.,				Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	to the STECF-EWG14-07 comments		No action needed
Х	Reference	es			To a second seco		Te
				Is there a complete list of references?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
ΧI	Annexes			And the second s			
				Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to	L	Yes	No action needed
				support statements made in the main text?	No comments	. 55	

Member State: The Netherlands

	N/	ahau Ctata.	Delived	1	_	
	wen	nber State:	Poland AR year	2013	Compliance class	dgement levels  Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	22 October 2011 EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
			Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
					NA	not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
ı	General framewo	ork				Action needed?
	National data col	llection organisatio	Are derogations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
•			and participating institutes			
			Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is there a national DCF website available?	Yes (under reconstruction)	Yes	No action needed
			Is the information provided on the website in line with legal	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)? Is there an overview and description of contents of national	No	V	No selfer resided
			coordination meetings?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	B Regio	nal and Internation	If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	B1		nternational meetings			
			Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes (although wrongly no stock coordinators in WGBFAS are indicated)	Yes	No action needed
			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings	are maleated)	Yes	No action needed
	B2	Fallow we of so	explained?	No comments	100	no dollon noodod
	62	rollow-up of reg	gional and international recommendations  Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting		Yes	No action pooded
			listed?	No comments		No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
			The the responsive details deceptable:	ive comments	100	no dollon noodod
Ш		aluation of the fish				
	A Gener	al description of th	e fishing sector  Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact		V	Ma astina anadad
			on the NP implementation well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	B Econo	omic variables	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
			Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic			
			Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR			
			guidelines? Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR	no comments	Yes	No action needed
			guidelines?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
	B1	Achievements: F	Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
	B2	Data quality: Res	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal	no comments	NA	No action needed
	52	Data quanty. Hes	Is respective data quality information given?	no comments	yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	no comments	NA	No action needed
	В3	Follow-up of Rec	Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations	no comments	NA	No action needed
	53	r ollow-up or rieg	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
	B4	Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
	54	Actions to avoid	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	no comments	NA	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	no comments	NA	No action needed
	SUPRA-REGION	Other regions	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR	Г		T
			guidelines?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR			
	B1	Ashiovomenta: E	guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal	no comments	Yes	No action needed
	ь.	Achievements. I	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
			proposal?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	no comments no comments	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
	B2	Data quality: Res	sults and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given?	no comments	yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	no comments no comments	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
	В3	Follow-up of Reg	gional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no comments	Yes Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments no comments	Yes	No action needed  No action needed
	B4	Actions to avoid			**	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	no comments	NA	No action needed
			The state of the s			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	no comments	NA	No action needed
	_					
	C Biolog	gical metier related	variables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Region Baltic Se	a		1	100	aoson noodod
	C1		Results and deviation from NP proposal			T
			Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR			
			guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	Yes Required CVS are given in % rather than numbers. CV	Yes	No action needed In future AR the MS should report CVs
			guidelines?	not calculated for unsorted catches	Mostly	in numbers
			Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			guidonnos		100	dollon nooded
				Overall, the no. of trips of the fleets in the sampling year has decreased to 82% compared to the reference years.		
				The no. of sampled trips was approx. 75% of the planned		
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	trips. In SD 22-24, the metiers LLS_DEF_0_0_0 and	Moothy	No action peoded
			proposal?	OTM_SPF_16-31_0_0 were not sampled Yes, due to decrease in fishing activity relative to	Mostly	No action needed
			Ave the deviations availabled?	reference years or early closure of fisheries in most	V	No ostion needed
			Are the deviations explained?	cases.	Yes	No action needed

Mem	ber State:	Poland	Judgement levels			
		AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level	
		Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	31 May 2014 22 October 2011	No Partly	<10% 10-50%	
			EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%	
		Overall compliance	Yes	Yes NA	>90% not applicable	
		Are the deviations justified?	EWG COMMENTS Yes	EWG judgement Yes	No action needed	
C2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal	165	163	No action needed	
					MO to associate OV/s formula and all	
					MS to provide CVs for unsorted catches. In future, Required Cv should	
		Were CV estimates provided?	not for unsorted catches	Mostly	be given as a number and not as a %	
			landings: in 4 of 20 cases for landings were not met, discards: no CV targets were achieved. Overall 57% were			
		Were CV targets met?	not met	Partly	No action needed	
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes, but turbot not mentioned	Yes	No action needed	
СЗ	Follow-up of Re	Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations	Yes	Yes	No action needed	
00	ronow-up or ric	Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	NA	No action needed	
			Very least annual and a second and a second and a second and		for future AR the relevant	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes, but recommendations for NA should not be included under the Baltic region	Yes	recommendations should be listed under the correct region in the text	
		Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed	
C4	<b>A</b> - <b>N A</b> ! -	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed	
C4	Actions to avoid	isnortians			1	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed	
Region North Sea						
C1	Achievements: I	Results and deviation from NP proposal			1	
			Yes. Fishing ground is actually ICES I-II, not only IIb.		Number of sampling trips in the year	
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR	Number of trips during sampling year (column N) not		should be listed and correct ICES	
		guidelines?	known	Mostly	fishing ground should be in table	
			Yes. Sampling frame (geographical location) is Eastern Arctic (ICES Sub-areas I and II), not Eastern Greenland			
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR	(would be Div. XIVb). No. of trips during sampling year not			
		guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	known	Yes	No action needed	
		guidelines?	Yes. Fishing ground is actually ICES I-II, not only IIb.	Yes	Fishing ground to be corrected	
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR	Vaa	Vee	Fishing around to be corrected	
		guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Yes	Yes	Fishing ground to be corrected	
		proposal?	Yes	Yes	No action needed	
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed	
C2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal	ING	I NA	No action needed	
		Were CV estimates provided?	No	No	CVs to be provided	
		Were CV targets met?	NA Yes	NA Yes	No action needed  No action needed	
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed	
C3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations				
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	in section I NA	Yes NA	No action needed	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed	
C4	Actions to avoid	i shortfalls		T	1	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed	
Region Other regi		•	1.00			
C1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR	Number of trips during sampling year (column N) not	T	1	
		guidelines?	provided	Mostly	Number of trips to be provided	
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?	Yes. No. of trips during sampling year not known	Mostly	Number of trips to be provided	
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	res. No. of this during sampling year not known	Mostry	ivamber of trips to be provided	
		guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR	Yes	Yes	No action needed	
		guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed	
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	CECAF: MS refers to multilateral agreement, SPRFMO:			
		proposal? Are the deviations explained?	no PL fisheries in 2013. NA	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA	No action needed	
C2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal			hu e · ·	
		Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed	
C3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations	<b>6</b>			
		Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA Yes (RCM LDF)	NA Yes	No action needed  No action needed	
		Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed	
C4	Actions to avoid	isnormalis			1	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	NA	No action needed	
		Are astigned to avoid aboutfalls in the fature accordable?	NA.	NA	No option monded	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed	
D Recrea	tional fisheries				<del>,                                      </del>	
		Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
Region Baltic Sea				•		
D1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP		Yes		
		proposal?	No comments		No action needed	
		Are obtained derogations mentioned?	Derogations apply for salmon and eel	Yes	No action needed	
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments NA	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed	
D2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal	F. W.	I IVA	TO GORDIT HOOGE	

	Momb	er State:	Poland	<b>1</b>		
	wemb	er State:	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Udgement levels  Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014 22 October 2011	No Borthy	<10% 10-50%
			Version of the NP proposal	EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
			Overall compliance	Yes	Yes	>90%
					NA	not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement Yes	EWG
			Were data quality targets provided?	Information on data quality provided, no specific targets		No action needed
			Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
	D3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations			
			Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	In section I No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	D4	Actions to avoid	i shortfalls		Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			No action needed
				NA	NA	
E	Biologica	I stock-related v	variables			
				Yes	Yes	No action needed
Region Ba	altic Sea		Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?			
ricgion De		Achievements: I	Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR	Yes	Yes	for future AR the planned CVs must be
			guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Sea trout, western Baltic cod undersampled and herring		given in numbers and not in %
			proposal?	in SD 25-32 undersampled .	Mostly	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
	E2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal			
		-	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?	30 of 43 cases were not met Yes	Partly Yes	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	E3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations	A. C.		
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	NA	No action needed for future AR the relevant
				Yes	Yes	recommendations should be listed
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	Yes	under the correct region in the text  No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	E4	Actions to avoid	i shortfalls		T	in future, MS should ensure that the
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes (typo: AR text refers to 2012 instead of 2013)	Yes	correct year is stated in the text
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
Region No		nd Eastern Arcti Achievements:	C Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR	Yes	Yes	for future AR the planned CVs must be
			guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Yes (cod in ICES Sub-areas I-II), derogation for		given in numbers and not in %
			proposal?	Greenland halibut sampling	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed No action needed
	E2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal	IVA	INA	No action needed
			Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?	only for length@age	Partly Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	E3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations			
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	in section I	Yes	No action needed relevant recommendations should be
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Recommendation re bilateral agreements is missing	Partly	listed and action added
			Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes for one recommendation. Accepted Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
	E4	Actions to avoid				dollor recoded
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
				Yes	Yes	
Region Ot	ther region	ıs	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		1	No action needed
Augion Ol			Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?	Yes	Yes	for future AR the planned CVs must be
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	CECAF: MS refers to multilateral agreement, SPRFMO:	NA	given in numbers and not in %
			proposal?	no PL fisheries in 2013. NA	NA NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed No action needed
	E2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal			
			Were CV testimates provided?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
			Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
	E3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	E4	Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Actions to avoic	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
F	Transver	sal variables				
*	ansver			Exemption from obligation to provide quality indicators		v
			Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	applies to EU legislation. MS should provide indicators for data collected under national legislation	Yes	Yes. MS should implement amendment in future AR
		Capacity			,	
			vements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP		T	
			proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed

N/	han C444.	Delived	<mark>-</mark> 1	_	
wem	ber State:	Poland AR year	2013	Compliance class	Udgement levels  Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	22 October 2011 EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
		Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
		·		NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	<b>F13</b> Ac	ctions to avoid shortfalls	No shortfalls	NA	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
F2	Effort				1
	F11 Ac	hievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		•	
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	<b>F12</b> Da	ata quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No commente	Yes	No action needed
		Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?	No comments No deviations	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	<b>F13</b> Fo	sllow-up of Regional and international recommendations		•	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recomendations	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments No comments	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
	F14 Ac	etions to avoid shortfalls			1
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls	NA	No action needed
	Landlana	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F3	Landings F11 Ac	chievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	AC	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP		Yes	
		proposal?	No comments		No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
	<b>F12</b> Da	ata quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	NA NA	Ino action needed
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	<b>F13</b> Fo	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	FI3 FO	Illow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recomendations	NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
	<b>F14</b> Ac	ctions to avoid shortfalls	No comments	T NA	No selfer resided
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments No comments	NA NA	No action needed No action needed
Resear	ch surveys at				
G1	Achievemen	its: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?	Max. days eligible not filled in	Yes	AR2014: MS to fill in max. days eligible
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Max. days engible not filled in	Yes	No action needed
		proposal?	No comments		
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling	No comments Maps are in Annex	Yes Yes	No action needed  AR2014: MS to put maps in text and no
		activities?			in Annex
G2	Data quality	: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g.		Yes	INIa antina annulud
		no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical		res	No action needed
		coverage etc.)?	No comments		
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
G3	Follow-up of	Are the deviations justified?  f Regional and international recommendations	No comments	res	INO action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning		Yes	No action needed
		Groups listed?	No relevant recommendations apply		No settlem manded
		Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
G4	Actions to a	void shortfalls	IVA	IVA	No delien needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
		economic situation of the aquaculture and processing indus neerning the aquaculture	stry		
Somect	ion of uald col	Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR			
		guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR	no comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
A1	Achievement	ts: Results and deviation from NP proposal			-
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	The segment of "Land based farms - Combined - salmon" is not provided	Month	No action needed
		proposal?	is not provided	Mostly	Explanations are needed to allow EWO
					to understand why this segment is not
		Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	no comments	No NA	the table anymore No action needed
A2	Data quality:	Are the deviations justified? Results and deviation from NP proposal	no comments	INA	prio action needed
-		• •			
		Is respective data quality information given?	no comments	Yes	Ms should provide missing information
		Are the deviations explained?	no comments	No	Ms should provide missing information
A 2	Follow f	Are the deviations justified?	no comments	No	Ms should provide missing information
A3	rollow-up of	Regional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	no comments	Na	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments	NA	No action needed
A4	Actions to av			V	No action no start
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	no comments no comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
Collect	ion of data cor	ncerning the processing industry	no seminorite	100	pro delion needed
		Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR			
		guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR	Yes	Yes	No action needed
				i e	1
		guidelines?	Unpaid labour is missing; MS should not delete cells	Yes	No action needed

G

	Member State:		Poland	Judgement levels			
	WEIIII	Jei State.	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level	
			Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%	
			Version of the NP proposal	22 October 2011	Partly	10-50%	
			rototon of the fit proposal		Mostly	50-90%	
			Overall compliance		Yes	>90%	
					NA	not applicable	
					1		
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG	
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP				
			proposal?	no comments	Yes	No action needed	
			Are the deviations explained?	no comments	No	No action needed	
			Are the deviations justified?	no comments	No	No action needed	
	B2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal		•		
			Is respective data quality information given?	no comments	Yes	No action needed	
			Are the deviations explained?	no comments	NA	No action needed	
			Are the deviations justified?	no comments	NA NA	No action needed	
	B3	Follow-up of Ber	gional and international recommendations	no commente		THE GOLDT HOUSES	
	50	1 Ollow up of Fic	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	One meeting is mentionned in 2011	Yes	No action needed	
			Are the responsive actions described?	no comments	No	No action needed	
	D.4	Antiona to	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments	NA	No action needed	
	B4	Actions to avoid					
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	no comments	Yes	no action needed	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	no comments	Yes	no action needed	
V Modul			of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem				
	<ol> <li>Achieve</li> </ol>	ments: Results ar	nd deviation from NP proposal				
				No comments	Yes	No action needed	
			Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?				
			Are the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation identified	Yes	No action needed	
	2 Actions	to avoid shortfalls					
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls identified	Yes	No action needed	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed	
VI Modul	le for manage	ement and use of	f the data				
				STECF (DG MARE) data call on fish processing industry (EWG 13-15) missing. Not clear for which species the length and age data have been transmitted to ICES NWWG (PL has derogation for Greenland halibut sampling). WKMSTB and WKMSSPDF2 were 2012. RCM		Yes. MS should implement amendment	
			Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NS&EA missing.	Mostly	in future AR	
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
			Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	System apparently mature	Yes	No action needed	
				Not clear, as AR text is not providing details on national		L	
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	databases etc.	Yes	No action needed	
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes (only minor)	Yes	No action needed	
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	2 Actions	to avoid shortfalls					
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
VII Follow	v-up of STEC	F recommendati					
			Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	No relevant recommendations in 2013	Yes	No action needed	
				It's not clear what kind of			
				action the MS is planning for the recommendation for		AR2014: MS to clearly describe	
			Are the responsive actions described?	2011	Mostly	responsive actions	
			A 10	D	N. de contraction	AR2014: MS to clearly describe	
Van 11		and all based of	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Responsive actions not concrete	Mostly	responsive actions	
VIII LIST OF	acronyms a	nd abbreviations		N	Vee	No college and deal	
			Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
IX Comm	nents, sugge	stions and reflec	tions				
			And the second s	N	Yes	No selfer readed	
			Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No comments	l	No action needed	
X Refere	ences					T	
			Is there a complete list of references?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
XI Annex	ces				•		
			Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	

	WICHIE	per State:	Portugal	0010		udgement levels
			AR year Version of the AR reviewed	2013 31 May 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
			Version of the NP proposal	October 2011?	Partly	10-50%
			Q	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
		_		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
eral t	framework	(	Are derogations listed?	No comments	Yes	Action needed?  No action needed
onal		ction organisation	1	No commonte	100	
	Nationa	I correspondent a	nd participating institutes			1
			Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			well described:	Yes, but the address is not provided clearly in the AR	Yes	MS should provide direct link in A
			Is there a national DCF website available? Is the information provided on the website in line with legal	res, but the address is not provided clearly in the Art	165	future
			requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Is there an overview and description of contents of national	No comments	100	
			coordination meetings?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Daniana		If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	B1	al and Internationa Attendance of in	aternational meetings			
			Is Table II.B.1 complete?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	B2	Follow-up of rec	pional and international recommendations	No comments	res	No action needed
			Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the reasonable estima acceptable?	The reason given for not uploading data is not valid.	No.	Ms should upload data according
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Therefore data should be uploaded.	No.	request from RCM NS&EA
ule c	of the eval	uation of the fishi	ng sector			
		description of the	e fishing sector			
			Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP	No comments	V	No action ========
			implementation well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed  Ms should explain why Mediterral
	Econom	nic variables	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	Mediterranean has not been mentionned	Mostly	missing
RA-F	REGION B	altic Sea, North Se	ea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic			•
			Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	100% planned cample rate chould be displayed as	Voo	MS has to write Census instead o
			Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	100% planned sample rate should be displayed as census. no comments	Yes Yes	survey sampling no action needed
			To rusio III.B.E complete and consistent with the galactimos.	Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio,	100	MS should provide variabales up
			Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	investment, number of fishing enterprises	Partly	last version of the guidelines
	B1	Achievements: R	esults and deviation from NP proposal			
				Number of dredgers <10m differs grossly from NP/ description of methods and assumptions made for		MS should provide more detailed assuptions how MS calculates ca
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	estimation of capital value and capital costs not provided;	Mostly	value and capital costs
			The decign and demoternence consistent than are it is proposed.	odimation of dapital value and dapital decidence provided,	Moday	value and capital coole
				The missing Mediterranean fleet is not explained but fleet		MS has to provide information to
			Are the deviations explained?	differences are mentionned	Mostly	the deviations from NP proposal
					•	MS has to provide information to
			Are the deviations justified?	Deviation for Mediterranean fleet is not justified	Mostly	the deviations from NP proposal
	B2	Data quality: Res	ults and deviation from NP proposal			<u> </u>
			Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?	no comments	Yes	no action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	no comments no comments	yes yes	no action needed no action needed
	В3	Follow-up of Rea	ional and international recommendations	55	, Jos	donon noodod
	-		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no comments	Yes	no action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	no comments	NA	no action needed
		•	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments	NA	no action needed
	В4	Actions to avoid s		[	\/	an antina annato d
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	no comments	Yes	no action needed
					1	MS should take the necessary ac
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Missing variables are not mentioned	Mostly	avoid these shortfalls in the future
RA-F	REGION O	ther regions				MC has tot= C==
RA-F	REGION O	ther regions	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AB guidelines?	100% planned sample rate should be displayed as census	Yes	
RA-F	REGION O	ther regions	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	100% planned sample rate should be displayed as census. no comments	Yes Yes	MS has to write Census instead of survey sampling no action needed
RA-F	REGION O	ther regions	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			survey sampling no action needed
RA-F	REGION O	ther regions		no comments		survey sampling no action needed
RA-F	REGION O		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises	Yes	no action needed MS should provide variabales upo
RA-F			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises  vessel number in 'Other reg. HOK2440' does not	Yes	survey sampling no action needed MS should provide variabales up- last version of the guidelines
RA-F			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises  vessel number in 'Other reg. HOK2440' does not correspond with NP' description of methods and	Yes	survey sampling no action needed MS should provide variabales up last version of the guidelines  MS should provide more detailed
RA-F			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises  vessel number in 'Other reg. HOK2440' does not	Yes	survey sampling no action needed MS should provide variabales up last version of the guidelines  MS should provide more detailed
RA-f			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? esults and deviation from NP proposal	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises  vessel number in 'Other reg. HOK2440' does not correspond with NP/ description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs not provided;	Yes Partly	survey sampling no action needed MS should provide variabales up- last version of the guidelines  MS should provide more detailed assuptions how MS calculates ca value and capital costs
RA-F			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises  vessel number in 'Other reg. HOK2440' does not correspond with NP/ description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs not provided;  Number of vessels deviations are explained but not the	Yes Partly  Mostly	survey sampling no action needed MS should provide variabales up last version of the guidelines  MS should provide more detailed assuptions how MS calculates ca value and capital costs  MS has to provide information to
RA-F			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? esults and deviation from NP proposal	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises  vessel number in 'Other reg. HOK2440' does not correspond with NP/ description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs not provided;	Yes Partly	survey sampling no action needed MS should provide variabales up last version of the guidelines  MS should provide more detailed assuptions how MS calculates ca value and capital costs
RA-f			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises  vessel number in 'Other reg. HOK2440' does not correspond with NP' description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs not provided;  Number of vessels deviations are explained but not the missing variables	Yes Partly  Mostly  Mostly	survey sampling no action needed MS should provide variabales up last version of the guidelines  MS should provide more detailed assuptions how MS calculates ca value and capital costs  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal  MS has to provide information to
RA-f	B1	Achievements: R	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises  vessel number in 'Other reg. HOK2440' does not correspond with NP/ description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs not provided;  Number of vessels deviations are explained but not the	Yes Partly  Mostly	survey sampling no action needed MS should provide variabales up last version of the guidelines  MS should provide more detailed assuptions how MS calculates ca value and capital costs  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal
RA-F		Achievements: R	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  ults and deviation from NP proposal	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises  vessel number in 'Other reg. HOK2440' does not correspond with NP' description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs not provided;  Number of vessels deviations are explained but not the missing variables  Deviations for missing variables are not justified	Yes Partly  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly	survey sampling no action needed MS should provide variabales up last version of the guidelines  MS should provide more detailed assuptions how MS calculates ca value and capital costs  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal
RA-F	B1	Achievements: R	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  ults and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises  vessel number in 'Other reg, HOK2440' does not correspond with NP/ description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs not provided;  Number of vessels deviations are explained but not the missing variables  Deviations for missing variables are not justified	Yes Partly  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes	survey sampling no action needed MS should provide variabales up last version of the guidelines  MS should provide more detailed assuptions how MS calculates ca value and capital costs  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal no action needed
RA-F	B1	Achievements: R	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  ults and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises  vessel number in 'Other reg. HOK2440' does not correspond with NP/ description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs not provided;  Number of vessels deviations are explained but not the missing variables  Deviations for missing variables are not justified  no comments no comments	Yes Partly  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes yes	survey sampling no action needed MS should provide variabales up last version of the guidelines  MS should provide more detailed assuptions how MS calculates ca value and capital costs  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal  no action needed no action needed
RA-F	B1	Achievements: R	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  ults and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises  vessel number in 'Other reg, HOK2440' does not correspond with NP/ description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs not provided;  Number of vessels deviations are explained but not the missing variables  Deviations for missing variables are not justified	Yes Partly  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes	survey sampling no action needed MS should provide variabales up last version of the guidelines  MS should provide more detailed assuptions how MS calculates ca value and capital costs  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal no action needed
RA-F	B1	Achievements: R	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises  vessel number in 'Other reg. HOK2440' does not correspond with NP/ description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs not provided;  Number of vessels deviations are explained but not the missing variables  Deviations for missing variables are not justified  no comments no comments	Yes Partly  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes yes	survey sampling no action needed MS should provide variabales up last version of the guidelines  MS should provide more detailed assuptions how MS calculates ca value and capital costs  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal  no action needed no action needed
RA-F	B1	Achievements: R	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  ults and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  onal and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises  vessel number in 'Other reg. HOK2440' does not correspond with NP/ description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs not provided;  Number of vessels deviations are explained but not the missing variables  Deviations for missing variables are not justified  no comments no comments no comments	Yes Partly  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes yes yes NA NA	survey sampling no action needed MS should provide variabales up last version of the guidelines  MS should provide more detailed assuptions how MS calculates ca value and capital costs  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal no action needed no action needed
RA-F	B1 B2	Achievements: R  Data quality: Res  Follow-up of Reg	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  ults and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  onal and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises  vessel number in 'Other reg. HOK2440' does not correspond with NP/ description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs not provided;  Number of vessels deviations are explained but not the missing variables  Deviations for missing variables are not justified  no comments no comments no comments	Yes Partly  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes yes yes	survey sampling no action needed MS should provide variabales up last version of the guidelines  MS should provide more detailed assuptions how MS calculates ca value and capital costs  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal  no action needed no action needed no action needed
RA-F	B1	Achievements: R	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  ults and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations justified?  ional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises  vessel number in 'Other reg. HOK2440' does not correspond with NP/ description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs not provided;  Number of vessels deviations are explained but not the missing variables  Deviations for missing variables are not justified  no comments no comments no comments no comments no comments no comments	Yes Partly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes yes yes NA NA NA	survey sampling no action needed MS should provide variabales up last version of the guidelines  MS should provide more detailed assuptions how MS calculates ca value and capital costs  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal  no action needed
RA-f	B1 B2	Achievements: R  Data quality: Res  Follow-up of Reg	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  ults and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  onal and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises  vessel number in 'Other reg. HOK2440' does not correspond with NP/ description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs not provided;  Number of vessels deviations are explained but not the missing variables  Deviations for missing variables are not justified  no comments no comments no comments no comments no comments	Yes Partly  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes yes yes NA NA	survey sampling no action needed MS should provide variabales up last version of the guidelines  MS should provide more detailed assuptions how MS calculates ca value and capital costs  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal no action needed
RA-F	B1 B2	Achievements: R  Data quality: Res  Follow-up of Reg	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  ults and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations justified?  ional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises  vessel number in 'Other reg. HOK2440' does not correspond with NP/ description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs not provided;  Number of vessels deviations are explained but not the missing variables  Deviations for missing variables are not justified  no comments no comments no comments no comments no comments no comments	Yes Partly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes yes yes NA NA NA	survey sampling no action needed MS should provide variabales up last version of the guidelines  MS should provide more detailed assuptions how MS calculates ca value and capital costs  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal no action needed
RA-F	B1 B2	Achievements: R  Data quality: Res  Follow-up of Reg	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  ults and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations justified?  orional and international recommendations  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises  vessel number in 'Other reg. HOK2440' does not correspond with NP/ description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs not provided;  Number of vessels deviations are explained but not the missing variables  Deviations for missing variables are not justified  no comments	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  yes  NA  NA  NA  Yes	survey sampling no action needed MS should provide variabales up last version of the guidelines  MS should provide more detailed assuptions how MS calculates ca value and capital costs  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal  no action needed MS should take the necessary acc
RA-F	B1 B2	Achievements: R  Data quality: Res  Follow-up of Reg	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  ults and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations justified?  ional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises  vessel number in 'Other reg. HOK2440' does not correspond with NP/ description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs not provided;  Number of vessels deviations are explained but not the missing variables  Deviations for missing variables are not justified  no comments no comments no comments no comments no comments no comments	Yes Partly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes yes yes NA NA NA	survey sampling no action needed MS should provide variabales up last version of the guidelines  MS should provide more detailed assuptions how MS calculates ca value and capital costs  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal  no action needed
RA-F	B1 B2 B3	Achievements: R  Data quality: Res  Follow-up of Reg	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  ults and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  ional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises  vessel number in 'Other reg. HOK2440' does not correspond with NP/ description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs not provided;  Number of vessels deviations are explained but not the missing variables  Deviations for missing variables are not justified  no comments	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  yes  NA  NA  NA  Yes	survey sampling no action needed MS should provide variabales up last version of the guidelines  MS should provide more detailed assuptions how MS calculates ca value and capital costs  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal  no action needed MS should take the necessary acc
RA-F	B1 B2 B3	Achievements: R  Data quality: Res  Follow-up of Reg  Actions to avoid s	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  esults and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  ults and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  ional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	no comments  Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises  vessel number in 'Other reg. HOK2440' does not correspond with NP/ description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs not provided;  Number of vessels deviations are explained but not the missing variables  Deviations for missing variables are not justified  no comments	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  yes  NA  NA  NA  Yes	survey sampling no action needed MS should provide variabales up last version of the guidelines  MS should provide more detailed assuptions how MS calculates ca value and capital costs  MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal MS has to provide information to the deviations from NP proposal no action needed MS should take the necessary ac

Member State:	Portugal			udgement levels
	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
	Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	31 May 2014 October 2011?	No	<10%
	version of the NP proposal	EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
	Overall complian		Yes	>90%
	o voicin compilant		NA NA	not applicable
		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Just a minor issue: In the table C3 there are metiers from different regions (OTB_DEF=120_0_0 and OTB_MDD_130-219_0_0 = PT1) OTM_DEF_100-119_0_0 OTM_DEF_100-119_0_0 OTM_DEF_100-129_0_0 = PT2) with the same sampling frame code. Tables C3 amd C4 for the region Eastern arctic are not coherent: in the C3 are mentioned two metier that thereafter are not reported (or if reported are merged with North Atlantic??) in Table C4. If the metiers have been put together (merged?) MS should check the design of the two tables, reporting the agreed naming convention for the fishery Region and be sure that the planned sampling numbers (trips), and also column N "Total No. of trips during the Sampling year" from the table C3 should match exactly with those of the table C4. In the AR 2013 text the mentioned metiers are correctly reported in separate sections	Yes	MS should clearly explain the difficulties of having one vessel cross into different regions in the same trip, and should highlight the various times where this occurs. MS should also explain how the "total number of trips during the sampling year" is calculated for III.C.3 and III.C.4 to make evaluation easier.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	see previous comments	Vec	MS should clearly explain the difficulties of having one vessel cross into different regions in the same trip, and should highlight the various times where this occurs. MS should also explain how the "total number of trips during the sampling year" is calculated for III.C.3 and III.C.4 to make evaluation easier.
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes for OTM_DEF_100-119_0_0 have no trips have been achieved as no fishery took place, and the same is true for Sebastes mentella (III.C.5) there is a deviation from the	Yes	No action needed
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	planned sampling due to no fishing activity.	Yes	No action needed

	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	F
	Are the deviations explained?	1
	Are the deviations justified?	-
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	_
	Were CV estimates provided?	(

Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations СЗ

Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal C1

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

> Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

r region:

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

> Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

> Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations justified?

planned sampling due to no fishing activity.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Cv has been provided for the sampled species	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
No deviations	NA NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
There are no derogations for module IIIC	NA	No action needed
No relevant recommendations made in 2012	NA	No action needed
Yes for 2011 recommendations	Yes	No action needed
	Yes	No action needed
Yes	V	No action needed
100	Yes Yes	No action needed
	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes		No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
For 4 metier, FYC_CAT_0_0_0, OTB_CRU_>=55_0_0, OTM_DEF_100-129_0_0 and OTM_DEF_100-129_0_0, and for some species (mentioned in the text and in the table of the AR) is reported undersampling in respect to the		
planned one	Mostly	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
100		Tro dollor ricodod
for all the species, in the landing fraction, CV has been met	Mostly	No action needed
The few deviations were found for the discard fraction	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
No derogations requested	NA	No action needed
Partly, as only one of the three relevant recommendations were listed.	Partly	MS should ensure that all relevant recommendations aimed at MS should be listed in future reports.
Yes	Partly	MS should ensure that all relevant recommendations aimed at MS should be listed in future reports.

Yes. MS should please respect the naming convention for LPF metiers	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Name of the Region should be reported as "Other Regions", IOTC, ICCAT are already specified under the column "RFMO" Yes. MS should please respect the		
naming convention for LPF metiers	Yes	No action needed
There is under sampling on shore for LLD_LPF_0_0_0 in IOTC. No sampling have been carried out in CECAF area at sea for PS_SPF_16_0_0, LHP_LPF_0_0_0, LLD_DWF_0_0_0.	Mostly	No action needed
The deviations are not explained for CECAF area	Partly	MS to explain why they did not achieve any at sea sampling in three CECAF metiers.
The deviations are not explained for CECAF area	Partly	MS to explain why they did not achieve any at sea sampling in three CECAF metiers.

Partly

Yes

be listed in future reports.

No action needed

No action needed

		ber State:		Judgement levels		
	Wichin	or oraco.	Portugal AR year	2013	Compliance class	Judgement levels  Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	31 May 2014 October 2011?	No Partly	<10% 10-50%
			• •	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall complian	nce Mostly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
			Were CV estimates provided?	Yes EWG COMMENTS E	WG judgement Yes	No action needed
			Were CV targets met?	Not for all the species	Partly	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	СЗ	Follow up of Br	Are the deviations justified?			
	C3	rollow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations requested	NA	No action needed
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	C4	Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Recreat	ional fisheries				
	ricorcat	iona iisiiciics		Information is given for North Atlantic, ICCAT, IOTC and CECAF all together	Mostly	AR2014: MS to follow Guidelines: 'Insert here region header, according to Appendix II of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU. For each region, sections III.D.1-4 should be given.]'
egion No	orth Atlan	atic	Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?			
egion ito	D1		Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			And desire and achievement assistant with the ND assessed	No information provided for about a and and Formation	Partly	V MC to electricate established
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No information provided for sharks and eel. For sea bass MS should better clarify the situation		Yes, MS to clarify the situation on sea bass, and add text on eel and sharks
				·	No	Yes, MS to mention derogations if any. If
			Are obtained derogations mentioned?	MS should clarify if there are derogations. It is now unclear if the derogation asked for in 2009-2010 is still in place.		no derogations apply, update text on sampling in 2013.
			Are the deviations explained?	No deviations related to 2013 mentioned, text refers	Partly	Yes, MS to explicitely mention 2013
			Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	2014/2015 No comments		sampling and deviations if any.
	D2	Data quality: Re	Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal	INO COMMENTS		1
				No information on data quality	Partly	Van MOda - Para - Para
			Were data quality targets provided?			Yes, MS to explicitely mention 2013 and if no sampling took place, mention that
						nothing can be said about data quality
			Were data quality targets met?	No comments No comments	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
	D3	Follow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations			
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations apply Only old recommendation listed	Yes Yes	No action needed
				Only did recommendation listed	res	AR2014: MS to follow guidelines: 'List
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			the appropriate recommendations from the Liaison Meeting (LM) relevant to the AR year related to the recreational fisheries and give a brief description of the responsive actions taken'
			Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Although it was an old recommendation, but the description of the responsive action is not concrete	NA	No action needed
	D4	Actions to avoid				
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
	Biologic	cal stock-related v		NO COMMENTS		140 delion needed
			Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	Yes		
egion No	orth Sea a	and Eastern Arcti	Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Acinevements.				
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with Art guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
				for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length	Yes	No action needed
	E2	Data quality: Re	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length  Yes  New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
	E2	Data quality: Re	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  esults and deviation from NP proposal	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length  Yes  New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to explain why they do not read the
	E2	Data quality: Re	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length Yes New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables No	Yes Yes Yes Mostly No	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MIS to explain why they do not read the cod otoliths they collect.  No action needed
	E2	Data quality: Re	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length  Yes  New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables  No  Yes	Yes Yes Yes Mostly No Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to explain why they do not read the cod otoliths they collect.  No action needed  No action needed
	E2		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Are the deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length Yes New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables No	Yes Yes Yes Mostly No	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MIS to explain why they do not read the cod otoliths they collect.  No action needed
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? sesults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length  Yes  New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables  No  Yes	Yes Yes Yes Mostly No Yes Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to explain why they do not read the cod otoliths they collect.  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length Yes New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables No Yes Yes The derogations in the Region Yes The sample of the species sampled and related variables No Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Mostly No Yes Yes NA Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to explain why they do not read the cod otoliths they collect.  No action needed
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? souts and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gjonal and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described?	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length Yes New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables No Yes Yes Yes To derogations in the Region Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Mostly No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to explain why they do not read the cod otoliths they collect.  No action needed
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? sesults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? sejional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length Yes New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables No Yes Yes The derogations in the Region Yes The sample of the species sampled and related variables No Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Mostly No Yes Yes NA Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to explain why they do not read the cod otoliths they collect.  No action needed
	E3	Follow-up of Re	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? sesults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? sejional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length Yes New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables No Yes Yes Yes To derogations in the Region Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Mostly No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to explain why they do not read the cod otoliths they collect.  No action needed
	E3	Follow-up of Re	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length  Yes  New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables  No  Yes  Yes  Yes  No derogations in the Region  Yes  Yes  NA	Yes Yes Yes Mostly No Yes Yes Yes Yes NA Yes Yes TNA Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to explain why they do not read the cod ofoliths they collect.  No action needed
	E3	Follow-up of Re	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  seuts and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations suptlied?  segional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the reponsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length  Yes  New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables  No  Yes  Yes  no derogations in the Region  Yes  Yes  NA	Yes Yes Yes Mostly No Yes Yes Yes NA Yes Yes 'NA	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to explain why they do not read the cod otoliths they collect.  No action needed  No action teeded  No action teeded  No action teeded  No action needed  No action teeded  No action needed  No action teeded
egion No	E3	Follow-up of Re	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length  Yes  New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables  No  Yes  Yes  Yes  No derogations in the Region  Yes  Yes  NA	Yes Yes Yes Mostly No Yes Yes Yes Yes NA Yes Yes TNA Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to explain why they do not read the cod otoliths they collect.  No action needed  No action teeded  No action needed  No action needed  No action teeded
egion No	E3	Follow-up of Re  Actions to avoid	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  seuts and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations suptlied?  segional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the reponsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length Yes New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables No Yes Yes Yes No No Yes Yes NA Yes NA Yes NA	Yes Yes Yes Mostly No Yes Yes Yes Yes NA Yes Yes TNA Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to explain why they do not read the cod otoliths they collect.  No action needed  No action teeded  No action teeded  No action teeded  No action needed  No action teeded  No action needed  No action teeded
·gion No	E3 E4	Follow-up of Re  Actions to avoid	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified? seutts and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations iustified? egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length Yes New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables No Yes Yes No derogations in the Region Yes Yes NA  Wes  Mostly	Yes Yes Yes Mostly No Yes Yes Yes Yes NA Yes Yes TNA Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to explain why they do not read the cod otoliths they collect.  No action needed  No action teeded  No action teeded  No action teeded  No action needed  No action teeded  No action needed  No action teeded
₃gion No	E3 E4	Follow-up of Re  Actions to avoid	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  souts and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  gional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length  Yes  New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables  No  Yes  Yes  Yes  No  Mostly  Yes  NA  Yes  The table is completely filled in. The "Number of fish sampled" for stock based variables where not achieved for most off stocks. For some species (hake, anglers) length at age have not been presented due to lack in the consensus	Yes Yes Yes Mostly No Yes Yes Yes Yes NA Yes 'NA Yes Mostly	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to explain why they do not read the cod otoliths they collect.  No action needed  MS should read Cod, as they say in the Annual Report that this is the most important species in this region - MS to clarify.
egion No	E3 E4	Follow-up of Re  Actions to avoid	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  souts and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  gional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant derogations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Results and deviation from NP proposal	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length Yes New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables No Yes Yes Yes No derogations in the Region Yes Yes NA  Yes  The table is completely filled in. The "Number of fish sampled" for stock based variables where not achieved for most off stocks. For some species (hake, anglers) length at the sample of the	Yes Yes Yes Yes Mostly No Yes Yes Yes NA Yes 'NA Yes Mostly  Mostly	No action needed  No action needed  MS to explain why they do not read the cod ofoliths they collect.  No action needed
egion No	E4 E4 Orth Atlan E1	Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  souts and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  splonal and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained?	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length Yes New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables No Yes Yes No Horder Sebastes	Yes Yes Yes Mostly No Yes Yes NA Yes NA Yes And Yes Yes NA Yes Partly	No action needed  No action needed  MS to explain why they do not read the cod otoliths they collect.  No action needed
egion No	E3 E4	Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length Yes New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables No Yes Yes No derogations in the Region Yes Yes NA  Wes  Mostly  Yes  The table is completely filled in. The "Number of fish sampled" for stock based variables where not achieved for most off stocks. For some species (hake, anglers) length at age have not been presented due to lack in the consensus on the methodology to read otoliths Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes Mostly No Yes Yes NA Yes NA Yes And Yes Yes NA Yes And Yes Yes Yes NA Yes	No action needed  No action needed  MS to explain why they do not read the cod otoliths they collect.  No action needed
egion No	E4 E4 Orth Atlan E1	Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  souts and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations iustified?  egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  seults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length Yes New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables No Yes Yes Yes NA  Ves  Yes  The table is completely filled in. The "Number of fish sampled" for stock based variables where not achieved for most off stocks. For some species (hake, anglers) length at age have not been presented due to lack in the consensus on the methodology to read otoliths Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes  Mostly No Yes Yes Yes NA Yes Yes NA Yes Analy Yes Analy Yes Yes Partly Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to explain why they do not read the cod otoliths they collect.  No action needed
egion No	E4 E4 Orth Atlan E1	Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length Yes New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables No Yes Yes No derogations in the Region Yes Yes NA  Wes  Mostly  Yes  The table is completely filled in. The "Number of fish sampled" for stock based variables where not achieved for most off stocks. For some species (hake, anglers) length at age have not been presented due to lack in the consensus on the methodology to read otoliths Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes Mostly No Yes Yes NA Yes NA Yes And Yes Yes NA Yes And Yes Yes Yes NA Yes	No action needed  No action needed  MS to explain why they do not read the cod otoliths they collect.  No action needed
egion No	E3  E4  Orth Atlan E1	Follow-up of Re  Actions to avoid  Actions to Achievements:  Data quality: Re	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  souts and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations iustified?  segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Are the deviations pusitified?  Were CV targets met? Are the deviations pusitified? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations syplained?	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length Yes New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables No Yes Yes Yes No Odrogations in the Region Yes Yes NA  Yes  Mostly  Yes  The table is completely filled in. The "Number of fish sampled" for stock based variables where not achieved for most off stocks. For some species (hake, anglers) length at age have not been presented due to lack in the consensus on the methodology to read otoliths Yes Yes Yes  Yes CV targets were met for 56% of the stocks	Yes Yes Yes Yes Mostly No Yes Yes Yes NA Yes 'NA Yes Mostly Yes Partly Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to explain why they do not read the cod otoliths they collect.  No action needed  No action teeded  No action needed
egion No	E4 E4 Orth Atlan E1	Follow-up of Re  Actions to avoid  Actions to Achievements:  Data quality: Re	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  souts and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  glonal and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are the deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pusified?  Pare the deviations pusified?  Pare the deviations pusified?  Pagional and international recommendations	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length Yes New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables No Yes Yes Yes No Hoderogations in the Region Yes Yes NA  Yes  The table is completely filled in. The "Number of fish sampled" for stock based variables where not achieved for most off stocks. For some species (hake, anglers) length at age have not been presented due to lack in the consensus on the methodology to read otoliths Yes Yes  Yes CV targets were met for 56% of the stocks Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes  Mostly No Yes Yes Yes  NA Yes  NA Yes  Mostly  Yes  Partly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  MS to explain why they do not read the cod otoliths they collect.  No action needed  No action that this is the most important species in this region - MS to clarify.  No action needed
egion No	E3  E4  Orth Atlan E1	Follow-up of Re  Actions to avoid  Actions to Achievements:  Data quality: Re	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  souts and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations iustified?  segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Are the deviations pusitified?  Were CV targets met? Are the deviations pusitified? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations syplained?	for the species Sebastes mentella no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersmapling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length Yes New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for S. mentella.  CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables No Yes Yes No derogations in the Region Yes Yes NA  Yes  Mostly  Yes  The table is completely filled in. The "Number of fish sampled" for stock based variables where not achieved for most off stocks. For some species (hake, anglers) length at age have not been presented due to lack in the consensus on the methodology to read otoliths Yes Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes CV targets were met for 56% of the stocks Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes  Mostly No Yes Yes  NA Yes Yes  NA Yes  Ana Yes  Ana Yes  Mostly  Yes  Partly  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes	No action needed  No action needed  MS to explain why they do not read the cod otoliths they collect.  No action needed  MS should read Cod, as they say in the Annual Report that this is the most important species in this region - MS to clarify.  No action needed

Me						
	ember	r State:	Portugal	2010		Judgement levels
			AR year Version of the AR reviewed	2013 31 May 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
			Version of the NP proposal	October 2011?	Partly	10-50%
				EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall complian	ce Mostly	Yes	>90%
					NA	not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA 2110 COMMITTEE	NA NA	No action needed
E4	Ad	ctions to avo				
				Only highlight that they will continue to improve the		
				sampling ashore, there is no mention of actions to solve on	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	board issues		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
on Other re						
E1	Ad	chievements	Results and deviation from NP proposal	lo.		In a contract
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
				No sampling for stock related variables was conducted in		MS should increase efforts to secure biological sampling, especially for the
				Azores; In all regions, for some species/variables the	Partly	Azores, even if this requires that the N
				coverage achieved was below what was planned		tracks landings to the mainland and
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			samples ashore.
						MS should increase efforts to secure
				V	V	biological sampling, especially for the
				Yes	Yes	Azores, even if this requires that the N tracks landings to the mainland and
			Are the deviations explained?			samples ashore.
			Are the deviations explained:			MS should increase efforts to secure
						biological sampling, especially for the
				Mostly	Mostly	Azores, even if this requires that the N
				· ·		tracks landings to the mainland and
			Are the deviations justified?			samples ashore.
E2	Da	ata quality: R	esults and deviation from NP proposal			
			Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Were CV targets met?	No	Partly	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
E3	Fo	ollow-up of R	egional and international recommendations			
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	no derogation for these Regions	NA	No action needed
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendation from RCM LDF	NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	No relevant recommendation from RCM LDF	NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No relevant recommendation from RCM LDF	NA	No action needed
E4	Ad	ctions to avo	d shortfalls			
				As stated by MS: "Shortfalls are due to problems inherent		
				in large pelagic fisheries: long fishing trips, vessel's		
				conditions and sampling intensities depend on fishing	No	No action needed
				pattern. No additional measures to be proposed." The EWG agrees that there are no actions to take as these	INU	No action needed
				issues will not change, as they are the features of the		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	fishery.		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
Tran	nsversa	al variables			L	
				Fleet segments <10m missing in effort and landings		
			Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	variable groups	Partly	MS should collect missing data
F1	Ca	apacity				
	F1	11 Achie	evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No deviations listed	NA	No action needed
	F1	13 Actio	ns to avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No shortfalls listed	NA	No action needed
F2		ffort				
	F1	11 Achie	evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	<b>-</b>		Trans
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Fleet segments <10m missing in effort variable group	Partly	MS should collect missing data
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing	David.	MS should collect missing data
	E4	12 Data		variables.	Partly	INIS STIDUIG COILECT THISSING GATA
	F1	12 Data	quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
				No comments No comments	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No deviations listed	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
	E4	13 Follo	w-up of Regional and international recommendations	.15 deviations listed	IVA	140 delion needed
	F1	.o rollo	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments		No action needed
			, all and responsive actions acceptable:			
	F1	14 Actio	ns to avoid shortfalls		NA	
	F1	14 Actio	ns to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?			
	F1	14 Actio	ns to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F1	14 Actio				
F3		14 Actio	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
F3	La	andings	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
F3	La	andings	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes Partly	No action needed  MS should collect missing data
F3	La	andings	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups	Yes Partly Partly	No action needed  MS should collect missing data  MS should collect missing data
F3	La	andings	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups  No	Yes Partly	No action needed  MS should collect missing data
F3	La	andings	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups No No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the	Yes Partly Partly No	No action needed  MS should collect missing data  MS should collect missing data  MS should collect missing data
F3	La F1	andings 11 Achie	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups  No	Yes Partly Partly	No action needed  MS should collect missing data  MS should collect missing data
F3	La F1	andings 11 Achie	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups  No  No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.	Yes Partly  Partly  No Partly	No action needed  MS should collect missing data
F3	La F1	andings 11 Achie	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups  No No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.	Yes Partly Partly No Partly Yes	MS should collect missing data  No action needed
F3	La F1	andings 11 Achie	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups  No  No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.  No comments  No comments	Yes Partly  Partly  No Partly  Yes NA	MS should collect missing data  No action needed  No action needed
F3	La F1 F1	andings 11 Achie 12 Data	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified? quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups  No No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.	Yes Partly Partly No Partly Yes	MS should collect missing data  No action needed
F3	La F1 F1	andings 11 Achie 12 Data	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  w-up of Regional and international recommendations	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups  No  No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments	Partly Partly No Partly Ves NA NA	MS should collect missing data  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
F3	La F1 F1	andings 11 Achie 12 Data	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  w-up of Regional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups  No  No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No relevant recommendations	Partly Partly No Partly No Partly No No NA NA	MS should collect missing data  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
F3	La F1 F1	andings 11 Achie 12 Data	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified? quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  w-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups  No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No relevant recommendations  No comments	Partly Partly No Partly No Partly Yes NA NA NA	No action needed  MS should collect missing data  No action needed
F3	La F1 F1	andings 11 Achie 12 Data 13 Follo	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified? quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations given?  Are the deviations form INP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations pustified?  w-up of Regional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups  No  No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments  No relevant recommendations	Partly Partly No Partly No Partly No No NA NA	MS should collect missing data  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
F3	La F1 F1	andings 11 Achie 12 Data 13 Follo	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  w-up of Regional and international recommendations  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  ns to avoid shortfalls	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups  No  No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No relevant recommendations  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments	Partly Partly No Partly No Partly Yes NA NA NA NA	MS should collect missing data  MS action needed  No action needed
F3	La F1 F1	andings 11 Achie 12 Data 13 Follo	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified? quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations given?  Are the deviations form INP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations pustified?  w-up of Regional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups  No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No relevant recommendations  No comments	Partly Partly No Partly No Partly Yes NA NA NA	MS should collect missing data  MS action needed  No action needed
F3	La F1 F1	andings 11 Achie 12 Data 13 Follo	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  w-up of Regional and international recommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  ns to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups  No No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.  No comments No comments No comments No relevant recommendations No comments	Yes Partly Partly No Partly Yes NA NA NA NA NA Yes	No action needed  MS should collect missing data  No action needed
	La F1 F1	andings 11 Achie 12 Data 13 Folio	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups  No  No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.  No comments  No comments  No comments  No relevant recommendations  No comments  No comments  No comments  No comments	Partly Partly No Partly No Partly Yes NA NA NA NA	No action needed  MS should collect missing data  No action needed
Rese	La F1 F1 F1	andings 11 Achie 12 Data 13 Follo 14 Actio	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations ijustified?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  ns to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups  No No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.  No comments No comments No comments No relevant recommendations No comments	Yes Partly Partly No Partly Yes NA NA NA NA NA Yes	MS should collect missing data  No action needed
	La F1 F1 F1	andings 11 Achie 12 Data 13 Follo 14 Actio	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups No No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.  No comments No comments No comments No relevant recommendations No comments No semments No comments No semments No comments No comments No comments	Partly Partly No Partly No Partly  Yes NA NA NA NA Partly  Partly	No action needed  MS should collect missing data  No action needed  No saction needed  No saction needed  No saction needed
Rese	La F1 F1 F1	andings 11 Achie 12 Data 13 Follo 14 Actio	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations ijustified?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  ns to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups  No No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.  No comments No comments No comments No relevant recommendations No comments	Yes Partly Partly No Partly Yes NA NA NA NA NA Yes	No action needed  MS should collect missing data  No action needed  MS should collect missing data  ARSOLION
Rese	La F1 F1 F1	andings 11 Achie 12 Data 13 Follo 14 Actio	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations ijustified?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  ns to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups No No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.  No comments No comments No comments No relevant recommendations No comments No semments No comments No semments No comments No comments No comments	Partly Partly No Partly No Partly  Yes NA NA NA NA Partly  Partly	MS should collect missing data  No action needed As action needed No action needed As action needed
Rese	La F1 F1 F1	andings 11 Achie 12 Data 13 Follo 14 Actio	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations ijustified?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  ns to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups No No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.  No comments No comments No comments No relevant recommendations No comments No semments No comments No semments No comments No comments No comments	Partly Partly No Partly No Partly  Yes NA NA NA NA Partly  Partly	No action needed  MS should collect missing data  No action needed  AN action needed  No action needed  AN action needed  AN action needed  AN action needed  No action needed  AN action needed  No action needed  MS should collect missing data
Rese	La F1 F1 F1	andings 11 Achie 12 Data 13 Follo 14 Actio	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations syplained?  Are the deviations gustified?  Are the deviations further accommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups No No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.  No comments No comments No comments No relevant recommendations No comments No semments No comments No semments No comments No comments No comments	Partly Partly No Partly No Partly  Yes NA NA NA NA Partly  Partly	MS should collect missing data  No action needed AN action needed No action needed AN action needed
Rese	La F1 F1 F1	andings 11 Achie 12 Data 13 Follo 14 Actio	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations ijustified?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  ns to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups No No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.  No comments No comments No comments No relevant recommendations No comments No semments No comments No semments No comments No comments No comments	Partly Partly No Partly No Partly Yes NA NA NA Partly NA NA NA NA NA Yes Partly	No action needed  MS should collect missing data  No action needed  AN action needed  No action needed  AN action needed  AN action needed  AN action needed  No action needed  AN action needed  No action needed  MS should collect missing data
Rese	La F1 F1 F1	andings 11 Achie 12 Data 13 Follo 14 Actio	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations syplained?  Are the deviations gustified?  Are the deviations further accommendations  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments  MS should assure that missing data are being collected  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups  No No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.  No comments No comments No comments No relevant recommendations No comments No comments No comments No comments  No comments  No comments  Complete: yes, following guidelines: no	Partly Partly No Partly No Partly  Yes NA NA NA NA Partly  Partly	No action needed  MS should collect missing data  No action needed  AN action needed  No action needed  AN action needed  AN action needed  AN action needed  No action needed  AN action needed  No action needed  MS should collect missing data
Rese	La F1 F1 F1	andings 11 Achie 12 Data 13 Follo 14 Actio	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments  No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups No No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.  No comments Comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Comments No comments No comments Comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Design: yes, following guidelines: no  Design: yes, achievements: no due to technical problems	Partly Partly No Partly No Partly Yes NA NA NA Partly NA NA NA NA NA Yes Partly	No action needed  MS should collect missing data  No action needed  MS should collect missing data  AR2014: MS to follow AR guidelines: survey had covered more than one ty of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activity.

	Membe	er State:	Portugal	1	.lu	udgement levels
		•	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	31 May 2014 October 2011?	No Partly	<10% 10-50%
			Overall compliance	EWG Answer Mostly	Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
					NA	not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
			Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Map numbers differ between text and table	Yes	AR2014: MS to align map numnbering in text and tables
	G2 I	Data quality: Res	sults and deviation from NP proposal	Unclear to which extent the limited Portguese data will	Mostly	Yes. MS to consider risk of using this
			Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change	influence the international indices. Bias on the estimates	Wostly	vessel in future
			in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?  Are the deviations explained?	presented to the relevant working groups No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	G3 I	rollow-up of Reg	gional and international recommendations	No recommendations listed, but text explains how follow-up	Yes	AR2014: MS to list relevant
				took place		recommendations from survey planning groups (available at
			Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups			http://community.ices.dk/admin/Recome ndations/_layouts/15/start.aspx#/SitePag
			listed?		V	es/Home.aspx)
			Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
	G4	Actions to avoid	shortfalls	Positive that MS investigates possibilities for a new vessel,	Yes	No action needed
				although this was also mentioned last year so it is unclear if	165	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	there is any progress. No comments	Yes	No action needed
			nomic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry			
Α	Collection	i oi data concerr	ning the aquaculture	Table IVA1 is not correctly filled: "sea bass and bream" are		T
			Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?	mentionned on 8 different lines (with wrong name in column "species")	Partly	MS has to follow the most recent guidelines
			Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no comments	Yes	no action needed
	A1 /		Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? esults and deviation from NP proposal	no comments	Yes	no action needed
				Table IVA1 is not consistent with the NP proposal/ Tables		MS has to follow the most recent quidelines and to fill correctly the table
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	are filled with 2012 reference year, and the text refers to 2011	Partly	IVA1. MS should clarify which is the reference year
					Partly	MS has to explain deviations from the
			Are the deviations explained?	Deviations are not explained	No	NP proposal MS has to justify deviations from the NP
	A2 I		Are the deviations justified?  Ilts and deviation from NP proposal	Deviations are not justified	No	proposal
	A2 1			Additional information needed if census has too low	V	LIG Land and Links In the Links
			Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?	response rate.  Deviations are not explained	Yes No	MS has to explain the low response rate MS should explain deviations
			Are the deviations justified?	no comments	NA	MS has to justify deviations from the NP proposal
	A3 I	Follow-up of Region	onal and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?	no comments no comments	NA NA	no action needed no action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments	NA	no action needed
	A4 /	Actions to avoid sl				MS has to take some measures to avoid
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Low response rates are not mentioned in the shortfalls no comments	Mostly NA	this low response rate no action needed
В	Collection	of data concerr	ning the processing industry	MS does not mention the segmentation according the		MS should follow the most recent
			Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	guidelines	Mostly	guidelines
						MS should clarify the inconsistency between the table and the text in AR
			Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	There is an inconsistency between the table and the text in AR about the collection of depreciation capital costs	Yes	about the collection of depreciation capital costs
	B1 /	Achievements: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal	Tables are filled with 2011 reference year, and the text		Ms should provide further information
				refers to 2012/ missing data for depreciation of capital,		about the missing variables of
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	unpaid labour and female FTE/the name of segments does not correspond to the guidelines	Mostly	depreciation of capital, unpaid labour and female FTE
			Are the deviations explained?	Some deviations are not explained	Mostly	Ms should provide further information about deviations
			Are the deviations justified?	Some deviations are not justified	Mostly	Ms should provide further information about deviations
	B2 I	Data quality: Resu	ults and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?	no comments no comments	Yes Yes	no action needed no action needed
	D0 1		Are the deviations justified?	no comments	Yes	no action needed
	B3 I		onal and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no comments	Yes	no action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments no comments	NA NA	no action needed no action needed
	B4 /	Actions to avoid sl		no comments	107	no detion needed
						Some measures or procedures for the
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No information provided	Mostly	missing variable should be undertaken.
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No information provided	Mostly	Some measures or procedures for the missing variable should be undertaken.
		of the effects of	f the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem	ivo information provided	iviostry	missing variable should be undertaken.
1	I Achieveme	ents: Results and	deviation from NP proposal	[	Yes	<del></del> _
			Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments		AR2014: MS to check information in column 'time interval for position reports'
				MS should clarify if there are derogations. It is now unclear	Mostly	
				if the derogation asked for in 2009-2010 is still in place.		AR2014: MS should clarify if there are derogations. It is now unclear if the
						derogation asked for in 2009-2010 is still in place. Clarify if derogation applies to
	Actions to	avoid shortfalls	Are the relevant derogations listed?			calculations or to data collection.
4	- 1000015 10		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
I Module fo	or managen	nent and use of t	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  he data	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			deviation from NP proposal	Aquaculture call missing; not clear why data for fleet		MS should implement amendments in
			Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP	economics and aquaculture are not submitted	Mostly	next AR
			proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed

Member State:	Portugal		J	udgement levels
	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
		31 May 2014	No	<10%
	Version of the NP proposal	October 2011?	Partly	10-50%
		EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
	Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%
			NA	not applicable
		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		Statements are too general, no real progress can be observed from the text so far	Mostly	MS should be more specific on achievements and on remaining problems
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Due to budget constraints MS was not able to carry out all the work related with a Central Data Base for DCF	Partly	MS should fulfil the oblgations according to NP
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No. No deviations foreseen in that context.	No	MS should fulfil the oblgations according to NP
2 Actions to avoid shortfalls				

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations

Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?

Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations

Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations ls there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?

IX Comments, suggestions and reflections
Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?

X References
Is there a complete list of references?

XI Annexes
Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
Statements are too general, no real progress can be observed from the text so far	Mostly	MS should be more specific on achievements and on remaining problems
Due to budget constraints MS was not able to carry out all the work related with a Central Data Base for DCF	Partly	MS should fulfil the oblgations according to NP
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No. No deviations foreseen in that context.	No	MS should fulfil the oblgations according to NP
No comments	Yes	No action needed
Not sufficient. Budgetary reasons cannot be accepted.	Partly	MS should provide budget and perform the necessary work
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

An deregion and between control of the wider of the control of the	Mambay Ctata		Domania					
Part		Member State:	Romania AR year	2013				
Company   Comp			Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%		
Foot Country 15.    Country 15.   Country 15			version of the NP proposal					
Fig. 20 Appearance of the Common Section Control of the Common Sec			Overall compliance	Partly				
Posture of the collection organization of the collection of the collectio				EWG COMMENTS	,	EWG		
An Antique data collection organization  National data collection organization  An Antique data collection organization  An included and collection organization  B in the collection organization  An included and collection organization  B in the collection organization  An in the collection organization organization organization  An in the collection organization organization organization organization organization  An in the collection organization organizatio	ı	General framework						
## Notice of the control of the cont						derogations and mention if have been		
A Miletani correspondent per despute per la personal de la calcular en la calcula		National data collection organization			No			
Part   Common   Com	"		and participating institutes					
In these analysis (CF metable contained) In the set of contained or production of the settle of the				No comments	Yes	No action needed		
In these continues are provided for the months of a 2017  Concertain an analysis of the control of a 2017  Concertain an analysis of the control of a 2017  Concertain an analysis of the control of a 2017  Concertain an analysis of the control of a 2017  Concertain an analysis of the control of a 2017  Concertain an analysis of the control of a 2017  Concertain and control of the control of a 2017  Concertain and control of the control of a 2017  Concertain and control of the control of a 2017  Concertain and control of the control of a 2017  Control of a 2017  Are the operand control of the control of a 2017  Are the operand control of the control of a 2017  Are the operand control of the control of a 2017  Are the operand control of 2017  Are						All the information related to national database are reported under Module VI,		
It be information promotion the website in the webs			Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments	Yes	for the future MS should report		
Beginner and contractions of contraction of the filled in secondary in the distance of the filled in secondary in the distance of the filled in secondary in the secondary in the filled in secondary in the secondary in the filled in secondary in the filled in secondary in the secondary in the filled in secondary in the secondary in the filled in secondary in the filled in secondary in the seconda			Is the information provided on the website in line with legal	No comments	Yes			
Page 10 to the feet fill of incoming the quotedines?   Security of the feet fill of the page of the			Is there an overview and description of contents of national	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
As its response of the production of the fishing sector  As the response actions described?  As the re			If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed		
Are the issuers for nor allocations at planned molecular and an immediation of recommendations  Are the general excenteredations  Are the general excenteredations from Lisean Municipal to the property of regional and informational recommendations from Lisean Municipal to the property of the property o								
As the inscreed for non-allocations of price of programs and informational recommendations on the flating section of this observed in commendations from a commendation from the flating section of the publishes. Recommendations from a specific of the publishes of the flating section of the flating			Is Table II.B.1 complete?	No comments	Yes			
And the research for conditional one of partners of the regional and informational recommendations.  A result of the regional and informational recommendations from Lisaivor Meeting States?  And the recommendation of the security of the states states of the recommendation to the security of the states states of the recommendation to the security of the states states of the security of the states states of the recommendation to the security of the states states of the recommendation to the security of the states states and the security of the States states						to all the planned meetings in order to		
See Fedom to or Implication of Implication for Commendations  And the responsive actions described?  And the responsive actions described and responsi			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings			harmonize and to standardize the collection of data between countries in		
And the potential recommendations from Liseasch Meeting State 1 Activation to global state 2 Activation of the facility of the state of		BO Fallow up of yo		No comments	Yes	the Region		
As the general incommendation from Liston Mustring IEEE/T  And the response actions described?  And the response actions described.  B Economic variables. It is maintained in the fairing soctor if any) and their impact on the fairing soctor if any) and their impact on the fairing soctor if any) and their impact on the fairing soctor if any) and their impact on the fairing soctor if any) and their impact on the fairing soctor if any) and their impact on the fairing soctor if any) and their impact on the fairing soctor if any) and their impact on the fairing soctor if any) and their impact on the fairing soctor if any) and their impact on the fairing soctor if any) and their impact on the fairing soctor if any) and their impact on the fairing soctor if any) and their impact on the fairing soctor if any) and their impact on the fairing soctor if any) and their impact on the fairing soctor if any) and their impact on the fairing soctor in the fairing soct		B2 Follow-up of reg	gional and international recommendations			MS should follow the guidelines and		
Models of the evaluation of the fishing sector  A contract the specific position of the fishing sector  A contract the specific position of the fishing sector  A contract the specific position of the fishing sector  A contract the specific position of the fishing sector  A contract the specific position of the fishing sector  A contract the specific position of the fishing sector  A contract the specific position of the fishing sector  A contract the specific position of the fishing sector  A contract the specific position of the fishing sector  B Economic variables  I b Table III & 1 compile and consistent with AR gradients and deviction from AR gradients and deviction from AR gradients and specific position of the fishing sector and consistent with AR gradients and specific position of the fishing sector and consistent with AR gradients and specific position of the fishing sector and consistent with AR gradients and specific position of the fishing sector and consistent with AR gradients and specific position of the fishing sector and consistent with the NP proposal and everywhere the consistent w			Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting					
Module of the evaluation of the finding sector  Accessed description of the finding sector  Accessed description of the finding sector of any and their impact on the finding sector of any and their impact on the finding sector of any and their impact on the finding sector of any and their impact on the finding sector of any and their impact on the finding sector of any and their impact on the finding sector of any and their impact on the finding sector of any and their impact on the finding sector of any and their impact on the finding sector of any and their impact on the finding sector of any and their impact on the finding sector of any and their impact on the finding sector of any and their impact on the finding sector of any and their impact on the finding sector of any and their impact on the finding sector of any and their impact on the finding sector of any and their impact on the finding sector of any and their impact on the finding sector of the findery is competents. No design on the finding sector of the findery is competents. No design on the finding sector of the findery is competents. No design of any and their impact on the finding sector of the findery is competents. No design sector of the findery is competents. No design sector of the findery is competent in the impact of the im					No	the reference year (2013)		
Mode of the evaluation of the finding sector  An enough in the foliage sector of the finding sector of the fin						recommendations, MS should report the		
Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector  Are General description of the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the Pill interpretentation well described.  Are thorsest in the Pill interpretentation well described.  B Economic variables  SUPPA-REGION Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea  B Economic variables  SUPPA-REGION Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea  I Table III 8.2 complete and consistent with AR quickless guideline?  I Table III 8.2 complete and consistent with AR quickless guideline?  I Table III 8.2 complete and consistent with AR quickless guideline?  I Table III 8.2 complete and consistent with AR quickless guideline?  I Table III 8.2 complete and consistent with AR quickless guideline?  I Table III 8.2 complete and consistent with AR quickless guideline?  Are the deviation spatimen?  Are the deviation spatimen?  Are the deviation spatimen?  Are the deviation spatimen?  Are the response and consistent with AR quickless guideline?  B Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are the response and commendations Are the response another than the subsect of the subsections and commendations Are t								
A Converside description of the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?  S Economic variables in Information under III.8-1 for each super-region given?  SUPRA-REGINI Mediterraneon Pear and Block See  B Table III.8.1 complete and consistent with ARI guidelines?  In Table III.8.1 complete and consistent with ARI guidelines?  In Table III.8.2 complete and consistent with ARI guidelines?  In Table III.8.2 complete and consistent with ARI guidelines?  In Table III.8.3 complete and consistent with ARI guidelines?  In Table III.8.4 complete and consistent with ARI guidelines?  In Table III.8.4 complete and consistent with ARI guidelines?  In Table III.8.4 complete and consistent with ARI guidelines?  An the deviations explanate?  ARI the deviations guideline?  ARI the responsive actions described ?  ARI the responsive actions acceptable?  ARI the deviations guidelines?  ARI the deviations guidelines?  ARI the deviations guidelines?  ARI the deviations gui				- Ve commente	100	THE GOLDT HEEGE		
SUPRIA—RECION Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea  Is Table III.51 complete and consistent with ARI quickliners?  Is Table III.51 complete and consistent with ARI quickliners?  Is Table III.51 complete and consistent with ARI quickliners?  Is Table III.51 complete and consistent with ARI quickliners?  Is Table III.51 complete and consistent with ARI quickliners?  Is Table III.51 complete and consistent with ARI quickliners?  Is Table III.51 complete and consistent with ARI quickliners?  Is Table III.51 complete and consistent with ARI quickliners?  Is Table III.51 complete and consistent with ARI quickliners?  And the development of the NP proposal is respective deals quality information to proposal is respective deals quality information plants.  B3 Follow up of Regional and informational recommendations with ARI quickliners?  And the development and power in the NP proposal is respective and development from NP proposal is respective and development fro	III							
SUPRIA—RECION Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea  Is Table III.51 complete and consistent with ARI quickliners?  Is Table III.51 complete and consistent with ARI quickliners?  Is Table III.51 complete and consistent with ARI quickliners?  Is Table III.51 complete and consistent with ARI quickliners?  Is Table III.51 complete and consistent with ARI quickliners?  Is Table III.51 complete and consistent with ARI quickliners?  Is Table III.51 complete and consistent with ARI quickliners?  Is Table III.51 complete and consistent with ARI quickliners?  Is Table III.51 complete and consistent with ARI quickliners?  And the development of the NP proposal is respective deals quality information to proposal is respective deals quality information plants.  B3 Follow up of Regional and informational recommendations with ARI quickliners?  And the development and power in the NP proposal is respective and development from NP proposal is respective and development fro		•	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact	The description of the fishery is comprehensiv. No				
Entries missing, "Archieved sample rate" incorrect.  But I camplete and consistent with ARI guidelines?  Is Table III. B. complete and consistent with ARI guidelines?  Is Table III. B. complete and consistent with ARI guidelines?  Is Table III. B. complete and consistent with ARI guidelines?  Is Table III. B. complete and consistent with ARI guidelines?  Is Table III. B. complete and consistent with ARI guidelines?  Are the deviations and an advantage of the deviation from the proposal.  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained from the III. I deviated from the III.					Yes	No action needed		
Einter missing "Arbiteved sample rate" incorrect. Population should be filled according to the latest of public missing and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.8.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.8.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.8.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.8.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.8.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.8.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  An elegist and deviation from AP proposal respective data guilly information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations incompleted in the future described and respective data guilly information given?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described and publishers on britant and guidelines?  Are the deviations incomplete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviations septimed?  Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviations respitated?  Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviations septimed?  Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviations septimed?  Are the deviations septimed?  Are the deviations septimed and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviations septimed?  Are the deviations septimed?  Are the deviations prompted and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviations septimed?  Are the de		B Economic variables	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	Yes (only Med & BS relevant)	Yes	No actions needed		
Population should be filled according to the latest in a part of the manufacture of the m		SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean Sea	and Black Sea	Entries missing "Ashioved comple rate" incorrect	ı			
provious years (AR lext indicates 84 machine vessels in another content of the Art and the LB 2 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.3 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.3 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.3 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.3 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.3 complete and consistent with AR quicklines and a few and the consistent with AR quicklines.  Is Table II B.3 complete and consistent with AR quicklines.  Is Table II B.3 complete and consistent with AR quicklines.  Is Table II B.3 complete and consistent with AR quicklines.  Is Table II B.3 complete and consistent with AR quicklines.  Is Table II B.5 complete and consistent with AR quicklines.  Is Table II B.5 complete and consistent with AR quicklines.  Is Table II B.5 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.5 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.5 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.5 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.5 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.5 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.5 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.5 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.5 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.5 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.5 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.5 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.5 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.5 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.5 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.5 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.5 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.5 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.5 complete and consistent with AR quicklines?  Is Table II B.5 complete an				Population should be filled according to the latest				
Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  B1			Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR			Correct and complete the table and		
is Table III.8.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations of south short falls in the future described? Are the deviations of south short falls in the future described? Are the deviations of south short falls in the future described? Are the deviations of south short falls in the future described? Are the deviations of south short falls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfall in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfall in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfall in the future accep			guidelines?		Partly			
as Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR quindlines?  B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal proposal?  Are the deviations pushled?  Are the deviations and evolution from the proposal to simple and consistent with AR guidelines?  B1					Yes	No actions needed		
## Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal Are the deviations systalined? Are the deviations systalined? Are the deviation systalined? Are the relevant recommendations from IM listed? Are the relevant recommendations from IM listed? Are the representation accomptable? Are the representation accomptable? Are the representation accomptable? Are the representation acceptable? Are the representation that the described? Are the representation that the thurse acceptable? Are the represen				size Category" is not a variable, line should be deleted;				
Several numbers do not correspond with entries in latest Archievements. Results and deviation from NP proposal Archievements consistent with the NP proposal? Archievements consistent with the NP proposal and the deviations justified?  B2 Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal Archievements in justified? B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Archievements in justified? Archievements in justified? B5 Bological metier related variables B5 In justified i					Partly	Correct the table and resend it		
proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pushined? Are the deviations explained? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		B1 Achievements: F	Results and deviation from NP proposal		rany	Served and table and reservant		
As the deviations justified?  B2 Data quality. Reutalis and deviation from NP proposal is respective data quality information given? Any the deviations explained? Any the deviations explained? Any the deviations explained? Any the relevant recommendations from LM jisted? Any the responsive actions described? Any the responsive actions acceptable? Any the responsive actions acceptable? Any the responsive actions acceptable? Any the responsive actions described? Any the responsive actions described? Any the responsive actions acceptable? Any the responsive actions from the proposal was actionated and acceptable acceptable? Any the deviations explained? Any the deviations explaine					Yes	No actions needed		
B2 Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations substitled?  Are the deviations justified?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are action								
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive accitors described? Are accitors to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are accitors to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? C Biological metier related variables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? Region Mediterranean Sea and Black See Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations pushfied? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pushfied? Are the deviations pushfied? Are the deviations pushfied? Are the deviations pushfied? Are the deviations explained? Are the devia		B2 Data quality: Res		INO	INO .	No actions needed		
Regional and international recommendations Are the devirations justified? Are the reployant recommendations Are the reployant recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? C Biological metier related variables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations suplained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviatio								
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  C Biological metter related variables Is failt in LC.1-4 given for each region?  Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations provided? Were CV targets mer? Are the deviations provided? Were CV targets mer? Are the deviations provided? NA NA NA No actions needed NA NA NA NO actions needed NA NA NA NO actions needed NA NA NO actions needed NA NA NO actions needed NA NA NO action			•					
Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  B4		B3 Follow-up of Reg		No relevant recommendations	Van	INIs nations woulded		
Actions to avoid shortfalls A Pas actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations is united and thermation and thermations are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations is united and thermations are the deviations are the deviations is united and thermations are the								
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? C Biological metier related variables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?  Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?		R4 Actions to avoid		NA	NA	No actions needed		
C   Biological metier related variables   Is information on III.C.1.4 given for each region?		Actions to dvoid	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?					
Sinformation on III.C.1-4 given for each region?   Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea		C Biological metier related		NA .	NA NA	No actions needed		
C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations ignified?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations ignified?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations ignified?  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  N		· ·	Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	Yes (only Med&BS relevant)	Yes	no action needed		
Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations gustflied? Are the deviations pustflied? Are the deviations justflied? NA								
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations guidelines? Are the deviations guidelines. Instead, and guidelines and guidelines and guidelines and guidelines and			Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR	NA.	NA	no action needed		
is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations plustified?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations plustified?  Are the deviations plustified?  Are the deviations plustified?  Are the deviations plustified?  NA NA no action needed  NA NA no action needed  NA NA no action needed			Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR					
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  NA no action needed				INA .		no action needed		
guidelines?  NA It seems that there has been no commercial sampling at all for pelagic trawls and gillnets. Instead, it seems that samples were taken on research surveys or by experimental sampling, but reported as at-sea sampling or port sampling. Not clear why only unsorted catches were sampled (not divided by landings and discards, see Table lill.C.5).  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Are the deviations provided? Were CV stimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pusified?  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  No action needed  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  NA  N				NA	NA	no action needed		
all for pelagic trawls and gillnets. Instead, it seems that samples were taken on research surveys or by experimental sampling, but reported as at-sea sampling or port sampling. Not clear why only unsorted catches were sampled (not divided by landings and discards, see Table III.C.5).  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  NA NA no action needed					NA	no action needed		
experimental sampling, but reported as at-sea sampling or port sampling. Not clear why only unsorted catches were sampled (not divided by landings and discards, see Table proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Pata quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV stimates provided? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  NA  NA  NA  NA  No action needed  NA  NA  NO  MS should report only the recommendations relevant for  MS to delete old recommendations				all for pelagic trawls and gillnets. Instead, it seems that				
port sampling. Not clear why only unsorted catches were sampled (not divided by landings and discards, see Table III.C.5).  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pusified? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation sexplained? NA								
proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? NA N			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	port sampling. Not clear why only unsorted catches were		MS should re-submit tables and AR text for the whole section III.C taking EWG		
Are the deviations justified?  Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations sylatified?  NA  NA  NA  Na  no action needed  NA  NA  no action needed  NA  NA  no action needed  NA  NA  NO  MS hould report only the recommendations relevant for  MS to delete old recommendations			proposal?	III.C.5).		comments into account.		
C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  NA NA no action needed  NA NA no action needed								
Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  NA  NA  NA  Na  no action needed  NA  no action needed  NA  no action needed  NA  no action needed  NA  NA  no action needed  NA  NA  NO  NO  MS should report only the recommendations relevant for  MS to delete old recommendations		C2 Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal					
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  C3 Follow-up of Regional and International recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  NA NA no action needed NA no action needed NA NA no action needed NA NA NO NA NO NA NO NO NO NA NO NA NO NA NO NA NO NA NO NA NA NO NA				NA				
C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  No  MS should report only the recommendations relevant for  MS to delete old recommendations			Are the deviations explained?	NA		no action needed		
Were the relevant derogations listed?  No MS should report only the recommendations relevant for MS to delete old recommendations		C3 Follow-up of Re		INA	NA NA	no action needed		
			Were the relevant derogations listed?		No	MS to delete old recommendations		
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Mostly			

				1		
	Memb	er State:	Romania AR year	2013	Ju Compliance class	dgement levels  Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	March 2010?  EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
			Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
					NA	not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
			Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
	C4	Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  I shortfalls	Yes	Yes	no action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	NA	no action needed
D	Daawaati	onal fisheries	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	no action needed
U	Hecreau	ional lisheries	Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Region M		ean Sea and Blac	ck Sea			
	D1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			T
			proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are obtained derogations mentioned?	MS mentioned a derogation for tuna and eel but no		AR2014: MS to clearly indicate whether
			The obtained delogations mentioned:	evidence that it has been accepted is reported by MS	Mostly	the derogation mentioned was accepted
						Yes. MS should request derogation for
			Are the deviations explained?			sampling recreational shark fisheries
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	based on relevant justification.  No action needed
	D2	Data quality: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	162	No action needed
			Were data quality targets provided?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
			Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained?	No comments No comments	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
	D3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations			
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	MS mentioned a derogation for tuna and eel but no evidence that it has been accepted is reported by MS	Mostly	No addidtional action needed (action already mentioned in III.D1)
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	MS should report only the recommendations relevant for		AR2014: MS to report only on
			Are the responsive actions described ?	the reference year No comments	Yes NA	recommendations for reference year  No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
	D4	Actions to avoid				
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments No comments	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
E	Biologic	al stock-related		re comments	101	No delien needed
			Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	Vas (only Mad&RS raloyant)	Yes	No action needed
Region M	lediterrane	ean Sea and Blad		res (only wedado relevant)		No action needed
	E1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?	Not clear if data source "landings" is correct, see comments on III.C	Mostly	No action needed
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Only for Psetta maxima, a lower number than the planned	Mostly	No action needed
			proposal?	ones has been achieved		MS should clarify correct sources of
			Are the deviations explained?	No	No	data (see comments on III.C)
	E2	Data quality: Da	Are the deviations justified? esults and deviation from NP proposal	NA	NA	No action needed
	LZ	Data quanty. He		Yes, but not clear if these are relevant (see comments on	NA	MS should clarify correct sources of
			Were CV estimates provided?	III.C) No	No	data (see comments on III.C)  No action needed
			Were CV targets met?	MS should explain the deviation from the planned CV	No	MS should explain the deviation from
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA NA	the planned CV No action needed
	E3	Follow-up of Re	Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations	INA	INA	No action needed
		•	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	NA	No action needed
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	MS should report only the recommendations relevant for the reference year.	Mostly	MS should delete old and non-relevant recommendations
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No action needed
	-4	A ations to over	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
	E4	Actions to avoid		Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?			MS should clarify how commercial
			Are estimate assistant aboutfalls in the future acceptable?	No	No	sampling has been done in 2013 and
F	Transve	rsal variables	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			will be done in future
				Come of the offest verichles are calliable only for exception		
				Some of the effort variables are aplicable only for specific fishing techniques. The reference year for transversal		
				data collection reported as 2012 meaning, that MS was		
				still collecting data for 2012 when it was already published on the EU Fleet Register web-site. Generally in case of		
				administrative data sources (logbooks, Fleet Register,		Consider the difference in effort data
			Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR	sales notes) the reference year should be the same as the AR/NP year. Howether the data presentation is the		collection obigations for different fishing techniques submitting the report next
			guidelines?	following year of data collection.	Yes	year.
	F1	Capacity F11 Achiev	vements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		ACHIEV	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			1
			proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments No comments	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
		F13 Action	s to avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments No comments	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
	F2	Effort	rue delibris to avoid shortialis in the future acceptable?	rao commenta	IVA	INO ACTION NEEDED
		F11 Achiev	vements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			,
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		F12 Data o	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		i iz Data c	quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		F13 Follow	Are the deviations justified?  Are the deviations justified?  Are the deviations justified?		NA	No action needed
		. IO FUIIOW	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		F14 Action	is to avoid shortfalls			

Member State:			Ludomont locale		
wen	iber State	Romania AR year	2013	Compliance class	Judgement levels  Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	March 2010? EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
		Overall comp		Yes	>90%
				NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described		NA	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable	e? No comments	NA	No action needed
F3	Landings				
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
		proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			To a second
		Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?	No comments No comments	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
	F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	To commente		no dollon noodod
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	F4.4	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described	? No comments	NA	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable		NA NA	No action needed
Resea	rch surveys a		The commonte	101	no dollon noodod
G1		ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR	Number of days at sea and the planned target include		AR2014: MS to only include number
		guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	both Romania and Bulgaria	Yes	days at sea for the MS Yes. MS to revise agreement with
		proposal?	No comments	Mostly	Bulgaria
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No comments	Vac	No action needed
G2	Data musli	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	INO action fleeded
U.E	-ata quali	Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (b	y e.g.		
		no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical			No additional action needed (see I
		coverage etc.)?	Bulgaria did not fulfill its part of the coordinated survey.	Mostly	on agreement with Bulgaria)
		Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
G3	Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations	no comments	103	140 delion needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Plan			
		Groups listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	Yes	No additional action needed (see I on agreement with Bulgaria)
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
G4	Actions to	avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable e economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture	e? No comments	Yes NA	No additional action needed (see I on agreement with Bulgaria)  No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?	e? No comments  Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells		on agreement with Bulgaria)  No action needed  Table should be replaced accordin the guidelines and resubmitted
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR	e? No comments  Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved	NA Mostly	on agreement with Bulgaria) No action needed  Table should be replaced accordin the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?	e? No comments  Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells	NA	on agreement with Bulgaria) No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted
Collec	tion of data c	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	e? No comments  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no.	NA Mostly	on agreement with Bulgaria) No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted
	tion of data c	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Its Table IV.A.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	e? No comments  Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no.  For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided	NA Mostly Mostly	on agreement with Bulgaria) No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with mit
Collec	tion of data c	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Its Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Its Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	e? No comments Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no. For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided	Mostly Mostly Mostly	on agreement with Bulgaria)  No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted  Table should be corrected and resubmitted  Table should be completed with mit CV and resubmitted
Collec	tion of data c	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Its Table IV.A.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	e? No comments  Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no.  For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided	NA Mostly Mostly	on agreement with Bulgaria) No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with mit
Collect	Achieveme	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable e economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	e? No comments  Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells. Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no.  For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided.	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes	on agreement with Bulgaria) No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with m CV and resubmitted  No actions needed
Collec	Achieveme	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable e economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Its Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Its Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are desuits and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal	e? No comments  Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no.  For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided  Yes Yes Yes Yes	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes	on agreement with Bulgaria)  No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with maction of the completed with mactions needed  No actions needed No actions needed No actions needed
Collect	Achieveme	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable e economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations justified? Y: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	e? No comments  Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells. Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no.  For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	on agreement with Bulgaria)  No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted. Table should be corrected and resubmitted. Table should be completed with m CV and resubmitted.  No actions needed.  No actions needed.  No actions needed.  No actions needed.
Collect	Achieveme	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable e economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? If Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?	e? No comments Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no. For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	on agreement with Bulgaria)  No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted. Table should be corrected and resubmitted. Table should be completed with m CV and resubmitted.  No actions needed. No actions needed. No actions needed.  No actions needed. No actions needed. No actions needed. No actions needed. No actions needed.
Collect	Achieveme Data qualit	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable e economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations justified? Y: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	e? No comments  Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells. Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no.  For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	on agreement with Bulgaria)  No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted. Table should be corrected and resubmitted. Table should be completed with m CV and resubmitted.  No actions needed.  No actions needed.  No actions needed.  No actions needed.
A1	Achieveme Data qualit	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable e economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Ints: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations justified? Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviation suptified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	e? No comments Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no. For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	on agreement with Bulgaria)  No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with m CV and resubmitted  No actions needed
A1	Achieveme Data qualit	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Its: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	e? No comments  Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no.  For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA	Mostly  Mostly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	on agreement with Bulgaria) No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with magnetic to the completed magnetic to the completed magnetic to the complete magnetic to the complete magnetic the complete ma
A1 A2 A3	Achieveme  Data qualit	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations functions are the deviations actions described? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described?	e? No comments Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no. For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	on agreement with Bulgaria)  No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with m CV and resubmitted  No actions needed
A1	Achieveme  Data qualit	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable e economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Ints: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations from NP proposal  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  If Regional and international recommendations  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	e? No comments Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no. For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA	Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  NA  NA	on agreement with Bulgaria)  No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted. Table should be corrected and resubmitted. Table should be completed with m CV and resubmitted.  No actions needed.
A1 A2 A3	Achieveme  Data qualit	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable e economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Its: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? world shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described	e? No comments  Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no. For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	Mostly  Mostly  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	on agreement with Bulgaria)  No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with m CV and resubmitted  No actions needed
A1 A2 A3	Achievement  Data qualit  Follow-up of	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable e economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described oncerning the processing industry	e? No comments  Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no. For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  NA  NA  NA  Yes	on agreement with Bulgaria)  No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted. Table should be corrected and resubmitted. Table should be completed with m CV and resubmitted.  No actions needed.
A1 A2 A3	Achievement  Data qualit  Follow-up of	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Its Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are tessults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations pustified? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? wid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR	e? No comments  Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no. For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	on agreement with Bulgaria) No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with magnetic states and resubmitted Table should be completed with magnetic states and resubmitted  No actions needed
A1 A2 A3	Achievement  Data qualit  Follow-up of	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable e economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described oncerning the processing industry	e? No comments  Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no. For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  NA  NA  NA  Yes	on agreement with Bulgaria)  No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted. Table should be corrected and resubmitted. Table should be completed with mic CV and resubmitted.  No actions needed.
A1 A2 A3	Achievement  Data qualit  Follow-up of	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Its Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are tessults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations pustified? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? wid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR	e? No comments  Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no.  For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes All cells should be filled in (Variable name), in order to	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	on agreement with Bulgaria) No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with material control of the submitted Table should be completed with material control of the submitted Table should be completed with material control of the submitted Table should be completed with material control of the submitted Table should be completed with material control of the submitted Table should be completed with actions needed No actions needed Ms Should explain why CV is not when actioned sample rate is 100 when actioned sa
A1 A2 A3	Achievement  Data qualit  Follow-up of	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Its Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviation explained? Are the deviation justified? Fresults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Pres  Yes  Yes  Yes  NA  NA  NA  NA  All cells should be filled in (Variable name), in order to prevent misunderstanding. CV should be 0 when	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	on agreement with Bulgaria)  No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted. Table should be corrected and resubmitted. Table should be completed with m CV and resubmitted.  No actions needed. No actions
A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect	Achieveme  Data qualit  Follow-up of Actions to	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable e economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Its: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? It results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations justified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? It is a complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	e? No comments  Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no.  For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes All cells should be filled in (Variable name), in order to	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	on agreement with Bulgaria) No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with mic CV and resubmitted  No actions needed
A1 A2 A3	Achieveme  Data qualit  Follow-up of Actions to	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Its Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviation explained? Are the deviation justified? Fresults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	e? No comments  Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no. For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  All cells should be filled in (Variable name), in order to prevent misunderstanding. CV should be 0 when achieved sample rate is 100%.	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	on agreement with Bulgaria)  No action needed  Table should be replaced accordin the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with mic CV and resubmitted  No actions needed So actions needed No actions needed No actions needed So actions needed No actions needed No actions needed So actions needed No actions needed
A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect	Achieveme  Data qualit  Follow-up of Actions to	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable e economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Its: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? word shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Its Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	e? No comments Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no. For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  NA	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	on agreement with Bulgaria) No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with mic CV and resubmitted  No actions needed
A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect	Achieveme  Data qualit  Follow-up of Actions to	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable e economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Ist a the IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable oncerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	on agreement with Bulgaria)  No action needed  Table should be replaced accordin the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with mic CV and resubmitted  No actions needed
A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect	Achievement  Achievement  Actions to the control of data contr	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable a conomic situation of the aquaculture and processing sincerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Institute and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? If Regional and international promation given? Are the deviations explained? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable oncerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Its Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Institute Are deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained?	e? No comments Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no. For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  NA	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	on agreement with Bulgaria) No action needed  Table should be replaced accordin the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with mi CV and resubmitted  No actions needed
A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect	Achievement  Achievement  Actions to the control of data contr	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable e economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Its: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations justified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? woid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable incerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Its Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal	e? No comments Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no. For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  NA NA NA NA All cells should be filled in (Variable name), in order to prevent misunderstanding. CV should be 0 when achieved sample rate is 100%.  Yes Yes Yes NA	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	on agreement with Bulgaria) No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with mic CV and resubmitted  No actions needed
A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect	Achievement  Achievement  Actions to the control of data contr	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable a conomic situation of the aquaculture and processing sincerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Institute and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? If Regional and international promation given? Are the deviations explained? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable oncerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Its Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Institute Are deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained?	Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	on agreement with Bulgaria)  No action needed  Table should be replaced accordin the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with mic CV and resubmitted  No actions needed
A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect	Achievement  Achievement  Actions to the control of data contr	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable e economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Its Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations in the future described and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable oncerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Its Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	e? No comments Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no. For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes All cells should be filled in (Variable name), in order to prevent misunderstanding. CV should be 0 when achieved sample rate is 100%.  Yes Yes NA Yes Yes NA Yes Yes NA Yes Yes NA Yes	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  NA  NA  NA  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes	on agreement with Bulgaria) No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with mic CV and resubmitted  No actions needed
A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect	Achieveme  Data qualit  Follow-up of Actions to action of data conditions to action of data conditions action of data cond	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable e economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Ista Bele IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviation signature and the service of the deviations of the service of the	e? No comments Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no. For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes All cells should be filled in (Variable name), in order to prevent misunderstanding. CV should be 0 when achieved sample rate is 100%.  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  NA  NA  NA  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes	on agreement with Bulgaria) No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with mic CV and resubmitted  No actions needed
A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect	Achieveme  Data qualit  Follow-up of Actions to action of data conditions to action of data conditions action of data cond	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable e economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NF proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable oncerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with the NF proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	on agreement with Bulgaria) No action needed  Table should be replaced accordin the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with mic CV and resubmitted  No actions needed
A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect	Achieveme  Data qualit  Follow-up of Actions to action of data conditions to action of data conditions action of data cond	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable e economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Its: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  (void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable oncerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Its Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation from NP proposal	e? No comments Industry  Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be Achieved no. Sample/Frame Population no. For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided  Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  NA	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	on agreement with Bulgaria) No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with mic CV and resubmitted  No actions needed
A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect B1 B2	Achievement  Data qualit  Follow-up of the control of data control dat	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation sylained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations justified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable received in the future acceptable of the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Its Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations pusitied? Are the deviations pusitied? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations from NP proposal Are the deviations pusitied? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	on agreement with Bulgaria) No action needed  Table should be replaced accordin the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with mit covariance and resubmitted  No actions needed
A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect	Achievement  Data qualit  Follow-up of the control of data control dat	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable e economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Its: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  (void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable oncerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Its Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation from NP proposal	Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	on agreement with Bulgaria) No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with mactions needed No actions needed
A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect B1 B2	Achievement  Data qualit  Follow-up of the control of data control dat	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable e economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable oncerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations pustified? Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described?	Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	on agreement with Bulgaria)  No action needed  Table should be replaced accordin the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted  Table should be completed with mic CV and resubmitted  No actions needed
A1  A2  A3  A4  Collect  B1  B2  B3  B4  ule of evalua	Achievement  Achievement  Actions to  Achievement  Action of data of  Achievement	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Ist Esseults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable oncerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Its Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations pustified? Results and teviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the responsive actions described?	Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with mit CV and resubmitted No actions needed
A1  A2  A3  A4  Collect  B1  B2  B3  B4  ule of evalua	Achievement  Achievement  Actions to  Achievement  Action of data of  Achievement	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Fr. Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations justified? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? World shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable are actions to av	Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	on agreement with Bulgaria) No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with mit covariance and resubmitted  No actions needed
A1  A2  A3  A4  Collect  B1  B2  B3  B4  ule of evalua	Achievement  Achievement  Actions to  Achievement  Action of data of  Achievement	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable economic situation of the aquaculture and processing oncerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Ist Esseults and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable oncerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Its Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations pustified? Results and teviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the responsive actions described?	Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres Pres	Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	on agreement with Bulgaria) No action needed  Table should be replaced according the guidelines and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be corrected and resubmitted Table should be completed with mit covariance and resubmitted  No actions needed

Member State:	Romania		Judgement levels	
	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
	Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
	Version of the NP proposal	March 2010?	Partly	10-50%
		EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
	Overall compliance	Partly	Yes NA	>90%
		L	INA	not applicable
2 Actions to avoid shortfalls		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
2 Actions to avoid shortialis	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
VI Module for management and use of	•	The comments		THE GOLDT HEEGE
1 Achievements: Results an				
1 /temevements. riesaits an	a deviation nom 141 proposal			
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent			
	with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	no deviations are reported	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
2 Actions to avoid shortfalls	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
VII Follow-up of STECF recommendation	•	The definition to		THE GOLDT HEEGE
VII Tollow-up of 31201 recommendation	ons	Also recommendations not relevant for AR are listed. Sime recommendations are listed in various formats (not always following quidelines), which makes it difficult to		AR2014: MS to list only directly relevant
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	overview.	Yes	recommendations in table format
	Are the responsive actions described?	For most relevant recommendations: yes.	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations				
•	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
IX Comments, suggestions and reflect	tions			
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	Comments passed on to Commission by STECF EWG 14- 07	Yes	No action needed
X References	, 55			•
	Is there a complete list of references?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
XI Annexes	The second secon			
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	79 annexes are presented. Half extensive background material and half results of the data collection. Results should not be included in AR	Yes	AR2014: MS only to present most relevant information in annexes

			AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
				EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%
					NA	not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
General f	ramewor	k		EWG COMMENTS	LWG judgement	Action needed?
			Are derogations listed?	Yes. No derogation was expected by MS.	NA	No action needed
		ection organisation				
Α	Nationa	I correspondent	and participating institutes			
			Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
			Is there a national DCF website available?	A website is given	Yes	No action needed
			Is the information provided on the website in line with legal	7. Website is given	163	140 delicii necaca
			requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
						MS should report the main contents and
			Is there an overview and description of contents of national			outputs of the national coordination
			coordination meetings?	Minutes sent to the Commission	Partly	meeting
В	Pogion	al and Internation	If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
ь	B1		nternational meetings			
						MS should list all the DCF meetings in
						the table II.B.1 even MS has not
						participated and/or the meetings are not
			Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Only a subset of meetings are listed	Mostly	relevant for the MS
			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings	No	NI-	MS should clarify the non-attendance to
	B2	Fallow up of vo	explained? gional and international recommendations	No comment	No	some planned meetings
	D2	rollow-up of rei	gional and international recommendations			MS should list all the recommendations
			Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting			relevant for the country and for the
			listed?	No comment	No	reference year
			Are the responsive actions described?	No comment	NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comment	NA	No action needed
		luation of the fish				
A	Genera	description of th	ne fishing sector			T
						MS should clarify if during the refence
						year changes occured in the fishing
			Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact			sector and if yes, whether this had
			on the NP implementation well described?	Only brief listing of vessels by category	Partly	implication on the implementation of NP
В		nic variables	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
SUPHA-F	REGION I	lediterranean Sea	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR			I
			guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR			
			guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	B1	Achievements: F	Results and deviation from NP proposal	140 Comment	163	No action needed
		7.01.10.701.101.101.1	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Yes. Clustering scheme in NP has not been updated for		
			proposal?	reference year 2008	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No comment	NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	B2	Data quality: Res	sults and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No comment	NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	B3	Follow-up of Reg	gional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	No comment	NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	B4	Actions to avoid	shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comment	NA	No action needed
С	Biologi	cal metier related		MO to according and all D. C. MED TO	V	INI- anti-a mand 1
Dent 1	ladit-	Oct 15	Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	MS is operating only in Region MED&BS	Yes	No action needed
region N	lediterrar C1	nean Sea and Blac	ck Sea Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	01	Acmevements:	nesans and deviation from NE proposal	Table complete. But only year 2013 was to be provided.		MS should only list the current years'
			Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR	All metiers are undersampled comparing to NP		achievements in the tables ie 2013 - not
			guidelines?	objectives.	Mostly	2011 and 2012
			le Table III C 4 complete and consists at 191 AB			MS should only list the current years'
			Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table complete. But only year 2013 was to be provided.	Mostly	achievements in the tables ie 2013 - not 2011 and 2012
			guidonties:	radio complete. Dut only year 2013 was to be provided.	iviostiy	MS should only list the current years'
			Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR			achievements in the tables ie 2013 - not
			guidelines?	Table complete. But only year 2013 was to be provided.	Mostly	2011 and 2012
						MS should only list the surrent years!
						MS should only list the current years' achievements in the tables ie 2013 - not
						2011 and 2012. MS to explain whether
						concurrent sampling took place or not
			Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR	Information provided only for anchovy and sardine. Is		as number of fish measured is the
			guidelines?	concurrent sampling really implemented ?	Mostly	same in tables IIIC5 and IIIC6
				Table complete. But only year 2013 was to be provided.		None of the metier or planned length
				Achievement rates are respectively 33% and 27% for the		sampling was achieved. Slovenia
				two species planned for sampling in the NP. No		states that pelagic trawling stopped in
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	information provided for other species, whereas Slovenia		2012. MS to confirm that there was no
			proposal?	is implementing the concurrent sampling method.	Partly	pelagic trawling in 2013
						Name of the metics and a second
				Only for PTM_SPF. Nothing for other metiers		None of the metier or planned length sampling was achieved. Slovenia
				undersampled. Mixture in the AR text between metiers		states that pelagic trawling stopped in
				variables and tranversal variables? Why in the AR text		2012. MS to confirm that there was also
				Slovenia wrote to have only two metiers to sample when		no pelagic trawling in 2013. MS to note
				in the NP and AR technical tables 5 are listed?		that TRANSVERSAL variables and text
				Transversal variables hould not be reported under		should not be included in Section C.
			Are the deviations explained?	section C. NB text on section IIIC2 is missing/been	No	The heading for Section IIIC2 must be highlighted within the text
			Are the deviations explained?	deleted from the text	INU	mgmignied within the text

Ш

	Mambar Cta	<b>.</b>	Slovenia	1		
,	Member Stat		AR year	2013	Compliance class	Gompliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	October 2012? EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
			Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
					NA	not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
						None of the metier or planned length sampling was achieved. Slovenia
						states that pelagic trawling ended in
			Are the deviations justified?	No	No	2012. MS to confirm that there was no pelagic trawling in 2013
c	C2 Data qua	ality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal	N. B	I	
			Were CV estimates provided?	Yes Precision target CV given as a % - this should be given as a number	Yes	No action needed other than, in future, the CV must be in numbers
			W 0V/	Discard CV ok but landings CV only given to 1 decimal	Mandle	MO As a second section and a second s
			Were CV targets met?	point	Mostly	MS to resubmit table with adjustments Section IIIC2 is missing and should be
			Are the deviations explained?	No	No	re-inserted into the AR
c	C3 Follow-u		Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations	NA	NA	No action needed
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations listed	NA	No action needed
				Text of the report a little bit confusing. Slovenia not		Only 1 listed for incorrect year (2009). MS should list the recommendations in
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	involved in LPF fisheries.	Partly	a proper format.
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	actions not described NA	No NA	MS to describe actions planned No action needed
c	C4 Actions		I shortfalls		100	No delien needed
				No deviation found by MS. Difficulties expected for carring out sampling in the future but no explanation how		MS to present actions planned in order
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	this will be dealt with.	No	to avoid shortfalls
D F	Recreational fishe		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
٠ F	iccicational IISD		Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective			
Region Mos	diterranean Sea a		region?	MS is operating only in Region MED&BS	Yes	No action needed
			Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	MS is operating only in Region MED&BS	Yes	No action needed
			Are obtained derogations mentioned?	ING IS OPERATING OTHY IT REGION INEDADS	res	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?		T	
				The NP states Slovenia will collect catch and effort data		MS should ensure compliance with
			Are the deviations justified?	on recreational fishing through the return of filled-in daily and weekly licenses or in the case of annual licenses,		provisions of daily / weekly licenses by increasing inspections at sea and MS
				through the annexed tables. A pilot study is planned for		should carry out planned pilot study for
				coastal fisheries.  No derogations apply for recreational fisheries in	Mostly	coastal recreational fisheries.
	Data qua	ality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal	Slovenia.	NA	No action needed
			Were data quality targets provided?	Yes: for daily and weekly licenses poor levels of cooperation; for pilot study poor financial situation.	Yes	No action needed
			Were data quality targets met?			MS to ensure more enforcement of
			Are the deviations explained?	More effort needed to improve data collection.	Mostly	relevant national legislation
				Exact statistics' from the two major classes of		
			Are the deviations justified?	recreational fishers (daily/weekly and annual license holders)	Yes	No action needed
_		4 D-		No. on anti-model delik (consider lineares abtelland in 2040)	Manda	MS to ensure return of daily/weekly
L	D3 Follow-u		gional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?	No, no returned daily/weekly licenses obtained in 2013 No comment	Mostly Yes	license data in future. No action needed
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Poor levels of compliance are uderstandable; more effort needed to improve data collection.	Mostly	MS to ensure more enforcement of relevant national legislation
			Are the responsive actions described ?	needed to improve data conection.	Wostly	relevant national legislation
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	The MS stated that no derogations apply for recreational fisheries in Slovenia.	NA	No action needed
	04 Actions	to avoid	shortfalls	Some recommandations listed.	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Recommendations listed not adressed to MS.	Yes	No action needed
E E	Biological stock-r		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comment	NA	No action needed
_	<b>g</b>					
				Planned sampling scheme for coastal and recreational fishers holding daily/weekly licenses mentioned but		
			Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	planned actions are postponed 'to the more appropriate time in the future' due to financial constraints	Partly	MS to provide more details on planned sampling schemes.
			region:	No clear when the 'more approriate time in the future' will	гану	MS to clarify when planned sampling
				be. No reference is made by MS to improving enforcement levels of returned daily/weekly license catch		schemes / pilot study for coastal recreational fisheries will be
	diterranean Sea a			and effort details.	Partly	implemented.
E	E1 Achiever	ments: I	Results and deviation from NP proposal			MS should only list the current years'
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR			achievements in the tables ie 2013 - not
			guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Information for 2011, 2012 and 2013 appear in table Partly. Achievement rates in numbers of fish sampled are	Mostly	2011 and 2012
			proposal?	always under 50%.	Partly	No action needed
				Text in AR states that pelagic trawling ended in 2012 -		MS to confirm that pelagic trawling did not occur in 2013 (as only 2012 is
			Are the deviations explained?	but no mention if it started again in 2013	Mostly	mentioned in the text)
						MS to confirm that pelagic trawling did not occur in 2013 (as only 2012 is
_	E2 Data qua		Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal	Mostly	Mostly	mentioned in the text)
-	Data qua		Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Were CV targets met?	no	no	No action needed
						MS to confirm that information actually
				Less availability of samples due to the stoppage of the		refers to 2013 as only 2012 is
			Are the deviations explained?	pelagic trawlers at the end of 2012. Difficulties to get access to fish for other metiers.	Partly	mentioned. Reference to JRC/precision- level website not relevant
					<u> </u>	MS to confirm that information actually
						refers to 2013 as only 2012 is
			Are the deviations justified?	Partly	Partly	mentioned. Reference to JRC/precision- level website not relevant
E	E3 Follow-u	ıp of Re	gional and international recommendations			
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation was expected by MS	Yes	No action needed

Member State:			Judgement levels		
		AR year Version of the AR reviewed	<b>2013</b> 30 May 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
		Version of the NP proposal	October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
		• •	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
				INA	пот аррисаріе
				EWG judgement	EWG
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Only 2013 or 2012 recommendations must be listed, no former ones.	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
E4	Actions to a	void shortfalls			
			Loss of the main metier providing biological samples. Improvement of sampling of other metiers, such as purse		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	seiners.	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
Transv	versal variables	5		·	
			Guidelines would request information for unclustered segments. The reference year for transversal data		
			collection reported as 2012. Generally in case of		
			administrative data sources (logbooks, Fleet Register,		
		Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR	sales notes) the reference year should be the same as the AR/NP year. While the data presentation is in the		
		guidelines?	following year of data collection.	Yes	No action needed
F1	Capacity				
	<b>F11</b> Ac	chievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	The reference year for capacity data collection reported		
			as 2012 meaning, that MS was still collecting data for		
			2012 when it was already published on the EU Fleet		
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Register web-site. However in the text MS refers to the fleet on the 1st of Januarry.	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comment	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comment	NA NA	No action needed
	<b>F13</b> Ac	tions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comment	NA NA	No action needed
F2	Effort	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comment	NA	No action needed
F2	Effort F11 Ac	chievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	^0	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
		proposal?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	No comment No comment	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
	<b>F12</b> Da	ata quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comment	INA	No action needed
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	<b></b>	Are the deviations justified?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	<b>F13</b> Fo	Illow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comment	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	<b>F14</b> Ac	tions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comment	NA	No action needed
F3	Landings	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comment	NA	No action needed
		chievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			It is not clean what is the reference year for data		
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	collection as in the report vessels registered in the Fleet Register on the 1st of January 2013 mentioned, while in		MS should clarify which is the reference
		proposal?	the ST reference year is 2012	Yes	year for data collection
		Are the deviations explained?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	<b>F12</b> Da	Are the deviations justified?	No comment		
	FIZ Da			NA	No action needed
		ata quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comment		
		Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?	No comment No comment	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
		Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No action needed
	<b>F13</b> Fo	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? sollow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No comment No comment	Yes NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed
	<b>F13</b> Fo	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comment No comment No relevant recommendations	Yes NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
	<b>F13</b> Fc	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? sollow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No comment No comment	Yes NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed
		Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Illow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  tions to avoid shortfalls	No comment No relevant recommendations No comment No comment	Yes NA NA NA NA	No action needed
		Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  tions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comment No relevant recommendations No comment No comment No comment No comment	Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA	No action needed
Poon	<b>F14</b> Ac	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Allow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  tions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comment No relevant recommendations No comment No comment	Yes NA NA NA NA	No action needed
	F14 Ac	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Allow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comment No relevant recommendations No comment No comment No comment No comment	Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA	No action needed
Resea G1	F14 Ac	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Allow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  tions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comment No relevant recommendations No comment No comment No comment No comment	Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA	No action needed
	F14 Ac	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Allow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  sea  tts: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment No relevant recommendations No comment No comment No comment No comment No comment	Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA	No action needed
	F14 Ac	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  etions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  sea  ths: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No comment No relevant recommendations No comment No comment No comment No comment No comment "% achievement target A/P %" is not calculated correctly.	Yes NA	No action needed Mo action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
	F14 Ac	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Allow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  sea  tts: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment No relevant recommendations No comment No comment No comment No comment No comment "% achievement target A/P %" is not calculated correctly. No comment MEDITS temperature data not available due to 'technical	Yes NA	No action needed
	F14 Ac	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Illow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Itions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  sea Its: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comment  No relevant recommendations No comment No comment No comment No comment No comment  "% achievement target A/P %" is not calculated correctly. No comment MEDITS temperature data not available due to "technical reasons" but no details given in this paragraph, but listed	Yes NA	No action needed MS to revise calculation of "% achievement target
	F14 Ac	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Illow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Itions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  sea  its: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	No comment No relevant recommendations No comment No comment No comment No comment No comment "% achievement target A/P %" is not calculated correctly. No comment MEDITS temperature data not available due to 'technical reasons' but no details given in this paragraph, but listed by MS as shortfall	Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA VA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA Mostly Yes	No action needed
	F14 Ac	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  etions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  sea  this: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling	No comment  No relevant recommendations No comment No comment No comment No comment No comment  "% achievement target A/P %" is not calculated correctly. No comment MEDITS temperature data not available due to "technical reasons" but no details given in this paragraph, but listed by MS as shortfall No comment	Yes NA	No action needed  MS to revise calculation of "% achievement target A/P %" No action needed No action needed No action needed
G1	F14 Ac arch surveys at Achievemer	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified?  Allow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  sea  tts: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No comment No relevant recommendations No comment No comment No comment No comment No comment "% achievement target A/P %" is not calculated correctly. No comment MEDITS temperature data not available due to 'technical reasons' but no details given in this paragraph, but listed by MS as shortfall	Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA VA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA Mostly Yes	No action needed
G1	F14 Ac arch surveys at Achievemer	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Allow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  sea  tts: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comment  No relevant recommendations No comment No comment No comment No comment No comment  "% achievement target A/P %" is not calculated correctly. No comment MEDITS temperature data not available due to "technical reasons" but no details given in this paragraph, but listed by MS as shortfall No comment	Yes NA	No action needed  MS to revise calculation of "% achievement target A/P %" No action needed No action needed No action needed
	F14 Ac arch surveys at Achievemer	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviation sylvatified? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  tions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  sea  tts: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No comment  No relevant recommendations No comment No comment No comment No comment No comment No comment  "% achievement target A/P %" is not calculated correctly.  No comment MEDITS temperature data not available due to 'technical reasons' but no details given in this paragraph, but listed by MS as shortfall No comment The sub-sectioning of the section is messy.	Yes NA	No action needed
G1	F14 Ac arch surveys at Achievemer	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Are the deviations justified?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  ctions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  sea  tts: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	No comment  No relevant recommendations No comment  "% achievement target A/P %" is not calculated correctly.  No comment MEDITS temperature data not available due to 'technical reasons' but no details given in this paragraph, but listed by MS as shortfall No comment The sub-sectioning of the section is messy.	Yes NA  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	No action needed  MS to revise calculation of "% achievement target A/P %" No action needed
G1	F14 Ac arch surveys at Achievemer	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? sea Its: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained?	No comment  No relevant recommendations No comment No comment No comment No comment No comment  "% achievement target A/P %" is not calculated correctly. No comment MEDITS temperature data not available due to 'technical reasons' but no details given in this paragraph, but listed by MS as shortfall No comment The sub-sectioning of the section is messy.  No comment No comment	Yes NA  Mostly Yes  Yes NA Yes	No action needed
G1	F14 Ac arch surveys at Achievemer Data quality	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Are the deviations justified?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  ctions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  sea  tts: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	No comment  No relevant recommendations No comment  "% achievement target A/P %" is not calculated correctly.  No comment MEDITS temperature data not available due to 'technical reasons' but no details given in this paragraph, but listed by MS as shortfall No comment The sub-sectioning of the section is messy.	Yes NA  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	No action needed  MS to revise calculation of "% achievement target A/P %" No action needed
G1	F14 Ac arch surveys at Achievemer Data quality	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? sea Its: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations form Survey Planning Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning	No comment  No relevant recommendations No comment No comment No comment No comment No comment  "% achievement target A/P %" is not calculated correctly. No comment MEDITS temperature data not available due to 'technical reasons' but no details given in this paragraph, but listed by MS as shortfall No comment The sub-sectioning of the section is messy.  No comment No comment No comment No comment	Yes NA	No action needed
G1	F14 Ac arch surveys at Achievemer Data quality	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  stions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  sea  sea  its: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?	No comment  No relevant recommendations No comment No comment No comment No comment No comment  "% achievement target A/P %" is not calculated correctly. No comment MEDITS temperature data not available due to 'technical reasons' but no details given in this paragraph, but listed by MS as shortfall No comment The sub-sectioning of the section is messy.  No comment No comment No comment No comment No comment	Yes NA  Mostly Yes  Yes NA Yes	No action needed
G1	F14 Ac arch surveys at Achievemer Data quality	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? sea Its: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations syplained? Are the deviations form Survey Planning Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning	No comment  No relevant recommendations No comment No comment No comment No comment No comment  "% achievement target A/P %" is not calculated correctly. No comment MEDITS temperature data not available due to 'technical reasons' but no details given in this paragraph, but listed by MS as shortfall No comment The sub-sectioning of the section is messy.  No comment No comment No comment No comment	Yes NA	No action needed
G1 G2	F14 Ac arch surveys at Achievemer Data quality	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? sea atts: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?	No comment  No relevant recommendations No comment No comment No comment No comment No comment No comment "% achievement target A/P %" is not calculated correctly. No comment MEDITS temperature data not available due to 'technical reasons' but no details given in this paragraph, but listed by MS as shortfall No comment The sub-sectioning of the section is messy.  No comment	Yes NA	No action needed
G1 G2	F14 Ac arch surveys at Achievemen  Data quality  Follow-up o	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? sea Its: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations justified? Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described?	No comment  No relevant recommendations No comment "% achievement target A/P %" is not calculated correctly. No comment MEDITS temperature data not available due to 'technical reasons' but no details given in this paragraph, but listed by MS as shortfall No comment The sub-sectioning of the section is messy.  No comment	Yes NA	No action needed
G1	F14 Ac arch surveys at Achievemen  Data quality  Follow-up o	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? sea Its: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations justified? Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comment  No relevant recommendations No comment No comment No comment No comment No comment  "% achievement target A/P %" is not calculated correctly. No comment MEDITS temperature data not available due to 'technical reasons' but no details given in this paragraph, but listed by MS as shortfall No comment The sub-sectioning of the section is messy.  No comment	Yes NA	No action needed
G1 G2	F14 Ac arch surveys at Achievemen  Data quality  Follow-up o	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviation justified?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  sea  Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations justified? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations form Sproposal and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comment  No relevant recommendations No comment "% achievement target A/P %" is not calculated correctly. No comment MEDITS temperature data not available due to 'technical reasons' but no details given in this paragraph, but listed by MS as shortfall No comment The sub-sectioning of the section is messy.  No comment	Yes NA	No action needed  MS to revise calculation of "% achievement target A/P %" No action needed
G1 G2	F14 Ac arch surveys at Achievemen  Data quality  Follow-up o	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? sea Its: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations justified? Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comment  No relevant recommendations No comment No comment No comment No comment No comment  "% achievement target A/P %" is not calculated correctly. No comment MEDITS temperature data not available due to 'technical reasons' but no details given in this paragraph, but listed by MS as shortfall No comment The sub-sectioning of the section is messy.  No comment	Yes NA	No action needed
G1 G2	F14 Ac arch surveys at Achievemen  Data quality  Follow-up o	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? sea Its: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations justified? Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comment  No relevant recommendations No comment No comment No comment No comment No comment  "% achievement target A/P %" is not calculated correctly. No comment MEDITS temperature data not available due to 'technical reasons' but no details given in this paragraph, but listed by MS as shortfall No comment The sub-sectioning of the section is messy.  No comment	Yes NA	No action needed  MS to revise calculation of "% achievement target A/P %" No action needed

G

				1		
	Mem	ber State:	Slovenia			gement levels
			AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
				EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%
			•		NA	not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
IV			onomic situation of the aquaculture and processing indering the aquaculture		Ewa juagement	LWG
	A Collect	ion of data conce	- '			
			Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR	Yes, but MS has to fill blank cells with "no" expression	Yes	No action needed
			guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	A1	Achievements: F	Results and deviation from NP proposal	TO COMMONE	103	140 delion needed
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No comment	NA NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	A2	Data quality: Re:	sults and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No comment	NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	A3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations		•	
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	No comment	NA	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	A4	Actions to avoid				
	***		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	B Collect	ion of data conce	erning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR			
			guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	B1	Achievements: F	Results and deviation from NP proposal	165	163	No action needed
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Yes, but Clustering scheme in NP was not updated for	V	
			proposal?	reference year 2009	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No comment	NA NA	No action needed
	ъ.	Data and litera Da	Are the deviations justified?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	B2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal	NI	V	NI
			Is respective data quality information given?	No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No comment	NA NA	No action needed
	ъ.	E-11	Are the deviations justified?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	В3	rollow-up of ne	gional and international recommendations	No. and the second	V	Nie automorada d
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	В4	A - 41 4 1 - 1	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	D4	Actions to avoid	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No shortfalls	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comment	NA NA	No action needed
٧			of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem			
	1 Achieve	ements: Results ar	d deviation from NP proposal	Information on "Effective time lag for availability" missing		Г
			Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	for indicators 1-4. "	Mostly	MS to fill in missing cells in Table V.1
				No. Sampling of Size at maturation of exploited fish		MS to clarify why data for indicator 4 is
			Are the relevant derogations listed?	species (4) is not done (NP and AP) but no derogation	Mostly	not collected or to give details on the
	2 Actions	to avoid shortfalls	Are the relevant delogations listed:	applies	Wostly	relevant derogation if any.
						MS to clarify why data for indicator 4 is
						not collected and to provide details on actions to avoid shortfalls in future
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	No	(unless derogation is granted).
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comment	NA NA	No action needed
VI	Module for manag	gement and use o	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	1 Achieve	ements: Results ar	d deviation from NP proposal		T	
						MS should report separately in the
				Some details provided but not very precise and several		table, both the name of each data call
				data calls missing (SGMOS, Aquaculture and processing,		or end user requests (i.e. GFCM WG
				AER, PGMED, GFCM Task1 and assesment WG).		on demersal species; Data call for
			In Table VII A complete of the control of the contr	Not all experts groups or projects as ADRIAMED are		Med&BS DCF etc etc) and the name of
			Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent	reported in the table.	Mostly	the species and the fleet segment
			with the NP proposal?	No comment	NA	No action needed
			Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NP text seems to be not updated since 2010. So it is not possible to know the exact objectives planned for 2013.	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Impossible to evaluate	NA NA	No action needed
		to ought the state	Are the deviations justified?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	2 Actions	to avoid shortfalls		Integration in the national DB of ERS logbooks are		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	mentioned	Yes	No action needed
VII	Follow-up of STE	CF recommendat	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  ions	No comment	Yes	No action needed
			Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
\/III	List of acronyms	and abbroviotics	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
7111	=.o. o. acionymis	and appreviations	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
IX	Comments, sugge	estions and reflec	ctions			
			Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
Х	References					

Alternative listing format

No comment

Yes

Yes

No action needed

No action needed

XI Annexes

Is there a complete list of references?

Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?

Slovenia	Judgement levels			
AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level	
Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%	
Version of the NP proposal	October 2012?	Partly	10-50%	
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%	
Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%	
	<u> </u>	NA	not applicable	

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

				_		
	Mem	ber State:	Spain	1		udgement levels
			AR year Version of the AR reviewed	<b>2013</b> 30 May 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
			Version of the NP proposal	30 October 2012	Partly	10-50%
			Overell compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
Gener	ral framewor	rk		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
			Are derogations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needded
Nation A		ection organisation	on and participating institutes			
^	Nation	ai correspondent	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and	l Na annuante	Van	No action needded
			their roles well described?	No comments	Yes	
			Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments  No. The site is only partly in e.g. English. No part of the	Yes	No action needded  MS should provide clarification on the
			Is the information provided on the website in line with legal	site seems to be reserved for the DCF. A general search	Partly	website and on the information related
			requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)? Is there an overview and description of contents of national	on the site for "DCF" didn't get any hits.		to the DCF that are stored in
			coordination meetings?	No comments	Yes	No action needded
_			If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needded
В	Region B1	nal and Internation Attendance of i	nal coordination International meetings			
			Is Table II.B.1 complete?	No comments	Yes	No action needded
			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needded
	B2	Follow-up of re	gional and international recommendations	THE COMMISSION	1100	THE GOLDST FICEGORD
			Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needded
			Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments No comments	Yes	No action needded
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needded
	la a4 44 :	dunation - 4 st - m -	in a costan			
Modul A		aluation of the fish al description of the				
	Genera	accompandin of the	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact			
В		mala vant-let	on the NP implementation well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needded
B SUPR		mic variables Baltic Sea. North :	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?  Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic	Yes	Yes	No action needed
00111	ATILOION	buille ocu, North	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR	Yes; asterisk for cluster should be put as last sign,		
			guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR	corresponding with III_B_2	Yes	No action needed
			guidelines?	Column H should be deleted	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR			Update table with the missing variable
	B1	Achievemente: I	guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal	Número de empresas/unidades pesqueras missing	Mostly	and resubmit
	ъ.	Acilievellients.	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
			proposal?	Yes NA	Yes NA	No actions needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed No actions needed
	B2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed No actions needed
	В3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations	10/1	i v	No actions needed
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA NA	NA NA	No actions needed
	В4	Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	INA	INA	No actions needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Comments not relevant	Yes	No action needed
OUDD	4 BEOLON I	Mediterranean Se	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
SUPR	A-REGION I	wediterranean Se	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR	Yes; asterisk for cluster should be put as last sign,		
			guidelines?	corresponding with III_B_2	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?	Column H should be deleted	Yes	No action needed
			Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR			Update table with the missing variable
	B1	Achievemente:	guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal	Number of enterprises/fishing units missing	Mostly	and resubmit
	ъ.	Achievements.	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
			proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			are the deviations evaluined?	la ca		
				NA NA	NA	No actions needed
	B2	Data quality: Re	Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal	NA NA		
	В2	Data quality: Re	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	NA Yes	NA NA Yes	No actions needed No actions needed No actions needed
	В2	Data quality: Re	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?	NA Yes NA	NA NA Yes NA	No actions needed
	B2 B3		Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	NA Yes	NA NA Yes	No actions needed No actions needed No actions needed
			Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA  Yes NA NA NA No relevant recommendations	NA NA Yes NA NA	No actions needed
			Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? giotal and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	NA Yes NA NA NA No relevant recommendations NA	NA NA Yes NA NA NA	No actions needed
		Follow-up of Re	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA  Yes NA NA NA No relevant recommendations	NA NA Yes NA NA	No actions needed
	В3		Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Isohortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA  Yes NA NA NA No relevant recommendations NA NA Comments not relevant	NA NA Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA	No actions needed
	B3 B4	Follow-up of Reg	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls	NA  Yes NA NA NA No relevant recommendations NA NA	NA NA Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA	No actions needed
SUPR	B3 B4	Follow-up of Re	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Isohortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA  Yes NA NA NA No relevant recommendations NA NA Comments not relevant	NA NA Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA	No actions needed
SUPR	B3 B4	Follow-up of Reg	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA  Yes NA NA NA No relevant recommendations NA NA Comments not relevant NA	NA NA Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA	No actions needed
SUPR.	B3 B4	Follow-up of Reg	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR	NA  Yes NA NA NA NO Relevant recommendations NA NA Comments not relevant NA Ves; asterisk for cluster should be put as last sign, corresponding with III. B. 2	NA NA Yes NA	No actions needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
SUPR	B3 B4	Follow-up of Reg	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR	NA  Yes NA NA NA No relevant recommendations NA NA Comments not relevant NA  Yes; asterisk for cluster should be put as last sign, corresponding with III_B_2 Column H should be deleted	NA NA Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA Ves Yes	No actions needed No action needed
SUPR	B3 B4 (A-REGION (	Follow-up of Re	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA  Yes NA NA NA NO Relevant recommendations NA NA Comments not relevant NA Ves; asterisk for cluster should be put as last sign, corresponding with III. B. 2	NA NA Yes NA	No actions needed No action needed
SUPR	B3 B4	Follow-up of Re	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR	NA  Yes NA NA NA No relevant recommendations NA NA Comments not relevant NA  Yes; asterisk for cluster should be put as last sign, corresponding with III_B_2 Column H should be deleted	NA NA Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA Ves Yes	No actions needed No action needed
SUPR	B3 B4 (A-REGION (	Follow-up of Re	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA  Yes NA NA NA NA  No relevant recommendations NA NA  Comments not relevant NA  Yes; asterisk for cluster should be put as last sign, corresponding with III. B. 2  Column H should be deleted  Number of enterprises/fishing units missing	NA NA Yes NA	No actions needed No action needed No action needed No action needed Update table with the missing variable and resubmit No actions needed
SUPR	B3 B4 (A-REGION (	Follow-up of Re	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Is hortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	NA  Yes NA NA NA NA No relevant recommendations NA NA Comments not relevant NA  Yes; asterisk for cluster should be put as last sign, corresponding with III_B_2 Column H should be deleted Number of enterprises/fishing units missing  Yes NA	NA NA Yes NA Ves Yes Mostly	No actions needed No action needed Update table with the missing variable and resubmit No actions needed No actions needed No actions needed
SUPR	B3 B4 (A-REGION (	Follow-up of Red Actions to avoid Other regions Achievements: I	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA  Yes NA NA NA NA  No relevant recommendations NA NA  Comments not relevant NA  Yes; asterisk for cluster should be put as last sign, corresponding with III. B. 2  Column H should be deleted  Number of enterprises/fishing units missing	NA NA Yes NA	No actions needed No action needed Update table with the missing variable and resubmit No actions needed
SUPR	B3 B4 (A-REGION (	Follow-up of Red Actions to avoid Other regions Achievements: I	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	NA  Yes NA NA NA NA NA  No relevant recommendations NA NA  Comments not relevant NA  Yes; asterisk for cluster should be put as last sign, corresponding with III_B_2  Column H should be deleted  Number of enterprises/fishing units missing  Yes NA NA NA  Yes	NA NA Yes NA	No actions needed No action needed Update table with the missing variable and resubmit No actions needed
SUPR	B3 B4 (A-REGION (	Follow-up of Red Actions to avoid Other regions Achievements: I	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?	NA  Yes NA NA NA No relevant recommendations NA NA Comments not relevant NA  Yes; asterisk for cluster should be put as last sign, corresponding with III_B_2 Column H should be deleted Number of enterprises/fishing units missing  Yes NA NA NA NA NA Yes	NA NA Yes NA	No actions needed No action  needed Update table with the missing variable and resubmit No actions needed
SUPR	B3  B4  A-REGION (	Follow-up of Red Actions to avoid Other regions  Achievements: I	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations spustified? Are the deviations spustified? Are the deviations spustified?	NA  Yes NA NA NA NA NA  No relevant recommendations NA NA  Comments not relevant NA  Yes; asterisk for cluster should be put as last sign, corresponding with III_B_2  Column H should be deleted  Number of enterprises/fishing units missing  Yes NA NA NA  Yes	NA NA Yes NA	No actions needed No action needed Update table with the missing variable and resubmit No actions needed
SUPR	B3 B4 (A-REGION (	Follow-up of Red Actions to avoid Other regions  Achievements: I	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?	NA  Yes NA NA NA No relevant recommendations NA NA Comments not relevant NA  Yes; asterisk for cluster should be put as last sign, corresponding with III_B_2 Column H should be deleted Number of enterprises/fishing units missing  Yes NA NA NA NA NA Yes	NA NA Yes NA	No actions needed No action  needed Update table with the missing variable and resubmit No actions needed
SUPR	B3  B4  A-REGION (	Follow-up of Red Actions to avoid Other regions  Achievements: I	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations yustified? gional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the tereponsive actions described?	NA  Yes NA NA NA NO Relevant recommendations NA NA NA  Comments not relevant NA  Yes; asterisk for cluster should be put as last sign, corresponding with III. B. 2  Column H should be deleted Number of enterprises/fishing units missing  Yes NA NA NA NA NO relevant recommendations NA	NA NA NA Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA Yes Mostly  Yes NA	No actions needed No action  needed
SUPR	B3  B4  A-REGION (	Follow-up of Red Actions to avoid Other regions  Achievements: I  Data quality: Re	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations is explained? Are the deviations is explained? Are the deviations is explained? Are the deviations is pusified? gional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA  Yes NA NA NA No relevant recommendations NA NA NA Comments not relevant NA  Yes; asterisk for cluster should be put as last sign, corresponding with III_B_2 Column H should be deleted Number of enterprises/fishing units missing  Yes NA	NA NA Yes NA Yes Yes Mostity  Yes NA	No actions needed No action needed Update table with the missing variable and resubmit No actions needed
SUPR	B3  B4  A-REGION (	Follow-up of Red Actions to avoid Other regions  Achievements: I	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations is explained? Are the deviations is explained? Are the deviations is explained? Are the deviations is pusified? gional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA  Yes NA NA NA NO Relevant recommendations NA NA NA  Comments not relevant NA  Yes; asterisk for cluster should be put as last sign, corresponding with III. B. 2  Column H should be deleted Number of enterprises/fishing units missing  Yes NA NA NA NA NO relevant recommendations NA	NA NA NA Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA Yes Mostly  Yes NA	No actions needed No action  needed

Ш

Spain AR year Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal 2013 Compliance leve <10% 10-50% 30 May 2014 30 October 2012 EWG Answer Partly Mostly 50-90% Overall compliance >90% not applicable

General framework
C Biological metier related variables

Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?

## Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic

# Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR

guidelines?

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations justified? C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

> Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?
> Are the deviations justified?

### C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls C4

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

C2

### Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal C1

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP

Are the deviations explained?

Were CV estimates provided?

Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

proposal?

Were CV targets met?

EWG COMMENTS **EWG** judgement

**EWG** Action needed?

According to table III.A.1 MS is operating in Regions NS&EA, NA including NAFO, MED&BS and Other/CECAF-ICCAT-IOTC-IATTC+WCPFC no action needed

Table properly filled and complete.	Yes	no action needed
Table properly filled. Some inconsistensies between III.C.3 and III.C.4: L2 does not appear in III.C.4 for VS&EA, so numbers of trips are not consistent between the two tables.	Mostly	MS to resubmeit table with L2 sampling frame
Table properly filled and consistent with AR guidelines. 2 arget species planned in 2013 (cod and redfish). Good ichievement rate for cod, but very poor for redfish.	Yes	no action needed
Table complete and consistent with table III.C.5, as target species mentioned in III.C.5 and main commercial species caught as by catch are reported.	Yes	no action needed
No deviation except Sebastes undersampling. Objectives by metiers and by sampling frames fully achived. Table 6 thows also that observers onboard try to implement concurrent sampling on main species fished.	Yes	no action needed
AS states that oversampling (of cod) as no effect on reversional costs, as main costs are to support observers mbarked for long trips applying sampling protocoles every day. Undersamplig of redfish due to allocation of ishing effort between NS&EA and NA, explaining also hat sampling frame L2 was not really applied in NS&EA egion in 2013. Jiscarding patterns are of very low level in these isheries.	Yes	no action needed
/es	Yes	no action needed

Yes	Yes	no action needed
No derogation listed in section I.	NA	no action needed
No recommendation adressed by RCM NS&EA 2012 t	0	
MS.	Yes	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
MS just give statement on shortfalls	No	MS to describe actions
NA	NA	MS to describe actions

	1	1
Table properly filled and complete.	Yes	no action needed
Table properly filled. Consistency between III.C.3 and III.C.4 (only one trip more planned and achieved in III.C.4). Sampling frames are sometimes split in two lines with different sampling strategies.	Yes	MS to check inconsistencies between tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 and resubmit tables. In future % achieved numbers to be provided in percentage
Table consistent with AR guidelines. It is difficult to understand why in NAFO fishing grounds column was not used to avoid strange names of some species (for example Gadus morhua SA1 or 2J,3KL).  Table complete and consistent with table III.C.5 and	Mostly	In future MS to provide planned precision target in numbers and not percentage and species name without reference to the fishing ground
III.C.3.	Yes	no action needed
Good achievement rates in NAFO in terms of trips samplies and biological sampling in length. Two stocks were never sampled (Pandalus 3M and Sebastes 3LN). In ICES areas, target planned by metiers mostly achieved but poor achievement rates for some metiers as OTB_MPD (at market), LHM_DWS and netting (these last ones were sometimes sampled as domains). Same comments in terms of sampling frames. for length samplings, all the stocks were oversampled in 2013 except Nephrops VII (achievement 16%).		no action needed
	iviostiy	no action needed
Explanations on deviations are provided in the AR text metiler by metiler. Main reasons are: decreasing of some metilers, decreasing of quotas for some SPF, changes in fishing paterns (particularly meshsize for netters and trawfers), closure of fishing areas, penalties on Mackerel quota, etc. Oversampling cases are also explained: mostly redeployment from some metiers to others. Sampling domains can also produce results different than those planned for metilers involved. Concerning stocks, oversampling is justified to obtain good pictures of length distributions. Small samples of landings can generate in the same time big samples of discards. Mixed catches can also oblige to implement higher sampling levels. Reason for Nephros VII undersampling is the change in processing of the catch on board: individuals are now frozen headless. Tests for buying "entire" samples in 2011 shown that it was too expensive to be implemented every year.		
Vee	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

Yes for landings and discards.	Yes	no action needed
Good results in NAFO. In ICES areas for around 60% of		
stocks for landings, less than 15% for discards.	Mostly	no action needed

	Spain		Jud	Igement levels
	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
	Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
	Version of the NP proposal	30 October 2012	Partly	10-50%
	Overall compliance	EWG Answer  Mostly	Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
	Overall compliance	Wostly	NA NA	not applicable
		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
eneral framework		EWG COMMENTS	Lwa juagement	Action needed?
		Variability of sizes distributions between samples, more		
	And the desirations contained	opportunistic sampling strategies for species which are not the main target species of the metiers sampled.		
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes Yes	no action needed no action needed
C3 Follow-up of R	egional and international recommendations		1.00	
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	One derogation for length sampling for rays.	Yes	no action needed
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	One recommendation adressed by RCM NA 2012 to MS.	Moothy	MS to list relevant recommendatio
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	Some others could be also listed. Yes	Mostly Yes	from previous LM no action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
C4 Actions to avo				
		For NAFO same as for Region NS&EA.		
		For other areas, improvement of the planned NP		
		ojectives, but some changes in fisheries cannot always be anticipated. Also to improve access to fish for biological		MS to provide actions to avoid sho
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	sampling in some harbours.	Mostly	on board.
				MS to provide actions to avoid sho
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	Mostly	on board.
gion Mediterranean Sea and Bla C1 Achievements:				
Ci Acnievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal	Table properly filled and detailed by GSAs. With footnotes		
		explaining some changes in 2013 for some metiers and/or		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR	sampling frames. ICCAT fisheries should be under "Other		MS to resubmit table with ICCAT
	guidelines?	Regions".	Mostly	fidheries under "Other Regions"
		Table properly fillled. Sampling rames are sometimes split		MS to resubmit table with correct t number os trips.
		in two lines with different sampling strategies.		number os trips.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR	Inconsistencies between total numbers of trips achieved in 2013 between III.C.3 (912) and III.C.4 (934).		
	guidelines?	11 2013 between 11.0.3 (312) and 11.0.4 (334).	Partly	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No discards reported but explained in the text.	Yes	no action needed
	guidelines.		103	no delicit fiedded
		Table properly filled. Information provided shows that concurrent sampling is fully implemented by MS but only		
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR	of the retained part of the catch. No discards reported.	.,	
	guidelines?	Target planned by metiers mostly achieved. Some metiers	Yes	no action needed
		undersampled (OTB_DWS GSA05 and LLS_DEF		
		GSA06), some not sampled at all (PS_SPF GSA07.		
		Concerning stocks, planned objectives in general		
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	achieved, sometimes with oversampled. But some deviations for 3 demerrsal species in GSA05 and for		
	proposal?	anchovy in GSA07.	Mostly	no action needed
	P. Speed	Explanations on deviations are provided in the AR text		
		metier by metier and by GSA. Main reasons are :		
		decreasing of some metiers, shorter fishing seasons,		
		change in fishing patterns due to decreasing CPEUs		
		(mainly for anchovy), difficulties to have access on board or to the fish		
		Concerning stocks, oversampling is justified by the high		
		variability of the catches between trips and GSAs.		
		Oversampling allows to obtain good pictures of length		
		distributions. Undersampling cases observed in 2013 due to decreasing landings of concerned stocks (mainly		
		anchovy) and small sizes of samples for some species		
		when operating at sea. MS demonstrates in its AR that		
	Are the deviations explained?	discarding patterns are low in GSAs exploited by MS.	Yes	no action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
C2 Data quality: R	esults and deviation from NP proposal	Yes, when numbers of fish measured were consistent	T	
		Only for retained catches.		
	Were CV estimates provided?	CVs are provided by stock (by GSA).	Yes	no action needed
		For around 50% of the stocks only for landings. Often big		
		differences observed between GSAs for the same species. Could be a consequence of planned objectives		
	Were CV targets met?	at national level and not at GSA.	Mostly	no action needed
	Troid of targete met.	Reasons given by MS are seasonality of catches for some	moony	no dodon noodod
		metiers or some stocks and their low volumes of landings		
		or availibity for sampling. Well detailed by types of	L.	no action needed
	Are the deviations explained?			nny action needed
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	species.	Yes Yes	
C3 Follow-up of R	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations		Yes	no action needed
C3 Follow-up of R	Are the deviations justified?	species. Yes  One derogation for metier PS_SPF GSA05.		no action needed
C3 Follow-up of R	Are the deviations justified?  glional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?	Species. Yes  One derogation for metier PS_SPF GSA05. One recommendation adressed by RCM MED&BS 2012	Yes Yes	no action needed  no action needed  MS to list relevant recommendatio
C3 Follow-up of R	Are the deviations justified?  egional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Species.  Yes  One derogation for metier PS_SPF GSA05.  One recommendation adressed by RCM MED&BS 2012 listed.	Yes Yes Mostly	no action needed  no action needed  MS to list relevant recommendation from previous LM
C3 Follow-up of R	Are the deviations justified?  egional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?	Species.  Yes  One derogation for metier PS_SPF GSA05. One recommendation adressed by RCM MED&BS 2012 listed.  Yes	Yes Yes Mostly Yes	no action needed  no action needed  MS to list relevant recommendatio from previous LM no action needed
·	Are the deviations justified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Species.  Yes  One derogation for metier PS_SPF GSA05.  One recommendation adressed by RCM MED&BS 2012 listed.	Yes Yes Mostly	no action needed  no action needed  MS to list relevant recommendatio from previous LM
C3 Follow-up of R  C4 Actions to avo	Are the deviations justified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Species.  Yes  One derogation for metier PS_SPF GSA05. One recommendation adressed by RCM MED&BS 2012 listed.  Yes  Yes	Yes Yes Mostly Yes	no action needed  no action needed  MS to list relevant recommendatio from previous LM no action needed
·	Are the deviations justified?  egional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  d shortfalls	Species.  Yes  One derogation for metier PS_SPF GSA05. One recommendation adressed by RCM MED&BS 2012 listed.  Yes  Yes  Shortfalls are considered as usual difficulties met in any	Yes  Wostly Yes  Yes  Yes	no action needed  no action needed  MS to list relevant recommendatio from previous LM no action needed no action needed  MS to report specific action to incr
·	Are the deviations justified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Species.  Yes  One derogation for metier PS_SPF GSA05. One recommendation adressed by RCM MED&BS 2012 listed.  Yes  Yes	Yes Yes Mostly Yes	no action needed  MS to list relevant recommendation previous LM no action needed no action needed  MS to report specific action to incisampling intensity
·	Are the deviations justified?  egional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Species.  Yes  One derogation for metier PS_SPF GSA05. One recommendation adressed by RCM MED&BS 2012 listed.  Yes  Yes  Shortfalls are considered as usual difficulties met in any	Yes  Yes  Mostly Yes  Yes  Yes	no action needed  no action needed MS to list relevant recommendation from previous LM no action needed no action needed MS to report specific action to inc sampling intensity MS to report specific action to inc
C4 Actions to avo	Are the deviations justified?  egional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  d shortfalls	Species.  Yes  One derogation for metier PS_SPF GSA05. One recommendation adressed by RCM MED&BS 2012 listed.  Yes  Yes  Shortfalls are considered as usual difficulties met in any monitoring programme. No specific action proposed.	Yes  Wostly Yes  Yes  Yes	no action needed  MS to list relevant recommendation previous LM no action needed no action needed  MS to report specific action to incisampling intensity
C4 Actions to avo	Are the deviations justified?  glional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal	Species.  Yes  One derogation for metier PS_SPF GSA05. One recommendation adressed by RCM MED&BS 2012 listed.  Yes  Yes  Shortfalls are considered as usual difficulties met in any monitoring programme. No specific action proposed.  Yes	Yes  Yes  Mostly Yes  Yes  Yes	no action needed  no action needed MS to list relevant recommendatio from previous LM no action needed no action needed MS to report specific action to incr sampling intensity MS to report specific action to incr sampling intensity
C4 Actions to avo	Are the deviations justified?  egional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR	Species. Yes  One derogation for metier PS_SPF GSA05. One recommendation adressed by RCM MED&BS 2012 listed. Yes Yes  Shortfalls are considered as usual difficulties met in any monitoring programme. No specific action proposed. Yes  ICCAT and CECAF RFMO have to be under *Other	Yes  Yes  Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	no action needed  MS to list relevant recommendation previous LM no action needed no action needed no action needed  MS to report specific action to increasing ling intensity  MS to report specific action to increasing intensity  MS to report specific action to increasing intensity
C4 Actions to avo	Are the deviations justified?  egional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Species. Yes  One derogation for metier PS_SPF GSA05. One recommendation adressed by RCM MED&BS 2012 listed. Yes Yes  Shortfalls are considered as usual difficulties met in any monitoring programme. No specific action proposed. Yes  ICCAT and CECAF RFMO have to be under "Other Regions".	Yes  Yes  Mostly Yes  Yes  Yes	no action needed  No action needed  MS to list relevant recommendation previous LM no action needed  no action needed  MS to report specific action to increampling intensity  MS to report specific action to increampling intensity  MS to report specific action to increampling intensity
C4 Actions to avo	Are the deviations justified?  egional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR	Species. Yes  One derogation for metier PS_SPF GSA05. One recommendation adressed by RCM MED&BS 2012 listed. Yes Yes  Shortfalls are considered as usual difficulties met in any monitoring programme. No specific action proposed. Yes  ICCAT and CECAF RFMO have to be under *Other	Yes  Yes  Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	no action needed  No action needed  MS to list relevant recommendatio from previous LM no action needed  no action needed  MS to report specific action to increampling intensity  MS to report specific action to increampling intensity  MS to report specific action to increampling intensity  MS to resubmit tables with correct region naming.
C4 Actions to avo	Are the deviations justified?  egional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Species. Yes  One derogation for metier PS_SPF GSA05. One recommendation adressed by RCM MED&BS 2012 listed. Yes Yes  Shortfalls are considered as usual difficulties met in any monitoring programme. No specific action proposed. Yes  ICCAT and CECAF RFMO have to be under "Other Regions". Table consistent with III.C.3. ICCAT and CECAF RFMO have to be under "Other Regions". ICCAT and CECAF RFMO have to be under "Other ICCAT and CECAF RFMO have to be under "Other Regions".	Yes  Yes  Mostly Yes Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly	no action needed  no action needed MS to list relevant recommendatio from previous LM no action needed no action needed  MS to report specific action to incr sampling intensity MS to report specific action to incr sampling intensity  MS to resubmit tables with correct region naming.  MS to resubmit tables with correct region naming.
C4 Actions to avo	Are the deviations justified?  segional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	Species. Yes  One derogation for metier PS_SPF GSA05. One recommendation adressed by RCM MED&BS 2012 listed. Yes Yes  Shortfalls are considered as usual difficulties met in any monitoring programme. No specific action proposed. Yes  ICCAT and CECAF RFMO have to be under "Other Regions". Table consistent with III.C.3. ICCAT and CECAF RFMO have to be under "Other Regions". ICCAT and CECAF RFMO have to be under "Other Regions".	Yes  Yes  Mostly Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly	no action needed  no action needed MS to list relevant recommendation from previous LM no action needed no action needed no action needed MS to report specific action to increasing the second of the
C4 Actions to avo	Are the deviations justified?  egional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Species. Yes  One derogation for metier PS_SPF GSA05. One recommendation adressed by RCM MED&BS 2012 listed. Yes Yes  Shortfalls are considered as usual difficulties met in any monitoring programme. No specific action proposed. Yes  ICCAT and CECAF RFMO have to be under "Other Regions". Table consistent with III.C.3. ICCAT and CECAF RFMO have to be under "Other Regions". ICCAT and CECAF RFMO have to be under "Other ICCAT and CECAF RFMO have to be under "Other Regions".	Yes  Yes  Mostly Yes Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly	no action needed  no action needed MS to list relevant recommendation from previous LM no action needed no action needed  MS to report specific action to incre sampling intensity MS to report specific action to incre sampling intensity  MS to resubmit tables with correct region naming. MS to resubmit tables with correct region naming.

no action needed

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

		01-1-	Oracla	_		
	wemb	er State:	Spain AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	30 October 2012 EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
			Overall compliance	e Mostly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
General	l framework			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
				IN CECAF most of the fisheries in third countries waters were closed in 2013 to Spanish vessels. Only OTB_DEF		
				off Mauritania and PS_SPF in Canary islands waters		
				could operate normally with good achievement rates.  Length sampling for these two fisheries were also well		
				achieved for all stocks planned.		
				In other RFMOs, generally good achivement rates in numbers of trips, except in ICCAT area for 2 LHP fleets		
				targeting BFT, 1 LLD targeting BFT, LHP_LPF_0_0_0		
				(MSP) and . PS_LPF in IOTC waters not sampled at all. Concerning stocks, good achievement rates are obtained		
				for well sampled metiers. But results difficult to evaluate		
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	for species without objectives planned in the NP.		
			proposal?		Mostly	no action needed
				Deviations are clearly identified by MS in its AR, metier by metier. Main reasons were: CECAF fisheries closures,		
				piracy in IOTC, difficulties for implementing sampling at		
				sea, difficulties for sampling when landings are frozen, changes in fishing patterns and operational difficulties in		
				ICCAT for sampling at sea. MS must also comply with		
				fisheries regulation and obligations implemented by third countries where Spanish vessels operate and land their		
				catches.  Deviations for samplings in length are directly linked to		
				have access to fish and the possibility to sample catches		
				correctly or not. MS provide detailed explanations stock by stock for each RFMOs.Dificult to follow the		
				explainations since ICCAT is under two different supra-		
			Are the deviations explained?	sections Other Regions and Med.	Yes	no action needed
	C2	Data quality: R	Are the deviations justified? desults and deviation from NP proposal	Yes	Yes	no action needed
				Yes for landings or unsorted catches when samples sizes permitted to calculate CVs. Discards are low in these LDF		
			Were CV estimates provided?	fisfheries so no CVs were provided.	Yes	no action needed
			Were CV targets met?	For around 20% of documented stocks.  High disparity between samples collected from metiers	Partly	no action needed
				targeting different stages of species exploited and so wide		
			Are the deviations explained?	size range of catches. In general not enough samples also to achieve good CVs.	Yes	no action needed
	00	E-114 B	Are the deviations justified?	Yes.	Yes	no action needed
	C3	rollow-up of K	egional and international recommendations	No derogation listed in section I and regardin metiers		
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	variables in Other regions.  No relevant recommendation ffrom RCM_LDF 2012	NA	no action needed
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	adressed to MS.	NA	no action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	no action needed no action needed
	C4	Actions to avo				1
				Shortfalls are considered as usual difficulties met in any monitoring programme of LDF fisheries. MS states an		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	observation, but no specific action proposed.	Partly	MS to suggest an action to avoid the shortfalls.
						MS to suggest an action to avoid the
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Partly	Partly	shortfalls.
D	Recreation	onal fisheries				T
Region I	North Atlant	tic	Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region	? No comments	Yes	No action needed
	D1		: Results and deviation from NP proposal			Tv. vo
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	It is unclear why seabass is only sampled in the Basque		Yes, MS to clarify why sea bass is on sampled in the Basque country and n
			proposal?	country and not in the other Atlantic areas	Mostly	in the other tlantic areas
			Are obtained derogations mentioned?  Are the deviations explained?	No derogations apply NA	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
	DO.	Data	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
	D2	⊔ata quality: R	lesults and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided?	Information on data quality provided	Yes	No action needed
			Were data quality targets met?	NA	NA	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
	D3	Follow-up of R	egional and international recommendations			
			Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No derogations apply No relevant recommendations apply	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	MS sent data to ICES WGEEL and is ready to apply		
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	recommendations from WGEEL and WGRFS. No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
	D4	Actions to avo	id shortfalls		•	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
Region I		ean Sea and Bla	nck Sea			
	D1	Achievements	Results and deviation from NP proposal		T	
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Due to low eel catches in the Baleares, eel is only	Mostly	MS might consider to ask for derogat
			Are obtained derogations mentioned?	sampled in Valencia region.  No derogations apply	Mostly Yes	for this species in the Baleares No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	D2	Data quality: R	Are the deviations justified? desults and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		quality . 11	Were data quality targets provided?	Information on data quality provided	Yes	No action needed
			Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed No action needed
					<u> </u>	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
	D3	Follow-up of R	Are the deviations justified? regional and international recommendations			
	D3	Follow-up of R	Are the deviations justified?	NA  No deregations apply No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed  No action needed

Wiching	oer State:	Spain			dgement levels
		AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	30 May 2014 30 October 2012	No Partly	<10% 10-50%
			EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compliance	e Mostly	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
eneral framework	•		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
D4	Actions to avoid		No shortfalls listed by MS, but lack of eel sampling in the		Yes, MS to list lack of eel sampling
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Baleares should have been listed as a shortfall.  Lack of eel sampling in the Baleares should have been	Mostly	Baleares as a shortfall Yes, MS to explain how to solve the
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	listed as a shortfall.	No	sampling issue in the Baleares
Biologic	cal stock-related	variables	According to table III.A.1 MS is operating in Regions	I	1
			NS&EA, NA including NAFO, MED&BS and	Yes	MS to not that ICCAT is in "Other Regions" and CECAF is not a region
Region North Sea a	and Fastern Arct	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	Other/CECAF-ICCAT-IOTC-IATTC+WCPFC		riogione and ozoni ionera regi
E1		Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR	Table properly complete.	Mostly	required precision CVs should be presented as a number and not as percentage. Achievement note
		guidelines?	Parameters were to be updated for two stocks (cod and		presented as percentage.
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	redfish). Cod oversampled and redfish undersampled. See comments III.C.5.	Mostly	no action needed
			Data collection is done by observers on board industrial vessels, from the beginning to the end of long trips. So oversampling has no extra costs. But observers at sea cannot choose fishing areas for sampling issues. See comments in section III.C.1 NS&EA.	Yes	no action needed
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
E2	Data quality: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal		1.44	1
		Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Mostly	MS to provide explanations why th CVs are not provided
			Cod target precision achieved for ALK and weight@length only, not for sex ratio and maturity@length. Not relevant	Partly	MS should consider a bilateral with another MS for aging redfish.
		Were CV targets met?	for redfish.  Variability in samples, definition precision targets for sex	Yes	no action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	ratio and maturity, redfish otoliths not yet read.		MS should consider a bilateral with
		Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	Mostly	another MS for aging redfish.
E3	Follow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation listed in section 1	NA	no action needed
		were the relevant derogations listed?	One recommendations of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed by	Yes	no action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	MS.		
		Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes yes	Yes Yes	no action needed no action needed
E4	Actions to avoid	d shortfalls	Better collaboration with the Industry on durations of trips.		MS should continue to improve rel
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Improvement of training of observers for better application of protocoles on board.	Mostly	with the fishing industry. Meanwhile should put in place a training progressor observers.
			Mostly	Mostly	MS to provide methods they will er
Region North Atlan	ntic	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			to improve training
E1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal		T	In future MC to provide planned
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR	Table properly complete. Planned precision target presented in percentage and % achieved in number.	Yes	In future MS to provide planned precision target in numbers and no percentage and % achieved in
		guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Achievement rates are reached with oversampling. In ICES areas, general oversampling of all the stocks	Yes	percentage.  No action needed
		proposal?	except for 3 parameters poorly sampled.  All deviations are explained in AR, stock by stock and for		
			every parameter. Main reasons are the following: fishing areas depending of the choice of vessels skippers (not those of observers on board), imperfect coverage of all the length sizes distribution in samples available. Sampling plans are built in numbers of samples and not in numbers of individuals. When oversampling, there is no additional costs, mostly when samples are collected at sea. But for some stocks, low landings and too high prices could give in final undersampling. Shorter fishing seasons		No action needed
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	than expected also. Yes	Yes	No action needed
E2	Data quality: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal			
	- •	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes when samples size allows to calculate consistent CVs.	Yes	No action needed
		Were CV targets met?	In NAFO more than 50% of CVs met for parameters updated. In ICES areas precision targets achieved for less than 50% of parameters updated.Mostly. Cvs met in general for ALKs and weight@length.	Mostly	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	Variability with fish sizes in samples, difficulties for planning efficient sampling plans for thes industrial fisheries. Except for sex ratio@length, comments most of the stocks given in AR.	Yes	No action needed
			Yes	Yes	No action needed
F0	Follow of D	Are the deviations justified?	165		
E3	Follow-up of Re		Two derogations listed in section 1	Yes	No action needed
E3	Follow-up of Re	Are the deviations justified?  gional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?	Two derogations listed in section 1 3 recommendations of RCM NA 2012 and one from RCM		No action needed  No action needed
E3	Follow-up of Re	Are the deviations justified?  egional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Two derogations listed in section 1 3 recommendations of RCM NA 2012 and one from RCM NS&EA 2012 listed by MS.	Yes Yes	No action needed
	·	Are the deviations justified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Two derogations listed in section 1 3 recommendations of RCM NA 2012 and one from RCM	Yes	İ
E3 E4	Follow-up of Re	Are the deviations justified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Two derogations listed in section 1 3 recommendations of RCM NA 2012 and one from RCM NS&EA 2012 listed by MS. Yes Yes  MS remains focused on providing high-quality data to	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
	·	Are the deviations justified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Two derogations listed in section 1 3 recommendations of RCM NA 2012 and one from RCM NS&EA 2012 listed by MS. Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed

	Member State: Spain			Judgement levels		
	WEITI	Jei State.	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	30 October 2012 EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
			Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
					NA	not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
I Gen	eral frameworl	•				Action needed? Required CVs should be numbers and
				Table properly fiiled but not consistent with III.E.2. Task		not percentage. The ICCAT data should
				sharing on LPF is correctly documented. All fishing	Mostly	be listed in "Other Regions". MS to amend table. The achievment rate
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR	grounds merged as required an appendix 7.		should be given in percentage and no
			guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			numbers
			proposal?	Yes.MS explained under and over sampling	Yes	no action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	Mostly	MS to suggest plan to achieve sampling of Trachurus mediterraneus
	E2	Data quality: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal		I	
				Yes when samples size allows to calculate consistent	Mostly	Required CVs should be numbers and not percentage. MS to provide CVs for
			Were CV estimates provided?	CVs.	iviostry	hake
			Ware OV terrate made	Yes for more than 50% of the parameters updated. Cvs	Mostly	no action needed
			Were CV targets met?	met in general for ALKs and weight@length.  Explanations is given for deviations concerning 4 major		
			Are the deviations explained?	species.	Yes	no action needed
	E3	Follow-up of Pa	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
	EJ	i onow-up or Re	egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation listed in section 1	NA	no action needed
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	NA	no action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	no action needed no action needed
	E4	Actions to avoi		lan.	lin t	no action needed
	•					MS to increase numbers of samples
				To increase numbers of samples and fish sampled for stocks and parameters for which CVs were note achieved.	Yes	and fish sampled for stocks and parameters for which CVs were note
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	•		achieved.
	den Otto		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
Reg	ion Other regio		Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Admicvements.	riesults and deviation nominal proposal	Many derogations granted for Other regions and so few		MS to explain why CVs provided without
				planned objectives included in NP 2013 for stocks	Mostly	sampling achievements for 2013. In future, MS to report Required precision
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR	targeted by LDF fisheries. Some CVs provided without	iviostry	target (CV) in number and not
			guidelines?	fish sampled.		percentage.
				For CECAF, only SPF in Canary Islands waters could be sampled, with adequate achievement rates in terms of		
				number of fish.		
				In ICCAT area, good achivement rates for LPF except SWO weight@length. Same comments for swordfish in	Mostly	no action needed
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	IOTC not sampled at all for 2 parameters on 3 planned,		
			proposal?	the last one achieved.  Deviations are explained stock by stock. CVs provided		
				without fish sampled in 2013 are results obtained from	Yes	no action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	analysis of sampling of former years. Yes	Yes	no action needed
	E2	Data quality: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal	165	165	no action needed
			Mare CV estimates are sided?	2013 CVs provided when possible. Some Cvs provided	Yes	no action needed
			Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?	for former years as only available in 2013.  Partly	Partly	no action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Several species not planned.	Yes	no action needed
	E3	Follow-up of Pa	Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations	Yes	Yes	no action needed
	LJ	rollow-up of the	egional and international recommendations	6 derogations listed concerning tunas fisheries, and more		
				precisely exemptions for sex ratio and maturity in ICCAT and IOTC and all stock related variables in	Yes	no action needed
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	IATTC+WCPFC		
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendation from RCM_LDF 2012	Yes	no action needed
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	adressed to MS. NA	NA	no action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	no action needed
	E4	Actions to avoi	d shortfalls		<u> </u>	1
				Shortfalls are considered as usual difficulties met in any monitoring programme of LDF fisheries. MS states an	Partly	MS to suggest an action to avoid the
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	observation, but no specific action proposed.		shortfalls.
				Partly	Partly	MS to suggest an action to avoid the
-	T	wool wester!	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	· woj	· aruj	shortfalls.
F	ıransve	ersal variables				
			In Table III Ed annulate and constant at 19, 40			MS should submit the updated version
			Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Old template provided	No	of the template as requested and present in the AR Guidelines 2013
	F1	Capacity				
		F11 Achie	everents: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP		I	MS have to submit the right Excel
			proposal?	No comments	Yes	template.
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA NA	No action needded
		F13 Action	Are the deviations justified?  ns to avoid shortfalls	No comments	NA	No action needded
		, 101101	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needded
	FO	Effort	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needded
	F2	Effort F11 Achie	evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		, 10.110	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
			proposal?	No comments MS stated, that there is no deviations, however there are	Yes	No action needded
				effort variables missing in the list of variables collected	<u> </u>	
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	and planned to collect.  No comments	No NA	No action needded  No action needded
		F12 Data	quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	(140 Comments	ling.	nto action needded
				No quality indicators assuided as the translation in		Considering, that the census data
			Is respective data quality information given?	No quality indicators provided as the template submitted is wrong	No	collection scheme been applied MS is encouraged to use right template
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	No	No action needded
			Are the deviations justified? w-up of Regional and international recommendations	No comments	NA	No action needded
		F13 Follov				

	Mambau Ctata		-	_		
	Memb	er State:	Spain AR year	2013	Ju- Compliance class	dgement levels  Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	30 October 2012 EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
			Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
					NA	not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
General f	ramework		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	NA	Action needed?  No action needded
			Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA	No action needded
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needded
		F14 Action	ns to avoid shortfalls	There are some effort variables missing and there is no	I	1
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	actions to avoid this shortfalls planned.	No	No action needded
	F3	Landings	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needded
	гэ	•	vements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No. and and an analysis of the second	V	No selfen assedded
			proposal?	No comments Spain provided description of data collection in the	Yes	No action needded
			Are the deviations explained?	section. Seems there is no deviations.	NA	No action needded
		F12 Data o	Are the deviations justified? quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	NA	No action needded
		··· Data		No quality indicators provided as there template submitted		
			Is respective data quality information given?	is wrong No comments	No Partly	No action needded  No action needded
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needded
		F13 Follow	v-up of Regional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	No relevant recommendations No comments	NA NA	No action needded  No action needded
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments No comments	NA NA	No action needded
		F14 Action	ns to avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments No comments	NA NA	No action needded No action needded
G	Researc	h surveys at sea			j ·	action moduled
	G1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal		1	IA DOOM to MO to a state or an arrange of
			Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR			AR2014: MS to add map number references in table III_G_1, check
			guidelines?	Map numbers are not incorporated in table	Yes	planning group acronyms
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mackerel egg survey achievements are relatively low due to bad weather	Mostly	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			activities?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	G2	Data quality: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical			
			coverage etc.)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No deviations listed NA	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
	G3	Follow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations	INA	INA	No action needed
			Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?	No comments	Voc	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	G4	Actions to avoid	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			onomic situation of the aquaculture and processing indus	stry		
Α	Collectio	on of data conce	rning the aquaculture	No. Table is not filled according to the guidelines. No cells		
			Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?	should be deleted from the table.	No	Fill the table according to the guidelines
			Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
				For census with less than 70% response rate, CV should		
			Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?	be provided. For some variables, response rate is 100% but CV is not zero.	Mostly	Table should be updated and corected and resubmitted
	<b>A</b> 1	Achievements: F	Results and deviation from NP proposal		· I	
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
	A 2	Data qualitus D	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
	A2	Data quality: Hes	Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No actions needed
	А3	Follow-up of Dea	Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations	NA	NA	No actions needed
	AJ	i ollow-up of rieg	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant comments made	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No actions needed
	A4	Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls	NA	NA	No actions needed
		oo.io to avolu	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
_	<b></b> .		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
В	Collection	or data conce	rning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR			
			guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
						MS should explain why Achieved
				Achieved sample rate bigger than response rate in case		sample rate is bigger than the response
			Is Table B/D O second to the first to the second to the se			rate in case of census. Table should be
			Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?	of census. Some variables are not collected under SBS but they are presented as SBS.	Mostly	corrected and resubmitted
	B1	Achievements: F	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal	of census. Some variables are not collected under SBS but they are presented as SBS.	Mostly	corrected and resubmitted
	B1	Achievements: F	guidelines?	but they are presented as SBS.	Mostly	Text should be updated with the missing
	B1	Achievements: F	guidelines?	but they are presented as SBS.  Missing methodology for the calculation of employment by gender and Imputed value of unpaid labour. It's not clear	Mostly	Text should be updated with the missing information. MS should clarify about the availability of variables not collected
	B1	Achievements: F	guidelines?	but they are presented as SBS.  Missing methodology for the calculation of employment by gender and Imputed value of unpaid labour. It's not clear if all variables were provided in case of no availability by	Mostly	Text should be updated with the missing information. MS should clarify about the
	B1	Achievements: F	guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	but they are presented as SBS.  Missing methodology for the calculation of employment by gender and Imputed value of unpaid labour. It's not clear if all variables were provided in case of no availability by SBS, as they are explicited in table IV.B.2. MS should explain how they obtain the No of enterprises by size		Text should be updated with the missing information. MS should clarify about the availability of variables not collected
	B1	Achievements: F	guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal	but they are presented as SBS.  Missing methodology for the calculation of employment by gender and Imputed value of unpaid labour. It's not clear if all variables were provided in case of no availability by SBS, as they are explicited in table IV.B.2. MS should	Mostly	Text should be updated with the missing information. MS should clarify about the availability of variables not collected under SBS
	B1	Achievements: F	guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	but they are presented as SBS.  Missing methodology for the calculation of employment by gender and Imputed value of unpaid labour. It's not clear if all variables were provided in case of no availability by SBS, as they are explicited in table IV.B.2. MS should explain how they obtain the No of enterprises by size		Text should be updated with the missing information. MS should clarify about the availability of variables not collected under SBS  Text should be updated with the missing information. MS should clarify about the
	B1	Achievements: F	guidelines? Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	but they are presented as SBS.  Missing methodology for the calculation of employment by gender and Imputed value of unpaid labour. It's not clear if all variables were provided in case of no availability by SBS, as they are explicited in table IV.B.2. MS should explain how they obtain the No of enterprises by size		Text should be updated with the missing information. MS should clarify about the availability of variables not collected under SBS  Text should be updated with the missing

ı

IV

			An year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	30 October 2012	Partly	10-50%
				EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%
					NA	not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
ı	General framewor	rk				Action needed?
						Text should be updated with the missing
						information. MS should clarify about the
						availability of variables not collected
			Are the deviations justified?	Partly	Partly	under SBS
	B2	Data quality: Res	sults and deviation from NP proposal			
		Data quanty. 1100	onto and deviation nominal proposal	No information is provided about the quality of variables		Information should be provided about
			Is respective data quality information given?	provided and not under SBS	Partly	variables provided and not under SBS
			is respective data quality information given:	provided and not under 353	i aitiy	Information should be provided about
			Ave the deviations combined?	Double	Double	
			Are the deviations explained?	Partly	Partly	variables provided and not under SBS
						Information should be provided about
			Are the deviations justified?	Partly	Partly	variables provided and not under SBS
	B3	Follow-up of Reg	ional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Not relevant recommendations	Yes	No actions needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No actions needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA	No actions needed
	ъ.	A - 11		IND	INO	INO actions needed
	B4	Actions to avoid				1
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
v	Module of evaluat	tion of the effects	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem			
-			d deviation from NP proposal			
	I Acilieve	ements. nesults an	d deviation from NF proposal			1
			In Table V.1 complete and consistent with AD avidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action peopled
			Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments		No action needed
			Are the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations apply	Yes	No action needed
	2 Actions	to avoid shortfalls				
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls identifed	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
<b>1/1</b>	Module for manag	noment and use of			l.	
٧ı						
	1 Achieve	ements: Results an	d deviation from NP proposal			
				A very long list provided by MS. But only for biological		MS should complete the list with all the
				data. SGMOS data call missing, as AER, Aquaculture and		end users requests specifying the data
				Processing industry ones. What also about research		and
			Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	projects such as MAREA in MED ?	Mostly	
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent	N		
			with the NP proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needded
			Is progress in the "Management of data" section well			MS should better clarify and detail the
			detailed?	No comments	Mostly	the use and management of data
			detailed:		iviostry	the use and management of data
				No detailed objectives provided in NP 2013.Only basic IT		
				developments for maintaining performances of the		1
				nattional data bases are mentioned in AR 2013.		
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Transcriate Sala Subos die Mondones III / II / 2015.	Yes	No action needded
			Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needded
			Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needded
	2 Actions	to avoid shortfalls	7.10 tilo deviatione justinou i		1	action necoded
	2 Actions	to avoid shortfalls	and the second s	No object to the second of the MO	h	In
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfall identified by MS.	NA	No action needded
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needded
VII	Follow-up of STE	CF recommendation	ons			
	-		Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
VIII	List of acronyms	and abbreviations				
			Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
ΙX	Comments, sugge	estions and reflect				
				Comments forwarded to Commission by STECF EWG 14-		
			Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	07	Yes	No action needed
	D-4		are there any comments, suggestions and/of fellections?	O/	I	INO action needed
X	References					1
			Is there a complete list of references?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
ΧI	Annexes				·	
			Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information		Yes	No action needed
			to support statements made in the main text?	No comments	1.00	To dollo Hooded
			to support statements made in the main text?	ino commento	ı	

Member State:

	IVIC	ilibei 3		Swedell			idgement levels
				AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
				Version of the AR reviewed	27 May 2014	No	<10%
				Version of the NP proposal	26 March 2013	Partly	10-50%
					EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
				Overall compliance	Yes	Yes	>90%
						NA	not applicable
					EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
	General framev	work					Action needed?
				Are derogations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
II I	National data of	collection	organisatio	n			
	A Nati	ional corre	espondent a	and participating institutes			
				Are the partners involved in the national data collection and	No comments		
				their roles well described?	NO COMMENTS	Yes	No action needed
				Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
				Is the information provided on the website in line with legal	No comments		
				requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	140 comments	Yes	No action needed
				Is there an overview and description of contents of national	Yes (minutes in Annex 1).		
				coordination meetings?	<u>'</u>	Yes	No action needed
				If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
- 1				al coordination			
	B1	Atten		ternational meetings	N	V	Discording and all
				Is Table II.B.1 complete?  Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings	No comments	Yes	No action needed
				explained?	No comments	Vaa	No astino acceled
	B2	Falls.			No comments	Yes	No action needed
	D2	FOIIO	w-up or reg	gional and international recommendations			Т
				Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
					No comments	Yes	No action needed
				Are the responsive actions described ?			
				Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Module of the						
	A Gen	neral descr		e fishing sector			<del></del>
				Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Very picely	Von	No action peoded
				and recomplementation well described?	Very nicely	Yes	No action needed
				to to form of the mode of the DA A form	L	,,	ka a se a sa a sa a
		nomic vari		Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	no comment	Yes	No action needed
•	JOT HA-REGIO	or partic 5	wa, North S	ea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic	For one segment Supra region is listed instead of		<del></del>
					segment information, accuracy indicators must be		1
					provided in percentage. Clustered segments must be	1	MS has to provide tables upon the last
				Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	marked with asterisk.	Mostly	versios of the guidelines
				2 3 2 2 and demonstrate with the guidelines:		iviostiy	gardonnos
					For one segment Supra region is listed instead of	1	1
				Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	reference year. Some segment is too big to be clustered.	Yes	No action needed
					Cv has not benn provided for some segments with		<u> </u>
				Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	response rate less than 70%	Mostly	Provide information about missing CV
	B1	Achie		esults and deviation from NP proposal		<del></del>	
				Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No action needed
				Are the deviations explained?	no comment	NA	No action needed
				Are the deviations justified?	no comment	NA	No action needed
	B2	Data		ults and deviation from NP proposal			
				Is respective data quality information given?	no comment	Yes	No action needed
				Are the deviations explained?	no comment	NA	No action needed
				Are the deviations justified?	no comment	NA	No action needed
	B3	Follov		ional and international recommendations			
				Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no comment	Yes	No action needed
				Are the responsive actions described ?	no comment	NA	No action needed
				Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comment	NA	No action needed
	B4	Action	ns to avoid s	shortfalls			
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	no comment	Yes	No action needed
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	no comment	NA	No action needed
	C Biol	logical met	tier related	variables			
				Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
	Region Baltic 9						
	C1	Achie		Results and deviation from NP proposal			
				Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
				Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
				Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
				Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
				Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal	Sevaral derogations apply (GNS/FPO on FWS/SPF). Severe undersampling of OTB_DEF_>=105_1_110, PTM_SPF_32-104_0_0 and FPN_CAT_0_0 in SD 22-24; PTM_SPF_16-31_0_0 in SD 25-29,32; OTB_SPF_16-104_0_0 in SD 30-31. Some metier coding not consistent across tables	Yes	metier naming not consistent between IIIC tables , nor between tables and text. MS to clarify
				Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
				Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	Yes	no action needed
	C2	Data		sults and deviation from NP proposal			·
				Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
				Were CV targets met?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
				Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	no action needed
				Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	no action needed
	C3	Follo	w-up of Re	gional and international recommendations			
				Were the relevant derogations listed?	in section I and Table III.C.3	Yes	no action needed
				Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
				Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
				Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	Yes	no action needed
	C4	Actio	ns to avoid				
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	Yes	no action needed
			astern Arcti	C			
ı	Region North S	Sea and Ea		Results and deviation from NP proposal			
ı	Region North S			Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	the total number of trips reported
ı					Yes	Yes	no action needed
ı				Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
ļ				Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
1					Yes Yes		no action needed no action needed
ı				Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes Yes Several derogations apply (mainly in ICES areas IV and	Yes	
1				Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes Yes Several derogations apply (mainly in ICES areas IV and VIId). Severe oversampling of PS_SPF_16-31_0_0,	Yes	
ı				Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes Yes Several derogations apply (mainly in ICES areas IV and VIId). Severe oversampling of PS_SPF_16-51_0_0, severe undersampling of OTB_CRU_32-69_0_0 and	Yes Yes	no action needed
ı				Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal.	Yes Yes Several derogations apply (mainly in ICES areas IV and VIId), Severe oversampling of PS_SPF_16-31_0_0, severe undersampling of OTB_CRU_32-69_0_0 and OTB_MCD_90-119_0_0_0 IIIaN.	Yes Yes Mostly	no action needed
ı				Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	Yes Yes Several derogations apply (mainly in ICES areas IV and VIId). Severe oversampling of PS_SPF_16-31_0_0, severe undersampling of OTB_CRU_32-69_0_0 and OTB_MCD_90-119_0_0_IIIaN. Yes	Yes Yes Mostly Yes	no action needed  no action needed no action needed
1	C1	Achie		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	Yes Yes Several derogations apply (mainly in ICES areas IV and VIId), Severe oversampling of PS_SPF_16-31_0_0, severe undersampling of OTB_CRU_32-69_0_0 and OTB_MCD_90-119_0_0_0 IIIaN.	Yes Yes Mostly	no action needed
1		Achie	quality: Re	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal	Yes Yes Several derogations apply (mainly in ICES areas IV and VIId). Severe oversampling of PS_SPF_16-31_0_0, severe undersampling of OTB_CRU_32-69_0_0 and OTB_MCD_90-119_0_0_IIIaN. Yes Yes	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes	no action needed  no action needed  no action needed  no action needed
1	C1	Achie	quality: Re	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	Yes Yes Several derogations apply (mainly in ICES areas IV and VIId), Severe oversampling of PS_SPF_16-31_0_0, severe undersampling of OTB_CRU_32-69_0_0 and OTB_MCD_90-119_0_0_IIIaN. Yes Yes	Yes Yes  Mostly Yes Yes Yes	no action needed  no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed
1	C1	Achie	quality: Re:	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?	Yes Yes Several derogations apply (mainly in ICES areas IV and VIId). Severe oversampling of PS_SPF_16-31_0_0, severe undersampling of OTB_CRU_32-69_0_0 and OTB_MCD_90-119_0_0_IIIaN. Yes Yes	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes	no action needed  no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed
1	C1	Achie	quality: Re:	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?	Yes Yes Several derogations apply (mainly in ICES areas IV and VIId). Severe oversampling of PS_SPF_16-31_0_0, severe undersampling of OTB_CRU_32-69_0_0 and OTB_MCD_90-119_0_0_IIIaN. Yes  Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes  Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	no action needed  no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed

Judgement levels

Member State:

		AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	27 May 2014	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	26 March 2013	Partly	10-50%
		Overall compliance	EWG Answer Yes	Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
		Overall compliance	Tes .	NA NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	FWO !!	FIMO
		Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	EWG judgement NA	no action needed
СЗ	Follow-up of R	regional and international recommendations	, w	101	no dollon noodod
					motion LUB FIE referred to deres
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	in section I and Table III.C.3	Yes	metier LHP_FIF referred to derog in text as LHM_FIF. No action ne
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	NA	no action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	no action needed
C4	Actions to avo	id shortfalls			MS should continue to improve
					response rates with the fishing in
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	if possible
Recrea	tional fisheries	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	Yes	no action needed
neciea	itional hishenes	Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
legion Baltic Sea					
D1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes	No action needed
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	res	No action needed
		Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	D. I	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
D2	Data quality: R	esults and deviation from NP proposal		Yes	No action needed
		Were data quality targets provided?	Information on data quality provided, no specific targets.	100	dollon flooded
			Cod: control checks on length and weight measurements		No. of the second secon
		Were data quality targets met?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
D3	Follow-up of R	egional and international recommendations	in.	INA	140 dollon ficeded
	ap 0.11	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations requested	Yes	No action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant LM recommendations apply	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
D4	Actions to avoi	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
<b>U</b> 4	ACTIONS TO SAO	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	a and Eastern Arc			•	•
D1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal	Cod recreational fisheries in the Kattegat from tour boats	Yes	No action needed
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		res	No action needed
			conducted as pilot survey.		
		Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained?	No derogations requested NA	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed No action needed
D2	Data quality: R	esults and deviation from NP proposal			
		Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets met?	Information on data quality provided, no specific targets.  NA	Yes NA	No action needed No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
D3	Follow-up of R	egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations requested	Yes	No action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant LM recommendations apply	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
D4	Actions to avoi	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
54	Actions to avo		No desafella Patad		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls listed	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	Yes NA	No action needed No action needed
E Biolog	ical stock-related	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  variables	NA	NA	No action needed
ū		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
Region Baltic Sea	a	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  variables  Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	NA	NA	No action needed
ū	a	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  variables	NA	NA	No action needed
Region Baltic Sea	a	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  variables Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal	Yes  Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U.  Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for	NA Yes	No action needed  No action needed
Region Baltic Sea	a	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  variables Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal	NA  Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U.  Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon	NA Yes	No action needed  No action needed
legion Baltic Sea	a	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  variables Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal	Yes  Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U.  Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed  in future MS should remove com
legion Baltic Sea	a	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?    variables   Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?    Results and deviation from NP proposal   Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?    Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U.  Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SI 02-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market-sea sampling.  Yes	Yes Yes Mostly Yes	No action needed  No action needed  in future MS should remove com no action needed no action needed
legion Baltic Sea E1	a Achievements:	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	NA  Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U.  Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market-sea sampling.	Yes Yes Mostly	No action needed  No action needed  in future MS should remove com no action needed
legion Baltic Sea	a Achievements:	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  variables Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  esults and deviation from NP proposal	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U.  Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight(@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market+sea sampling.  Yes  Yes	Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes	No action needed  No action needed  in future MS should remove com no action needed no action needed no action needed
legion Baltic Sea E1	a Achievements:	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U.  Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SI 02-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market-sea sampling.  Yes	Yes Yes Mostly Yes	No action needed  No action needed  in future MS should remove com no action needed no action needed
legion Baltic Sea E1	a Achievements:	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?    variables     Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?    Results and deviation from NP proposal     Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?    Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?     Are the deviations explained?     Are the deviation from NP proposal     Were CV estimates provided?	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SI 02-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market-sea sampling. Yes Yes 10 from 59 not provided	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Mostly Mostly Mostly	No action needed  No action needed  in future MS should remove com no action needed no action needed no action needed MS to provide missing CVs
degion Baltic Sec E1	Achievements:	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?    variables	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market-sea sampling. Yes Yes 10 from 59 not provided In about half of the cases	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Mostly Mostly Mostly	No action needed  No action needed  in future MS should remove com no action needed no action needed no action needed MS to provide missing CVs no action needed
legion Baltic Sea E1	Achievements:	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ivariables Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  esults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations gustified?  egional and international recommendations	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market-sea sampling. Yes Yes  10 from 59 not provided in about half of the cases Yes Yes	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  In future MS should remove com no action needed no action needed no action needed MS to provide missing CVs no action needed no action needed no action needed
degion Baltic Sec E1	Achievements:	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?    variables	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U.  Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market+sea sampling.  Yes  Yes  10 from 59 not provided in about half of the cases  Yes  Yes  Yes  In section I	Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	No action needed  In future MS should remove com no action needed no action needed no action needed MS to provide missing CVs no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed
egion Baltic Sec E1	Achievements:	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ivariables Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  esults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations gustified?  egional and international recommendations	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market-sea sampling. Yes Yes  10 from 59 not provided in about half of the cases Yes Yes	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  In future MS should remove com no action needed no action needed no action needed MS to provide missing CVs no action needed no action needed no action needed
egion Baltic Sec E1	Achievements:	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ivariables Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  esults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  ere to deviations pustified?  egional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market-sea sampling. Yes Yes 10 from 59 not provided in about half of the cases Yes Yes In section I from RCM Baltic 2011, there are no more recent recommendations	Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	No action needed  In future MS should remove com  no action needed  no action needed  mo action needed  MS to provide missing CVs no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed
egion Baltic Sec E1 E2 E2	Achievements:  Data quality: R  Follow-up of R	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?    variables	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market-sea sampling. Yes Yes Yes 10 from 59 not provided In about half of the cases Yes Yes In section I From RCM Baltic 2011, there are no more recent recommendations	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  In future MS should remove com no action needed no action needed no action needed MS to provide missing CVs no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed
degion Baltic Sec E1	Achievements:	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ivariables Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  sesults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  segional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  id shortfalls	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market-sea sampling. Yes Yes Yes  10 from 59 not provided in about half of the cases Yes Yes in section I from RCM Baltic 2011, there are no more recent recommendations Yes Yes	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Yes Mostly Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  In future MS should remove com no action needed no action needed no action needed MS to provide missing CVs no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed
egion Baltic Sec E1 E2 E3	Achievements:  Data quality: R  Follow-up of R	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?    variables	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market-sea sampling. Yes Yes 10 from 59 not provided in about half of the cases Yes Yes In section I from RCM Baltic 2011, there are no more recent recommendations Yes Yes	Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	No action needed  In future MS should remove com  no action needed  no action needed  no action needed  MS to provide missing CVs no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed
egion Baltic Sec E1 E2 E3	Achievements:  Data quality: R  Follow-up of R	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?    variables	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market-sea sampling. Yes Yes Yes  10 from 59 not provided in about half of the cases Yes Yes in section I from RCM Baltic 2011, there are no more recent recommendations Yes Yes	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Yes Mostly Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  In future MS should remove com no action needed no action needed no action needed MS to provide missing CVs no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed
egion Baltic Sec E1 E2 E3	Data quality: R Follow-up of R Actions to avoi	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?    variables	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market-sea sampling. Yes Yes 10 from 59 not provided in about half of the cases Yes Yes In section I from RCM Baltic 2011, there are no more recent recommendations Yes Yes	Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	No action needed  In future MS should remove com  no action needed  no action needed  no action needed  MS to provide missing CVs no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed
egion Baltic Ser E1  E2  E3  E4	Data quality: R Follow-up of R Actions to avoi	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ivariables Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  sesults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  segional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Id shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market-sea sampling. Yes Yes 10 from 59 not provided in about half of the cases Yes Yes In section I from RCM Baltic 2011, there are no more recent recommendations Yes Yes	Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	No action needed  In future MS should remove com  no action needed  no action needed  no action needed  MS to provide missing CVs no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed
egion Baltic Ser E1  E2  E3  E4	Data quality: R Follow-up of R Actions to avoi	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?    variables	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U.  Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market+sea sampling.  Yes  Yes  10 from 59 not provided in about half of the cases  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	No action needed  In future MS should remove com no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed
egion Baltic Ser E1  E2  E3  E4	Data quality: R Follow-up of R Actions to avoi	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ivariables Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? eegional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? id cations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It cations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It cations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It cations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It cations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It cations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It cations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It cations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It cations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It cations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It cations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It cations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It cations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market-sea sampling. Yes Yes 10 from 59 not provided in about half of the cases Yes Yes In section I from RCM Baltic 2011, there are no more recent recommendations Yes Yes Yes Yes	Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	No action needed  In future MS should remove com no action needed no action needed no action needed MS to provide missing CVs no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed
egion Baltic Ser E1  E2  E3  E4	Data quality: R Follow-up of R Actions to avoi	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  I variables  Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pushfied?  egional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  id shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  etc.  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod markel-sea sampling. Yes Yes  10 from 59 not provided in about half of the cases Yes Yes  in section I from RCM Baltic 2011, there are no more recent recommendations Yes Yes Yes  Yes Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	No action needed  In future MS should remove com no action needed
egion Baltic Ser E1  E2  E3  E4	Data quality: R Follow-up of R Actions to avoi	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ivariables Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  sesults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations ijustified?  legional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  It is the substant deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market-sea sampling. Yes Yes  10 from 59 not provided in about half of the cases Yes  Yes  In section I from ROM Baltic 2011, there are no more recent recommendations Yes Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	No action needed  In future MS should remove com no action needed
Region Baltic Ser E1 E2 E3 E4	Data quality: R Follow-up of R Actions to avoid	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  I variables  Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pushfied?  egional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  id shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  etc.  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod markel-sea sampling. Yes Yes  10 from 59 not provided in about half of the cases Yes Yes  in section I from RCM Baltic 2011, there are no more recent recommendations Yes Yes Yes  Yes Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	No action needed  In future MS should remove com no action needed
egion Baltic Ser E1 E2 E3 E4 Legion North Sea E1	Data quality: R Follow-up of R Actions to avoid	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ivariables Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  sesults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations ijustified?  legional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  It is the substant deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market+sea sampling. Yes Yes  10 from 59 not provided in about half of the cases Yes Yes  In section I from ROM Baltic 2011, there are no more recent recommendations Yes Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Yes Mostly Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed  In future MS should remove com no action needed No action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
egion Baltic Ser E1 E2 E3 E4 Region North Sea E1	Data quality: R Follow-up of R Actions to avoid	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ivariables Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Are the deviations pustified?  Besults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  Begional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  It escults and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?  Besults and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations pustified?  Besults and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations pustified?  Besults and deviation from NP proposal   Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market-sea sampling. Yes Yes Yes  10 from 59 not provided in about half of the cases Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  In section I from RCM Baltic 2011, there are no more recent recommendations Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	No action needed  In future MS should remove com no action needed No action needed no action needed no action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed	
egion Baltic Ser E1 E2 E3 E4 Legion North Sea E1	Data quality: R Follow-up of R Actions to avoid	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  I variables  Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pushfied?  Regional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations prom NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market-sea sampling. Yes Yes Yes  10 from 59 not provided in about half of the cases Yes Yes  in section I from RCM Baltic 2011, there are no more recent recommendations Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	No action needed  In future MS should remove com no action needed MS to provide missing CVs no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed
egion Baltic Ser E1 E2 E3 E4 Region North Sea E1	Data quality: R Follow-up of R Actions to avoid and Eastern Archievements:	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ivariables Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pusified?  legional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  It. Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Are the deviation for NP proposal Were CV stimates provided? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pusitified?	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market-sea sampling. Yes Yes Yes  10 from 59 not provided in about half of the cases Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  In section I from RCM Baltic 2011, there are no more recent recommendations Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	No action needed  In future MS should remove com no action needed No action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed No action needed No action needed no action needed no action needed
egion Baltic Ser E1 E2 E3 E4 eegion North Sea E1	Data quality: R Follow-up of R Actions to avoid and Eastern Archievements:	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ivariables Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Are the deviations pushined? Are the deviations pushined? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pushined? Are the deviations pushined? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  It results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pushified?  results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pushified?  regional and international recommendations	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market-sea sampling. Yes Yes Yes 10 from 59 not provided in about half of the cases Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	No action needed  In future MS should remove com no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed No action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed
egion Baltic Ser E1 E2 E3 E4 eegion North Sea E1	Data quality: R Follow-up of R Actions to avoid and Eastern Archievements:	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ivariables Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pusified?  legional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  It. Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Are the deviation for NP proposal Were CV stimates provided? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pusitified?	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market-sea sampling. Yes Yes Yes  10 from 59 not provided in about half of the cases Yes Yes  in section I from RCM Baltic 2011, there are no more recent recommendations Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	No action needed  In future MS should remove com no action needed MS to provide missing CVs no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed
egion Baltic Ser E1 E2 E3 E4 Region North Sea E1	Data quality: R Follow-up of R Actions to avoid and Eastern Archievements:	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ivariables Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pushified?  egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  idescribed: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pusified?  esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pusified?  esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pushfied?  egional and international recommendations Were the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described?	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market-sea sampling. Yes Yes Yes 10 from 59 not provided in about half of the cases Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	Yes  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	No action needed  In future MS should remove com no action needed
egion Baltic Ser E1 E2 E3 E4 Region North Sea E1	Data quality: R Follow-up of R Actions to avoid and Eastern Archievements:	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ivariables Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pusified?  egional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Id shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It also a complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pusitified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Are the deviations pusitified? esults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Are the deviations pusitified? esults and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U. Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market+sea sampling. Yes Yes  10 from 59 not provided in about half of the cases Yes Yes  In section I from RCM Baltic 2011, there are no more recent recommendations Yes Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	Yes  Yes  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Mostly  Mostly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	No action needed  In future MS should remove com no action needed

	mber State:	Sweden	2012		udgement levels Compliance level
		AR year Version of the AR reviewed	<b>2013</b> 27 May 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
		Version of the NP proposal	26 March 2013	Partly	10-50%
		Overall compliance	EWG Answer Yes	Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
		Overall compliance	163	NA NA	not applicable
			EWC COMMENTS	FWC independent	EMC
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	EWG judgement Yes	no action needed
Tran	sversal variables				•
		In Table III E 1 complete and consistent with AB avidalizate?	"Control Foot Atlantic" is not a mariable array	Vee	MS should amend one wrong entry
F1	Capacity	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	"Central East Atlantic" is not a variable group	Yes	"variable group" column
		nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		A control of the state of the s	No. of the control of	V	No selfen asseded
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	F13 Acti	ions to avoid shortfalls		•	<u> </u>
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No Shortfalls	NA NA	No action needed
F2	Effort	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	IVA	No action needed
		nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	F12 Dat	a quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	The state of the s		Terror and a second
		Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?	No comments No deviations	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
	F13 Foll	low-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recomendations	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments No comments	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
	F14 Acti	ions to avoid shortfalls	140 comments	INA	pro action needed
	. 100	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No Shortfalls	NA	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F3	Landings F11 Ach	nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	· · · Aci				
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No deviations No comments	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
	F12 Dat	a quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	IVA	No action needed
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	NA	No action needed
	F13 Foll	Are the deviations justified? low-up of Regional and international recommendations	No comments	NA	No action needed
	FIS FOII	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recomendations	NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	F14 Acti	ions to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No Shortfalls	NA	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
	arch surveys at s	ea			
G1	Achievement	s: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
				Yes	No action needed
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No astina mandad
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments No comments	Yes	No action needed  No action needed
				Yes	No action needed
G2	Doto quality	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No comments		
G2	Data quality:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no		Yes	No action needed
		change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage			
		etc.)? Are the deviations explained?	No comments No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
G3	Follow-up of	Regional and international recommendations		•	
			No, but text explains how follow-up took place	Yes	AR2014: MS to list relevant recommendations from survey plar
					groups (available at
		Are the relevant recommendations from Commen Plant's			http://community.ices.dk/admin/Re
		Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?			endations/_layouts/15/start.aspx#/s ages/Home.aspx)
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
G4	actions to av	roid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industr		<del></del>	<del></del>
Colle	ection of data con	Icerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
A1	Achievements	s: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Minor changements which improve the AR	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	no comments	NA	No action needed
	D	Are the deviations justified?	no comments	NA	No action needed
A2	Data quality: F	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	no comments	NA NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	no comments	NA NA	No action needed
A3	Follow-up of F	Regional and international recommendations	No discourse della di		M
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?	MS gives recommendations on meeting no comments	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments no comments	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
	Actions to avo				
A4		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>A</b> 4					NA ALCOHOLOGICA CONTRACTOR CONTRA
	ection of data ac-	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	no comments	NA	No action needed
	ection of data con	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  cerning the processing industry  Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? acerning the processing industry	no comments	NA	

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? no comments

Member State:		Sweden	Judgement levels		
		AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	27 May 2014	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	26 March 2013	Partly	10-50%
			EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compliance	Yes	Yes	>90%
		·		NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		Are the deviations explained?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
B2	Data quality: Res	sults and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	no comments	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	no comments	NA	No action needed
В3	Follow-up of Rea	ional and international recommendations		•	
	р9	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	no comments	NA.	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments	NA	No action needed
B4	Actions to avoid	shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	no comments	NA	No action needed
lodule of evalua	ation of the effects	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem	·		
1 Achiev	ements: Results and	d deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations apply	Yes	No action needed
2 Actions	s to avoid shortfalls	-			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls listed	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
Module for mana	gement and use of	f the data	<u></u>		
1 Achiev	ements: Results and	d deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes, very complete list	Yes	No action needed
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with			
		the NP proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		The second of th	No. and the second seco	V	No selfer readed
		Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			l		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	database development slower than anticipated	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
2 Actions	s to avoid shortfalls		In .		To a contract
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
onow-up of STI	ECF recommendati		No.	T	Inc
		Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
ist of acronyms	and abbreviations		_		T
		Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
omments, sugg	estions and reflec		T		T
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	Comments passed on to Commission by adding them to	Yes	No action needed
eferences					
		Is there a complete list of references?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
nnexes					
		Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to		Yes	No action needed
		support statements made in the main text?	No comments		

			_		
	Member State:	UK AR year	2013	Ju Compliance class	dgement levels  Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	October 2012? EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
		Overall compliance		Yes NA	>90% not applicable
General fi	amework		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
		Are derogations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
A A	lata collection organisa National corresponde	tion nt and participating institutes			
		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			Information on website is provided in section VI	Mostly	No action needed, for next AR is
		Is there a national DCF website available? Is the information provided on the website in line with legal		-	suggested to provide it in IIA section.
		requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)? Is there an overview and description of contents of national	No comments	NA	No action needed
		coordination meetings?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
В	Regional and Internati	If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?  onal coordination	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	B1 Attendance of	of international meetings Is Table II.B.1 complete?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings	No comments		
	B2 Follow-up of	explained? regional and international recommendations		Yes	No action needed
	•	Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	Relevant recommendations provided in the separate	Mostly	No action needed, for next AR is
		Are the responsive actions described ?	relevant sections No comments	Mostly Yes	suggested to provide it in IIB section.  No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Module of	the evaluation of the fi	shing sector			
Α	General description of				
		on the NP implementation well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
В	Economic variables	Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	no comments	Yes	no action needed
SUPRA-R	EGION Baltic Sea, Nort	h Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic			
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR	Clustered segments are not marked with asterix as it is		MS has to put some asterix on clustered
		guidelines?	required in guidelines.  For some segments, as Polyvalent active and passive	Mostly	segments and to resubmit tha table
			gears10-12 m, pure seiners 18-24 m and etc. target population and planed sample numbers are 0. If these		
			segments do not have vessels in fleet register they should		
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	not be included into AR, if they are, then it must be in target population.	Mostly	MS needs to delete segments that have no vessels
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
	B1 Achievements	Results and deviation from NP proposal		res	No action needed
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Number of clustered segments differ from NP and it is not explained in AR section regarding deviations from NP		Deviations from the NP has to be
		proposal?	proposal.	Mostly	explained in the AR
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	No	Deviations from the NP has to be explained in the AR
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	No	Deviations from the NP has to be explained in the AR
	B2 Data quality: F	Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	MS gives some explantions on the CV's calculation but it is not sufficient.	Partly	MS has to enhance the quality of the data
			For some segments as dredges18-24, dredges 24-40, Drif and/or net fixed12-18/24-40, the sample is higher than in		
			NP proposal without any explantion in the AR. MS		
		Are the deviations explained?	samples inactive vessels and it is a deviation from the NP proposal	Partly	More detail is asked to the MS to highlight the deviations
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	No	More detail is asked to the MS to highlight the deviations
	B3 Follow-up of F	Regional and international recommendations		140	ingringit the deviations
			Recommendations listed are not from LM meetings. But MS mentions recommendations from other meetings as		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	PGECON	Yes NA	No action needed No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments no comments	NA NA	No action needed
	B4 Actions to avo	oid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
С	Biological metier relat	ed variables	According to table III.A.1 MS is operating in Regions NA		<u> </u>
Book of		Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	and NS&EA.	Yes	No action needed
negion No	orth Sea and Eastern A C1 Achievement	rctic s: Results and deviation from NP proposal	·		
			Table complete and detailed by fishing grounds. Table		
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR	difficult to analyse because metiers are split by countries (Scotland, England, etc). 6 metiers not planned in the NP		For the next AR, MS should consider reporting by regions, not split by
		guidelines?	were added in the AR table.	Mostly	countries within the UK.
			Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 not comparable. Several metiers, target assemblages and regions included in the same		For the next AR, MS should consider
			sampling frames (codes). Some inconsistencies in		reporting by regions, not split by countries within the UK. MS should
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	numbers of trips achieved with Table III.C.3 (see for example sampling frame E2).	Mostly	improve comparibility of Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4.
		-	Table modified by MS and difficult to check. Results by	,	
			provinces and partners are irrelevant. Many species not planned in the NP added in the table and which should be		
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	enough to list in table III.C.6, especially when no CVs are		MS to submit final clean table in accordance with the AR Guidelines &
		guidelines?	provided.	Partly	Templates.
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR	Table modified by MS. Concurrent sampling is correctly implemented.		MS to submit final clean table in accordance with the AR Guidelines &
		guidelines?	Objectives planned for sampling trips and species are	Partly	Templates.
			mostly achieved. Metier DRB_MOL abd OTB_DEF_100- 119 in UKE severely undersampled. Often better		
			achievement rates for strategy at sea than at the market		
			or specific stock ones. Sampling frames E2 and E5 partly achieved for some fleets. Most of the species planned		
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	appear as oversampled. Rays in NS and mackerel in I,II	Monthy	No action pooded
		proposal?	not sampled at all.	Mostly	No action needed

Member St	ate: UK		Judgement levels		
	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level	
	Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	31 May 2014 October 2012?	No Partly	<10% 10-50%	
	version of the NP proposal	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%	
	Overall con		Yes	>90%	
			NA	not applicable	
		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG	
		New sampling programmes were established on the basis of probability-based sampling rather than using a quota sampling system based on targeted numbers of metier-			
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	based samples.  Deviations in on-shore sampling and length sampling by species well explained.  Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed	
C2 Data q	uality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes when samples sizes allow to calculate consistent CVs.	Yes	No action needed	
	Were CV targets met?	Rarely. It's strange to have very high CVs with samples with more than 50000 indivuals measured (see edible crab for example).		No action needed	
		Best results achieved are listed in the AR. But MS considers that the DCF precision targets are currently unachievable for many stocks at the Member State level,			
	Are the deviations explained?	despite substantial and costly sampling programmes.	Yes	No action needed	
C3 Follow	Are the deviations justified? -up of Regional and international recommendations	No	No	No action needed	
C3 Follow	-up of Regional and International recommendations				
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	Several derogations for stocks listed in the AR text for this section III.C.3. Some derogations are pending for metiers One recommendation from RCM NS&EA 2012 listed. And	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	one for RCM NA 2012 (I). 4 recommendations from two STECF EWGs are also listed (why not only in section VII?).	Yes	MS to shift STECF recommendations to section VII.	
	Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	Yes	No action needed	
C4 Action	Are the responsive actions acceptable? s to avoid shortfalls	Yes	Yes	No action needed	
C4 ACIO	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future describe	More explanations on deviations than actions planned to d? avoid shortfails in the future.	Partly	MS to provide concrete plans for action for each shortfall.	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptal		NA	No action needed	
gion North Atlantic					
C1 Achie	ements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Table complete and detailed by fishing grounds. Table			
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	difficult to analyse because metiers are split by countries (Scotland, England,etc). 20 metiers not planned in the NP were added in the AR table.	Mostly	For the next AR, MS should consider reporting by regions, not split by countries within the UK.	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR	Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 not comparable. Several metiers, target assemblages and regions included in the same sampling frames (codes). Some inconstitancies in numbers of trips achieved with table III.C.3 (see for		For the next AR, MS should consider reporting by regions, not split by countries within the UK. MS should improve comparibility of Tables III.C.3	
	guidelines?	example sampling frame E2, E5, N3).  Table modified by MS and difficult to check. Results by provinces and partners are irrelevant. Many species not	Mostly	and III.C.4.  MS to submit final clean table in	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	planned in the NP added in the table and which should be enough to list in table III.C.6, especially when no CVs are provided.	Partly	accordance with the AR Guidelines & Templates.  MS to submit final clean table in	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table modified by MS. Concurrent sampling is correctly implemented.	Partly	accordance with the AR Guidelines & Templates.	
	Are design and achievements consistent with the N proposal?	Objectives planned for sampling trips and species are most of time achieved. Some metiers highly undersampled (OTB_DEF_100-119 and DRB_MOL in VIlfgh, FPO_CRU in VIIa). Often better achievement rates for strategy at sea than at the market or specific stock ones. Sampling frames E2, E5 and N6 poorly achieved for some fleets. Most of the species planned appear as oversampled. Lobster is undersampled and in VIIa and VIIe not sampled at all.	Mostly	No action needed	
		New sampling programmes were established on the basis of probability-based sampling within clearly defined sampling frames rather than using a quota sampling system based on targeted numbers of metier-based samples.  Change in fishing behaviour, quatas restrictions had also impacts on fleet sampling. Deviations well explained by metier. The same for length sampling shortfalls detailed			
	Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	by species. No comment	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed	
C2 Data q	uality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	- Common	163	p to dollon needed	
		Yes when samples sizes allow to calculating consistent			
	Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?	CVs. Rarely (in 16 cases only).	Yes No	No action needed  No action needed	
	Work of largest met.	Best results achieved are listed in the AR. But MS considers that the DCF precision targets are currently unachievable for many stocks at the Member State level,	140	No action needed	
	Are the deviations explained?	despite substantial and costly sampling programmes.	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations explained:  Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed	
C3 Follow	-up of Regional and international recommendations				
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	11 derogations listed in the AR text for this section III.C.3 North Atlantic for length measurements, some of them in NAFO or CECAF areas. Some derogations are pending for metiers.	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Two recommendations from RCM NA 2012 listed. Plus 4 recommendations from two STECF EWGs are also listed (why not only in section VII?).	Yes	MS to shift STECF recommendations t section VII.	
	Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed	
C4 Action	s to avoid shortfalls				
		Improvement of the observers at sea system in Northern Ireland, more discussion with the Industry to have better acces to vessels and landings in England and Wales.	Death	MS to provide concrete plans for action	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future describe	d?			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future describe  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptal	0 ?	Partly NA	for each shortfall.  No action needed	
Recreational fis	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptal	0 /			

	per State:	UK AR year	2013	Compliance class	Judgement levels  Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
		Overall compliance	EWG Answer  Mostly	Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
		·	•	NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS  DCF regulation mentions cod, eel and sharks as the recreative targeted species to be sampled in the NS&EA region. Reporting for the region is provided by provinces and for a mixture of species concerning both NS&EA and NA. So AR is difficult to evaluate: England is processing	EWG judgement Mostly	EWG AR2014: MS to report by species instead of by country
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	2012 data collected by a Sea angling survey, when Scotland banned recreationnal fishing for eel and sharks but was collecting some data on cod. States of way appear really different in England and Scotland, without national coordination. 2013 NP objectives were not clearer.  To be noted results of a study provided in annex 2 of the AR on inland salmon and eel recreational fisheries.		
		Are obtained derogations mentioned?	Derogations for eel and sharks mentioned only for Scotland. Derogations in Annex III (2) unclear, it only contains a list of species without any further explanation. Derogation in III.D.4 is also not completely clear, but it s assumed that this derogation relates to text in III.D (first paragraph)	Mostly	AR2014: MS to list derogations (if any in III.D.1, following guidelines: 'If the M obtained derogation for the collection landings data on recreational fisheries then it should explicitly be mentioned this section.'
		Are the deviations explained?	The deviations are in the report but are not well structured	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
D2	Data quality: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal			
		Were data quality targets provided?	No information on data quality	Partly	Yes, MS to provide information on dat quality based on the final report
		Were data quality targets met?	NA	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
D3	Follow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations	INA	INA	No delien needed
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No (listed in III.D.4)	Yes	No action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	No recommendation adressed to MS.  NA	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described:  Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA NA	No action needed
D4	Actions to avoi	d shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	AR2014: MS to move derogations to a different paragraph
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	In England only the charter boats survey should be carried out in the beginning of 2013 to achieve data collection for a full year.	Yes	No action needed
orth Atlar	ntic		a ran your.		1
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	sharks as the recreative targeted species to be sampled in the NA region. Reporting for the region is provided by provinces and for a mixture of species concerning both NS&EA and NA. So AR is difficult to evaluate: only salmon seems to be monitored on a regular basis. England is processing 2012 data collected by a Sea angling survey, when Scotland banned recreationnal fishing for eel and sharks an did not collect data on sea bass in 2013. Data collection in Northern Ireland but was just beginning in 2013. States of way appear really different in the different provinces, without national coordination. 2013 NP objectives were also not clearer. To be noted results of a study provided in annex 2 of the AR on inland salmon and eel recreational fisheries.	Maste	instead of by country  AR2014: MS to list derogations (if any
		Are obtained derogations mentioned?	Derogations for eel and sharks mentioned only for Scotland. Derogations in Annex III (2) unclear, it only contains a list of species without any further explanation. Derogation in III.D.4 is also not completely clear, but it s assumed that this derogation relates to text in III.D (first paragraph)	Mostly	Anaul 4. Mo to list derogations (in arri in III.D.1, following guidelines: 'If the obtained derogation for the collection landings data on recreational fisherie then it should explicitly be mentioned this section.'
		Are the deviations explained?	The deviations are in the report but are not well structured	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
D2	Data quality: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal	Information on data quality presided for England	NA AL -	ADOUGH MO to worseld a feet some of the
		Were data quality targets provided?	Information on data quality provided for England and Scotland (not for Northern Ireland), no specific targets.	Mostly	AR2014: MS to provide information for all provinces explicitly
		Were data quality targets met?	NA	NA	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed  No action needed
D3	Follow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations			•
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No (listed in III.D.4)	Yes	No action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?	No recommendation adressed to MS NA	Yes NA	No action needed  No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No action needed
D4	Actions to avoi	d shortfalls	The devegations should be under III 5.4	Yes	AR2014: MS to move derogations to
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	The derogations should be under III.D.1  In England only the chartered boats survey should be carried out in the beginning of 2013 to achieve data	Yes	different paragraph  No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	collection for a full year. But not real improvement of data collection on recreational fisheries can be expected before next DCMAP.		
Biologic	cal stock-related	variables		·	
		Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region	According to table III.A.1 MS is operating in Regions  NS&EA and NA	Yes	No action needed
	and Eastern Arct	tic			
	A a la la crama a maa .	Results and deviation from NP proposal			
orth Sea	Achievements:	• •	Table modified by MS (a.g. added columns) and difficult to		MS to submit final class table in
	Achievements:	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table modified by MS (e.g. added columns) and difficult to check. Two species not planned in the NP added in the table.	Mostly	MS to submit final clean table in accordance with the AR Guidelines & Templates.

Region

Region

	Memb	er State:	UK AR year	2013	Ju- Compliance class	dgement levels  Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
			Overall compliance	EWG Answer e Mostly	Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
			Overall compliance	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	NA NA	not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	Achievements rates can be considered as mostly achieved in terms of numbers of fish sampled. Most of the stocks appear as well or oversampled for the parameters planned. But undersampling is registered for scallops (not sample at all) and some valuable species such as sea bass (OK for length@age), John Dory, brill. Weakness also of samples for sex ratio and maturity @age for megrim and anglerfish. Some planned numbers very low (less than 10 fish), doubtful that parameters can be estimated from so few individuals.	EWG judgement  Mostly	No action needed
			proposal?	Sampling achievement is mostly totally dependent on the catches of the species on the surveys and the staff time available between tows to process multiple species.	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	E2	Data quality: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal		100	no dollon noodod
			Were CV estimates provided?	CVs are presented for biological samples where there were adequate samples sizes and where the statistical models used were able to converge.	Yes	No action needed
			Were CV targets met?	Yes for more than 50% of the stocks for ALKs, maturity@length and weight@length. Other parameters estimations are of lower quality.	Mostly	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Explanations provided for two stocks, anglerfish and megrim, with too small samples collected during IBTS. But MS considers that the DCF precision targets are currently unachievable for many stocks at the Member State level, despite substantial and costly sampling programmes.	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	E3	Follow-up of Re	egional and international recommendations	NA	NA	No action needed
			Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	One from RCM NS&EA 2012 on bilateral agreements.	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	E4	Actions to avoid	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	More task sharing between MS for to achieving precision targets at regional level. Only existing case up to now in NA UK fishing areas : sole in VIId.	Yes	No action needed
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
Region No						
	E1	Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal			MS to submit final clean table in
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table modified by MS and difficult to check. 14 stocks not planned in the NP added in the table.  Achievements rates can be considered as mostly	Mostly	accordance with the AR Guidelines & Templates.
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	achieved in terms of numbers of fish sampled. More than 50% of the stocks were well or over-sampled for the parameters planned. But undersampling is registered for species assessed by ICES WGNEW, Selacians and Gadoids in Southern fishing grounds, but also for some parameters of important stocks estimated from surveys data in the Northern areas.	Mostly	No action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	Sampling achievement is mostly totally dependent on the catches of the species on the surveys and the staff time available between tows to process multiple species.	Yes	No action needed
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	E2	Data quality: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal	CVs are presented for biological samples where there were adequate samples sizes and where the statistical	Yes	No action needed
			Were CV estimates provided?	models used were able to converge. For less than 20% of the parameters updated. Best results for ALKs and maturity@length (around 50%). Other	Partly	No action needed
			Were CV targets met?	parameters estimations are of lower quality.  The majority of stock-based variables are obtained from sampling at sea on research vessels in order to obtain	railly	IVO action needed
			Are the deviations explained?	data representative of the population. Sampling achievement is therefore totally dependent on the catches of the species on the surveys and the staff time available between tows to process multiple species. Undersampling by more than 10% can be explained by low catches or logistical constraints of working with many species. Over-sampling by more than 50% compared to the set targets can occur especially where the targets are modest but catches are sufficiently large to allow the sampling rate to be expanded at no additional expense (as the survey staff costs are fixed).  More information provided for two stocks: Gadus morhua from Rockall VIb and Nephrops FU 13.	Yes	No action needed
		Follow up of D	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	F3	. JIIOW-UD OI KE	egional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation listed.	NA	No action needed
	E3				t	<del>                                     </del>
	E3		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA wrote by MS. But recommendation by RCM NA 2012 on bilateral agreements is relevant, as for RCM NS&EA in North sea.	No	MS to add missing recommendation
	E3		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	on bilateral agreements is relevant, as for RCM NS&EA in North sea. NA	NA	No action needed
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	on bilateral agreements is relevant, as for RCM NS&EA in North sea.		
	E3	Actions to avoid	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? i shortfalls	on bilateral agreements is relevant, as for RCM NS&EA in North sea.  NA  NA  More task sharing between MS for to achieving precision targets at regional level. Only existing case up to now in	NA	No action needed
	E4		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	on bilateral agreements is relevant, as for RCM NS&EA in North sea.  NA  NA  More task sharing between MS for to achieving precision	NA NA	No action needed No action needed
	E4	Actions to avoid	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR	on bilateral agreements is relevant, as for RCM NS&EA in North sea.  NA NA NA More task sharing between MS for to achieving precision targets at regional level. Only existing case up to now in NA UK fishing areas: sole in VIIa.	NA NA Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
F	E4	Actions to avoid	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	on bilateral agreements is relevant, as for RCM NS&EA in North sea.  NA  NA  More task sharing between MS for to achieving precision targets at regional level. Only existing case up to now in NA UK fishing areas: sole in VIIa.  Yes	NA NA Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed
F	E4 Transve	Actions to avoid	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  vements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	on bilateral agreements is relevant, as for RCM NS&EA in North sea.  NA  NA  More task sharing between MS for to achieving precision targets at regional level. Only existing case up to now in NA UK fishing areas : sole in VIIa.  Yes  No comments	NA NA Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
F	E4 Transve	Actions to avoid	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? d shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  vements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	on bilateral agreements is relevant, as for RCM NS&EA in North sea.  NA  NA  More task sharing between MS for to achieving precision targets at regional level. Only existing case up to now in NA UK fishing areas: sole in VIIa.  Yes	NA NA Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed

		AD week	2012		udgement levels
		AR year Version of the AR reviewed	2013 31 May 2014	Compliance class No	Compliance level <10%
		Version of the NP proposal	October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
		Overall comp	EWG Answer liance Mostly	Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
		o voi all oonip.	mood)	NA NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA NA	No action needed
	F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described		Yes	No action needed
F2	Effort	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable	No comments	NA	No action needed
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	No comments	Vaa	No potion monded
		proposal?  Are the deviations explained?	No deviations indicated.	Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments  No deviations indicated. For future, MS is asked to	Yes	No action needed
			provide precise information on whether deviations occured		
		Are the deviations explained?	or not	Yes	No action needed
	F13	Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No comments	NA	No action needed
	гіз	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described	? No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable		Yes	No action needed
F3	Landings				
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		ı	1
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		b. share.	No deviations indicated. For future, MS is asked to		,
		Are the deviations explained?	provide precise information on whether deviations	Voc	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	occuredn or not No comments	Yes NA	No action needed No action needed
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
			No deviations indicated. For future, MS is asked to provide precise information on whether deviations occured		
		Are the deviations explained?	or not	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recomendations	Voc	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls		1	_
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable		Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed
Resear	ch surveys		NO COMMENTS	res	No action needed
		Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR	survey (1, 2, 3) is split up in three lines although it is one survey.		account that ran during the current D( (2011-2014?) period. Follow guideline II a survey had covered more than or type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activity and consider merging one survey carried out by multiple vessels as one survey. Check acronyms of survey planning groups (eg PGHERS does nexist anymore, IBTS should be IBTSWG)
		guidelines?		Yes	(2011-2014?) period. Follow guidelind I'l a survey had covered more than on type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activit and consider merging one survey carried out by multiple vessels as on survey. Check acronyms of survey planning groups (ep PGHERS does re exist anymore, IBTS should be IBTSWG)
				Yes	(2011-2014?) period. Follow guidelin: If a survey had covered more than or type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activit and consider merging one survey carried out by multiple vessels as on survey. Check acronyms of survey planning groups (ep PGHERS does rexist anymore, IBTS should be IBTSWG)  No action needed
		guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	No comments No comments	Yes	(2011-2014?) period. Follow guidelin I'l a survey had covered more than o type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activit and consider merging one survey carried out by multiple vessels as on survey. Check acronyms of survey planning groups (ep PGHERS does rexist anymore, IBTS should be IBTSWC)  No action needed  No action needed
		guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	survey.  No comments	Yes Yes	(2011-2014?) period. Follow guidelin If a survey had covered more than o type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activit and consider merging one survey carried out by multiple vessels as on survey. Check acronyms of survey planning groups (eg PGHERS does rexist anymore, IBTS should be IBTSWG)  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
		guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	No comments No comments	Yes	(2011-2014?) period. Follow guidelin If a survey had covered more than o type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activit and consider merging one survey carried out by multiple vessels as on survey. Check acronyms of survey planning groups (eg PGHERS does rexist anymore, IBTS should be IBTSWG)  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
G2	Data qua	guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  ity: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Ve.g.	Yes Yes	(2011-2014?) period. Follow guidelin If a survey had covered more than o type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activit and consider merging one survey carried out by multiple vessels as on survey. Check acronyms of survey planning groups (ep PGHERS does rexist anymore, IBTS should be IBTSWG)  No action needed  No action needed  AR2014: MS to add map numbers in
G2	Data qua	guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Ity: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	No comments No comments No comments No comments Ve.g. No comments	Yes Yes Yes	(2011-2014?) period. Follow guidelin II a survey had covered more than o type of activity. MS should insert separate lines for each type of activit and consider merging one survey carried out by multiple vessels as on survey. Check acronyms of survey planning groups (eg PGHERS does rexist anymore, IBTS should be IBTSWG)  No action needed  No action needed  AR2014: MS to add map numbers in text and in table  No action needed
G2	Data qua	guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  ity: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained?	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Ve.g.	Yes Yes Yes	(2011-2014?) period. Follow guidelin If a survey had covered more than o type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activit and consider merging one survey carried out by multiple vessels as on survey. Check acronyms of survey planning groups (eg PGHERS does rexist anymore, IBTS should be IBTSWG)  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  AR2014: MS to add map numbers in text and in table
G2 G3		guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? itty: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	(2011-2014?) period. Follow guidelin If a survey had covered more than o type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activit and consider merging one survey carried out by multiple vessels as on survey. Check acronyms of survey planning groups (eg PGHERS does rexist anymore, IBTS should be IBTSWG)  No action needed  No action needed  AR2014: MS to add map numbers in text and in table  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
		guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? ity: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Plann	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	(2011-2014?) period. Follow guidelind If a survey had covered more than or type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activit and consider merging one survey carried out by multiple vessels as on survey. Check acronyms of survey planning groups (ep PGHERS does rexist anymore, IBTS should be IBTSWG)  No action needed
		guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Its the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  Of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Plann Groups listed?	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	(2011-2014?) period. Follow guidelind If a survey had covered more than of type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activit and consider merging one survey carried out by multiple vessels as on survey. Check acronyms of survey planning groups (eg PGHERS does rexist anymore, IBTS should be IBTSWG)  No action needed  No action needed  AR2014: MS to add map numbers in text and in table  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
G3	Follow-u	guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Ity: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Plann Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	(2011-2014?) period. Follow guidelind If a survey had covered more than on type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activit and consider merging one survey carried out by multiple vessels as on survey. Check acronyms of survey planning groups (ep PGHERS does rexist arymore, IBTS should be IBTSWG)  No action needed  No action needed  AR2014: MS to add map numbers in text and in table  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed
	Follow-u	guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  ity: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Plann Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described?	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA	(2011-2014?) period. Follow guidelin II a survey had covered more than o type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activit and consider merging one survey carried out by multiple vessels as on survey. Check acronyms of survey planning groups (ep PGHERS does rexist anymore, IBTS should be IBTSWG)  No action needed  No action needed  AR2014: MS to add map numbers in text and in table  No action needed
G3	Follow-u	guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? If y. Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Or of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Plann Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments On comments No com	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	(2011-2014?) period. Follow guidelin 'If a survey had covered more than o type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activit and consider merging one survey carried out by multiple vessels as on survey. Check acronyms of survey planning groups (eg PGHERS does i exist anymore, IBTS should be IBTSWG)  No action needed  No action needed  AR2014: MS to add map numbers in text and in table  No action needed
G3 G4	Follow-u	guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  lity: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Plann Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Of avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described.	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments On comments No com	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA	(2011-2014?) period. Follow guidelin IIf a survey had covered more than o type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activit and consider merging one survey carried out by multiple vessels as on survey. Check acronyms of survey planning groups (ep PGHERS does rexist anymore, IBTS should be IBTSWG)  No action needed  You action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action seeded  No action needed  No action seeded  No action needed  No action seeded  No action seeded  No action seeded  No action seeded
G3 G4	Follow-u Actions t	guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  ity: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Plant Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  o avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described.  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments On comments No com	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA Mostly	(2011-2014?) period. Follow guidelin 'If a survey had covered more than o type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activit and consider merging one survey carried out by multiple vessels as on survey. Check acronyms of survey planning groups (eg PGHERS does revist anymore, IBTS should be IBTSWG)  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  AR2014: MS to add map numbers in text and in table  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Vo action needed  No action needed  Vo action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Ves, see comment below  Yes, MS to add concrete actions for future to avoid shortfalls. E.g. how win mismatch of logistical requirements ocharter vessels for WCBTS Q4 be
G3 G4 f the eva	Follow-u Actions t	guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  Its the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations pustified? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described.  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable he economic situation of the aquaculture and processing concerning the aquaculture	No comments No com	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes ANA NA Mostly No	(2011-2014?) period. Follow guidelin If a survey had covered more than of type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activity and consider merging one survey carried out by multiple vessels as on survey. Check acronyms of survey planning groups (eg PGHERS does exist anymore, IBTS should be IBTSWG)  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  AR2014: MS to add map numbers in text and in table  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Vo action needed  Vo action needed  No action needed  Ves, see comment below  Yes, MS to add concrete actions for future to avoid shortfalls. E.g. how we mismatch of logistical requirements of charter vessels for WCBTS Q4 be avoided?
G3 G4 f the eva	Follow-u Actions t	guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  ity: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?  of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Plant Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  o avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described.  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments On comments No com	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA Mostly	(2011-2014?) period. Follow guidelin 'If a survey had covered more than o type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activit and consider merging one survey carried out by multiple vessels as on survey. Check acronyms of survey planning groups (eg PGHERS does i exist anymore, IBTS should be IBTSWG)  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  AR2014: MS to add map numbers in text and in table  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Vo action needed  No action needed  Vo action needed  No action needed  No action needed  Ves, see comment below  Yes, MS to add concrete actions for future to avoid shortfalls. E.g. how wi mismatch of logistical requirements ocharter vessels for WCBTS Q4 be
G3 G4 ff the eva	Follow-u Actions I	guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  ity: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Plant Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Of avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described.  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing concerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Por comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments Na NA NA The comments Na Na The comments The comments Table IV.A.3 indicates A and B scheme, not reflected here. Also achieved sample and planned sample as well as population data differ in some cases extremely. If new	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	(2011-2014?) period. Follow guideline If a survey had covered more than or type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activit and consider merging one survey carried out by multiple vessels as one survey. Check acronyms of survey planning groups (ep PGHERS does rexist anymore, IBTS should be IBTSWG)  No action needed  Tyes, see comment below  Yes, MS to add concrete actions for future to avoid shortfalls. E.g. how will mismatch of logistical requirements or charter vessels for WCBTS Q4 be avoided?  no action needed  MS should explain why achieved sample number is higher than the planned sample number. The table should be updated according to the guidelines and to the explanations
G3 G4 f the eva	Follow-u Actions I	guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?  lity: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Plann Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?  o avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described he economic situation of the aquaculture and processing concerning the aquaculture  Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?  Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR	No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments  No additional recommendations NA NA  Only descriptions on the deviations listed, no actions to avoid shortfalls in furture  Actions not clearly described industry  no comments  Table IV.A.3 indicates A and B scheme, not reflected here. Also achieved sample and planned sample as well as population data differ in some cases extremely. If new information are available, table shall be updated.  In most cases achieved sample rate and response rates	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	(2011-2014?) period. Follow guidelind If a survey had covered more than on type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activit and consider merging one survey carried out by multiple vessels as on survey. Check acronyms of survey planning groups (ep PGHERS does rexist anymore, IBTS should be IBTSWG)  No action needed  Ves, see comment below  Yes, see comment below  Yes, see comment below  Yes, see comment below  Yes, see comment below  Thure to avoid shortfalls. E.g. how with mismatch of logistical requirements of charter vessels for WCBTS Q4 be avoided?  In o action needed  MS should explain why achieved sample number is higher than the planned sample number. The table should be updated according to the guidelines and to the explanations provided  MS has to provide sample rate and

wemi	ber State:	UK			udgement levels
		AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
			EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compliance	e Mostly	Yes	>90%
			•	NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
					MS has to provide detailed explanations
					on the deviation (added segments) from
		Are the deviations explained?	Deviations from NP proposal are not explained	Partly	NP proposal
		•		1	MS has to provide detailed explanations
					on the deviation (added segments) from
		Are the deviations justified?	no comments	No	NP proposal
	Data sualitu Da		no comments	140	141 proposal
A2	Data quality: He	sults and deviation from NP proposal		1	
					MO has de soude de la contraction de la contract
					MS has to apply the methodology to get
		and the second second			all data required (CVs, sample rates,
		Is respective data quality information given?	MS provides some explanation but not sufficient	Mostly	reponse rate) for the aquaculture sector
			MS is not explaining the all deviations from the NP		MS has to explain by
		Are the deviations explained?	proposal	Mostly	methodology/comments deviations
		Are the deviations justified?	Deviations are not fully justified	Mostly	MS has to to justify all the deviations
A3	Follow-up of Red	gional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no comments	Yes	no action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	no comments	NA	no action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments	NA	no action needed
A4	Actions to avoid	I shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	no comments	yes	no action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	no comments	yes	no action needed
Collecti	ion of data cor		sammonto	, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	4000.11100404
Collecti	on or data conce	erning the processing industry		T	
		Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR	no commente	V	no action pooded
		guidelines?	no comments	Yes	no action needed
		In Table BAD Committee of the Committee			Marada dadi
		Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR	L		No cells shall be removed from the
		guidelines?	Employment rows are missing	Mostly	table. The table should be resubmitted.
B1	Achievements: I	Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP	MS states that subsidies, other income, unpaid labour		MS should provide explanations for the
		proposal?	costs and net extraordinary costs are not mandatory.	Mostly	missing variables
		Proposition and the second sec	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	+	MS should provide explanations for the
		Are the deviations explained?	MS does not explain these deviations	No	missing variables
		Alle the deviations explained:	wie dees not explain these deviations	140	MS should provide explanations for the
		And the deviations instilled?	Deviations are not instified	Ne	
		Are the deviations justified?	Deviations are not justified	No	missing variables
B2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	no comments	yes	no action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	no comments	Yes	no action needed
			Subsidies, other income, unpaid labour costs and		
		Are the deviations justified?	extraordinary costs, net are missing	Yes	no action needed
В3	Follow-up of Rea	gional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no comments	Yes	no action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	no comments	NA	no action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments	NA	no action needed
B4	Actions to avoid	I shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	no comments	Yes	no action needed
				1	
					MS should take the necessary actions
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Missing variables are not identified as shortfalls	No	to avoid these shortfalls in the future
Indula of avaluati	ion of the effects	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		.1	
1 Achieve	ements: Hesuits ar	nd deviation from NP proposal		V	No sellen mended
				Yes	No action needed
		Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments		
		Are the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations apply	Yes	No action needed
2 Actions	to avoid shortfalls	3			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
lodule for manag	ement and use o				
		nd deviation from NP proposal			
i Acilieve	mento, nesults di	na actiation nomini proposal		T	
		In Table VII.1 complete and consistent with AD and delice and	No comments	V	No action panded
		Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No commente	NIA.	No action page 454
			No comments	NA	No action needed
		Is progress in the "Management of data" section well	No comments	V	No action panded
		detailed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
2 Actions	to avoid shortfalls			·	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described:  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	
-II OTT	·		No comments	res	No action needed
ollow-up of STEC	or recommendati		<u> </u>		International Control
		Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
ist of acronyms a	and abbreviations		-		
		Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	allama arr de		140 comments		
omments, sugge	stions and reflec	ctions			The second second
			L.	Yes	No action needed
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No comments	_1	_1
eferences					
				No	AR2014: MS to update reference list
		Is there a complete list of references?	No references listed		with references used in the report
nnexes				•	
				Yes	No action needed
		Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information			
		to support statements made in the main text?	No comments		

Member State:

VI

VII

x x

## ANNEX 3 – DETAILED DT EVALUATION TABLE BY MS

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory)
18	Belgium	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Depreciated Replacement value missing for 2008 for several fleet segments. Energy consumption missing for several fleet segments and years (2008/09). Incomplete/inconsistent data sets for some fleet segments. 2, Recreational catch data not submitted  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	1, Most of the "suspect or missing" data relate to fleet segments with very few members, which easily yield large variations. 2. In belgian there is no obligation to record the catches from recreational fisheries. Therefore, it is not possible to submit catch data for recreational fisheries. To improve and hopefully solve this problem, Belgium has started a new project (LIVIS) under the EFF where a full inventarisation of the recreational fisheries is done and based on this, recommendations will be done to the government to implement a registration system for the catches from recreational fisheries in belgium. The project started end 2013 and is finalized begin 2015.	gradual implementation of a full quantitative study on recreational fisheries is undertaken in 2011, 2012 and 2013"	Unsatisfactory
40	Belgium	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	No information submitted for vessels <10m in length. See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	For the requested period, there were no vessel <10m active in the Belgian fisheries.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
85	Belgium		Hake in Division IIIa, Subareas IV, VI and VII and Divisions	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards	BE has length information of Hake but the stock coordinator agreed that the upload of quarterly landings and effort into InterCatch was sufficient.	It is not up to the stock coordinator to decide on changes in data calls. MS should in general comply with data calls unless an agreed derogation is in force.	Satisfactory
86	Belgium		Data call under Intercatch for: European seabass in Divisions IVbc,VIIa and VIId-h (Irish Sea, English Channel and southern North Sea)(bss-47) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings	BE does not have age and length samples of seabass in recent years	Seabass in not part of stocks of the MS DCF NP and MS has therefor no obligation to submit the data.	Satisfactory
87	Belgium		Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(cod-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	The data were uploaded on the day of the deadline (17/04/2014 14h20)	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
88	Belgium			Missing data: Age or length data for landings	Plaice in VIIe can only be sampled as opportunity arises, therefore we didn't have enough samples to deliver an age or length distribution.	Seems that MS was in position to respond to the Data call but as not perform it properly (for length distribution).	Unsatisfactory
89	Belgium		Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Divisions VIIh-k (Southwest of Ireland)(sol-7h- k) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings	The area VIIh-k is not an area BE has to sample (cfr ranking of metiers) , and BE only has a quotum of about 4 ton of sole in VIIh.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
90	Belgium		Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(sol-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline after EG	In the assessment of sole 7A, the raw age data were combined for the major countries (Belgium, Ireland and UK) without weighting. The combined ALK was applied to the raised length distribution of the national catches to obtain a combined age distribution. Therefore InterCatch cannot be used for the raising and an upload of the Belgian data is irrelevant.	Seems that MS was in position to respond to the Data call but as not perform it properly (time delivery).	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory)
91	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Subarea IV (North Sea), Divison VIId (Eastern Channel) and IIIa West (Skagerrak)(cod- 347d) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Because of the expanding demand to deliver data and the delay in the data transmission for the administration, we were not able to upload the data into InterCatch on time. However we uploaded the data (04/04/2014 11h39) within one week after the deadline for submission.	Seems that MS was in position to respond to the Data call but as not perform it properly (time delivery).	unsatisfactory
92	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Common shrimp (Crangon crangon) in sub-area IV and division VIId(csh-47d) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	The data of common shrimp were not requested in the Data call under InterCatch. De Crangon data needed for WGCRAN were delivered directly to the chair of WGCRAN by email.	Derogation granted to MS in its NP. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
93	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Subarea IV (North Sea) and Division Illa West (Skagerrak)(had-34) WGNSSK	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards Delay: after deadline	Hake is only 0.2% of the total landings in Belgium. Therefore, it can hardly be sampled for as well landings as discards.	Hake was not in the selected stocks of the MS NP. Only data collected at sea could be available if MS applied corrrectly the concurrent sampling method. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
94	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IVb (Off Horn Reef, FU 33)(nep-33) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Because of the expanding demand to deliver data and the delay in the data transmission for the administration, we were not able to upload the data into InterCatch on time. However we uploaded the data (04/04/2014 11h52) within one week after the deadline for submission.	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
95	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IVbc (Botney Gut - Silver Pit, FU 5)(nep-5) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Because of the expanding demand to deliver data and the delay in the data transmission for the administration, we were not able to upload the data into InterCatch on time. However we uploaded the data (04/04/2014 11h52) within one week after the deadline for submission.	-	Satisfactory
96	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIId (Eastern Channel)(ple-eche) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Because of the expanding demand to deliver data and the delay in the data transmission for the administration, we were not able to upload the data into InterCatch on time. However we uploaded the data (04/04/2014 12h17) within one week after the deadline for submission.	-	Satisfactory
97	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice Subarea IV (North Sea)(ple-nsea) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Because of the expanding demand to deliver data and the delay in the data transmission for the administration, we were not able to upload the data into InterCatch on time. However we uploaded the data (04/04/2014 12h17) within one week after the deadline for submission.	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
98	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Saithe in Subarea IV (North Sea) Division IIIa West (Skagerrak) and Subarea VI (West of Scotland and Rockall)(sai-3a46) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	The data were uploaded the day before the deadline (27/03/2014)	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory)
99	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIId (Eastern Channel)(sol-eche) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Because of the expanding demand to deliver data and the delay in the data transmission for the administration, we were not able to upload the data into InterCatch on time. However we uploaded the data (04/04/2014 12h27) within one week after the deadline for submission.		Satisfactory
100	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Subarea IV (North Sea)(sol-nsea) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Because of the expanding demand to deliver data and the delay in the data transmission for the administration, we were not able to upload the data into InterCatch on time. However we uploaded the data (04/04/2014 12h27) within one week after the deadline for submission.	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
101	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting Subarea IV (North Sea) & Division VIId (Eastern Channel)(whg-47d) WGNSSK	,	The data were uploaded the day before the deadline (27/03/2014)	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
335	Belgium	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (gug-celt)Grey gurnard in Subarea VI and Divisions VIIa-c and e-k (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/ Publication%20Reports/Advice /2013/2013/gug-celt.pdf	,	gurnard under the generic category 'gurnards' until 2010, it is not possible to improve the quality of landings data prior to	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. Data call deadline should try to match the NP from relevant MS.	satisfactory
349	Belgium	ICES	of Scotland Stock: (ple-iris)Plaice in Division VIIa (Irish Sea) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/	Type of issue: Data quality - Discards sampling intensity Description: The discard data are noisy and the assessment would benefit from increased sampling intensity. Discard information from Northern Irish and Irish Nephrops fleets became available for the first time this year, enabling improved discard estimates for the most recent years (2010–2012). Because no time-series of this information was available to be incorporated in the assessment model, the previous discards computation was used. However, the new discard information was used to quantify the catch advice.	Age distribution of discards and landings was provided on 17/04/2014 14h22	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. Data call deadline should try to match the NP from relevant MS.	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory)
353	Belgium		of Scotland Stock: (ple-echw)Plaice in	Description: This assessment would benefit from the addition of age composition information from both the French and Belgian fleets who collectively account for 30% of the total landings for this stock.	, ,	Seems that MS was in position to respond to the Data call but as not perform it properly (by combining with French data at least).	

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG Comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory)
2	Bulgaria	JRC/DG MARE		Only few variables (number of enterprises by size category, turnover for 2008-2010, livestock costs (2008), livestock volume and total sales volume for 2008-2010) were disaggregated at the segment level. The turnover and sales volume by specie was not reported by DCF segment for 2011. See: https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	The information of 2011 is revised. We send you table Aqua_production_2013_ revised.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	NA
19	Bulgaria	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Significant amount of missing and inconsistent data for several fleet segments . Energy consumption missing for 2011.  National level capacity data (number of vessels, GT, kW) significantly lower than at fleet segment level due to the submission of MS capacity data only on the active fleet.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	It's not possible to report these data because our e-database does not contain information about Energy consumption for 2011 and 2012. For 2013 information for Energy consumption is available.  Capacity_tot for 2011 include only the active vessels.	No response to "Significant amount of missing and inconsistent data for several fleet segments". Insufficient explanation for failure of data delivery on energy consumption.  MS indicated in 2013 AR that energy consumption data were collected for 2012.  MS was alerted to provide inactive vessels in previous years' AR evaluation	Unsatisfactory
55	Bulgaria	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	No information on enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity. The values provided for the variable "purchase of fish and other raw material for production" are very low compared with those for "turnover". Although the national correspondent for Bulgaria has confirmed that all the information provided were correct, the experts continued to find the consistency of the data provided questionable. Values equal to zero: subsidies in 2011.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	material for production" and "turnover" will be checked again. The value of subsidies in 2011 is zero, bacause from all submitted questionnaires the value of this indicator is zero. In	No justification for "No information on enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity".  Explanation on subsidies acceptable.  Evaluation of questionable data should be based on the check as announced by MS	Unsatisfactory
83	Bulgaria	JRC/DG MARE		No discards data received. Table B landings at length is missing all years except 2008. Landings in tons is missing from 2007-2009. Fishing effort is missing for years before 2008. See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Currently no collected data from discard. You could see landings in tons from 2008-2012 by species in table MEDBS_CATCH. There is no data for fishing effort before 2008.	Before the 2008 MS was not involved in the DCF. Instead, discards data should be collected under module III.C of the current DCF, and at least for the metiers identified during RCMMed&BS 2010 (see RCMMed&BS Report Varna, 2010. Table 7. Priorities for sampling effort for discards)	Unsatisfactory
399	Bulgaria	GFCM	Task 1 2 Main resource and activity components variables per Operational Units	Mostly completed (75%)	All available data is submitted.	In general the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call	Satisfactory
412	Bulgaria	GFCM	Task 1 4 Catch and effort variables catch effort discard bycacth	Mostly completed (75%)	All available data is submitted.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call	Satisfactory
422	Bulgaria	GFCM	Task 15 Provisional biological parameters	No data provided	Currently, we have not collected biological data from landings.	Under Module III.C and III.E of the current DCF, MS is collecting the request data. Moreover, if the requested data (for GFCM task 1.5 those corresponds to mean length, max and min length) are not available from commercial catches, MS could use surveys data.	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	Pre-screening comments	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
40	0 Croatia	GFCM	Task 1 2 Main resource and activity components variables per Operational Units	Mostly completed (75%)	Data for referent years 2011 and 2012 will be provided by 31 May 2014.	Following the dead line of the Task 1, data for 2011 should have already been transmitted by the country in May 2013. 2012 data should be transmitted in may 2014. GFCM should confirm if the data have been received	Croatia joined the EU on the first of July 2013, also starting the implementation of the DCF in that period. In general the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call.	Satisfactory
40.	5 Croatia	GFCM	Task 1 3 Economic component variables	Partially completed (50%)	Data for referent years 2011 and 2012 will be provided by 31 May 2014.	Following the dead line of the Task 1, data for 2011 should have already been transmitted by the country in May 2013. 2012 data should have be transmitted in may 2014. GFCM should confirm if the data have been received	Croatia joined the EU on the first of July 2013, also starting the implementation of the DCF in that period. In general the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call.	Satisfactory
41.	3 Croatia	GFCM	Task 1.4 Catch and effort variables catch effort discard bycacth	Scarcely completed (25%)	Data for referent years 2011 and 2012 will be provided by 31 May 2014.	Following the dead line of the Task 1, data for 2011 should have already been transmitted by the country in May 2013. 2012 data should be transmitted in may 2014. GFCM should confirm if the data have been received	Croatia joined the EU on the first of July 2013, also starting the implementation of the DCF in that period.	Satisfactory
42	3 Croatia	GFCM	Task 15 Provisional biological parameters	No data provided	Data for referent year 2013 will be provided in 2015.	For Task 1, 2013 data should be sent in 2015. 2011 data were to be transmitted in May 2013. GFCM should confirm if the 2011 data have been received in 2013	Croatia joined the EU on the first of July 2013, also starting the implementation of the DCF in that period.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
3	Cyprus	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Cyprus provided all economic variables at the national level. However, due to a low number of firms only turnover and sales volume by specie have been provided by segments. Some information is provided by group of species instead of by specie (3 alpha code). See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	For the Turnover Aqua Template the information provided is by species  -Regarding DCF-Aqua Template indeed only Turnover and sales volumes have been provided by species due to the low number of firms in Cyprus. However if it is required upon request we could revise the data with further breakdown in relation to the other variables.  -Another issue that needs to be addressed is the units that relate to the hatcheries. we strongly recommend that in the Turnover Aqua Template the hatcheries production is reported in number of fry instead of weight.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
20	Cyprus	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Substantial amount of data not submitted at all levels. Capacity data not submitted for any of the years requested. Effort data not submitted for any of the years requested. Employment data not submitted for any of the years requested. Income and Expenditure data not submitted for any of the years requested. Capital & Investment not submitted for any of the years requested. Recreational catch data not submitted for any of the years requested. See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	We ackonwledge that data should be send within the deadline. However, the data were not ready to be uploaded within the deadline but on a later stage. Thus, on June 2013 we have sent email whether we could upload the data even with a delay. Despite the fact that permission was given, there was not this possibility through the system. Relevant email was sent by us suggesting if it was possible to send the data by email but we have not received any reply to our question. (Relevant emails attached). As for the Recreational catch data, is not relevant for Cyprus because derogation was granted to Cyprus by STECF for eel and BFT fishery is prohibited for recreational fishery.	Insufficient explanation for failure of fleet data delivery in time.  Evaluation of e-mail dialogue between MS and end user is beyond scope of EWG.  Recreational catch: MS provided reasonable explanation	Unsatisfactory
56	Cyprus	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Values equal to zero: "imputed value of unpaid labour" (all years); "extraordinary costs, net" (all years); subsidies (2009) See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	These variables were collected through the questionnaire method and their values were zero	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
76	Cyprus	JRC/DG MARE	Med and BS	Late submission in respect of first deadline (3/06/2013) . No catch at age (Table A) and effort data (Table D). No MEDITS TE file.TC file included only data from 2013.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Data regarding landings and discards were submitted in early September 2013. There was further delay for the preparation of catch at age data due to other commitments, but at the time they were prepared the uploading system was already closed. Concerning the Medits TE file, Cyprus submitted the file on the 29th of November 2013, and an updated version of the file on the 6 of December, by email (at mare-datacollection framework@ec.europa.eu). In the email it was requested that the uploading system, which closed early afternoon on the 29th of November, would re-open for uploading TE file and other files already uploaded with some corrections (the relevant emails are attached). However, the uploading system did not open again and for this TE file and TC including data from all the years were not uploaded, even with some delay. Considering that in other data calls JRC accepts the uploading of files even after the deadline, we would be greatfull if the system remains open at least during the whole day of the last submission date.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
406	Cyprus	GFCM	Task 1 3 Economic component variables	Mostly completed (75%)		In general, the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call. The failure of 25% is because the requested data are the ones not requested to be collected under DCF.	,
414	Cyprus	GFCM	Task 1.4 Catch and effort variables catch effort discard bycacth		Cyprus, we inform you that the partial or non data submission of some of the required data was due to administrative issues.	GFCM should confirm if the requested data have been	NA
424	Cyprus	GFCM	Task 15 Provisional biological parameters	•	noted that the information requested will derive from the National Data Collection Programme under the Data Collection	GFCM should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	NA

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
21	Denmark	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Effort and landings data provided for 2012 but no corresponding capacity data (national and fleet segment levels). Capacity data not reported for 2013 (national and fleet segment levels). Recreational catch data not submitted See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	The Fleet Economic Data Call asks for processed data for 2012 already in February/March 2013, but we cannot deliver data for a given year before the data has been validated and is ready for processing. It is the same for the 2014 data call, that we cannot deliver 2013 data already in March 2014. We have corresponded with DGMARE about this and proposed to report some preliminary 2013 data in May 2014. See the enclosed e-mail correspondence.	Deadline was evidently missed. Evaluation of bilateral correspondence between MS and DG Mare is beyond scope of EWG.	NA
41	Denmark	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	No effort or catch information for the special conditions BACOMA or T90 in the Baltic. See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	See point 4 in the attached letter to DG MARE concerning the SGMOS data call.	Evaluation of bilateral correspondence between MS and DG Mare is beyond scope of EWG.	NA
57	Denmark	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Values equal to zero: subsidies (all years); "turnover attributed to fish processing" for enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity (2011). As explained by the national expert, although reported as zero, the "turnover attributed to fish processing" is not equal to zero (and indeed it could not be, as the value provided for "number of enterprises carrying cannot fish processing not as a main activity" is not zero) but it cannot be shown for confidentiality reasons. More information is available in Section 4.4.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Statistics Denmark has thoroughly examined data for the processing industry for the years reported to JRC and has concluded that there are no subsidies in the Danish processing industry. This has been explained by the MS several times. Furthermore, it is correct that the numbers of enterprises carrying out fish processing, but not as a main activity, is not zero. However, the numbers cannot be provided for public publication do to Statistics Denmark's (and for that matter EUROSTAT's) rules on confidentiality. MS was instructed to insert the value zero, because the data is collected, but cannot be provided for publication.		Satisfactory
102	Denmark	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder pelagic in Subdivisions 26 and 28(fle- 2628) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Age or length data for discards	Denmark has never sampled the stock in 26 and 28. Before the stock was defined for the area 22 to 32 - and in the last 10 years around 0.2 % of the landings from 22 to 32 came from 26 and 28. Since 2000 we have in total landed 75 tons from subdivision 26 and 28.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
103	Denmark	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IVa (Norwegian Deeps, FU 32)(nep-32) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Data were uploaded before the deadline, but due to an error in InterCatch data were not imported into InterCatch, see mail from Henrik Kjems-Nielsen (ICES) from 4th of April 2013.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	NA
104	Denmark	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IVb (Off Horn Reef, FU 33)(nep-33) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Data were uploaded before the deadline, but due to an error in InterCatch data were not imported into InterCatch, see mail from Henrik Kjems-Nielsen (ICES) from 4th of April 2013.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	NA
105	Denmark	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IIIa (Skagerak Kattegat, FU 3,4)(nep-3-4) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Data were uploaded before the deadline, but due to an error in InterCatch data were not imported into InterCatch, see mail from Henrik Kjems-Nielsen (ICES) from 4th of April 2013.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	NA

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
106	Denmark	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IVbc (Botney Gut - Silver Pit, FU 5)(nep-5) WGNSSK	Missing data: Landings data Delay: after deadline	Data were uploaded before the deadline, but due to an error in InterCatch data were not imported into InterCatch, see mail from Henrik Kjems-Nielsen (ICES) from 4th of April 2013.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	NA
107	Denmark	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IVa (Fladen Ground, FU 7)(nep-7) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Data were uploaded before the deadline, but due to an error in InterCatch data were not imported into InterCatch, see mail from Henrik Kjems-Nielsen (ICES) from 4th of April 2013.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	NA
304	Denmark	ICES	stocks Stock: (hom-west)Horse mackerel (Trachurus	Type of issue: Data transmission - Transmission of discard data Description: Discards are included in the assessment. However, not all countries provide data on discards; consequently, there is no estimate of the total amount of discards in the horse mackerel fisheries.	Denmark is having derogation for discard sampling in the Danish horse-mackerel fishery.	Derogation checked. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
317	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	Ecoregion: North Sea Stock: (sol-kask)Sole in Division Illa and Subdivisions 22–24 (Skagerrak, Kattegat, and the Belts) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub /Publication%20Reports/Advi ce/2013/2013/sol-kask.pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Sampling of landings is complicated by the low total landings which are dispersed spatially. Comments: The problems of sampling intensity are due to the low landings.	The sole landings in Kattegat and Skagerrak was in 2012 150 t. and 134 t., respectivly. This is a very low level of total landings and it is extreamly difficult to get a good spatial and temporal coverage with so few landing events. We have increased the sampling program to also include the sole above minimum landing size on the observer trips to try to optimize the numbers of sampling events of sole.	call.	Unsatisfactory
318	Denmark	ICES	Ecoregion: North Sea Stock: (spr-kask)Sprat in Division IIIa (Skagerrak – Kattegat) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub /Publication%20Reports/Advi ce/2013/2013/spr- kask_201303102249.pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Even though the sampling intensity conforms to the DCF regulation, it does not provide a good enough representation of the fishery catches for use in an analytical assessment. Sampling intensity of commercial catches should be increased.	To increase sampling event and the quality of the sprat samples we have initiated a self-sampling program for sprat. This have given better data (we have now positions by haul) and increased the number of samples. Denmark still has samples from the control to ensure that the samples collected by the industry is not different from the samples taken by the control agency.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to responde according to the data call.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
	All countries exploring the stock		, ,	Description: Ageing problems are a concern for the quality of the assessment.	Denmark has started a quality program for East Baltic cod were we a reading the same otolith across many countries. Denmark will in WebGr highlight the age rings read and try to focus on the differences between countries. If the discrepancy between MS are within the first rings the true age can be verified by reading day rings. If the discrepancy are in the older age ring structure it is more difficult to set a true age. However, the work is ongoing.	Attempts of DK to reach consistency in age determination of eastern Baltic cod are acknowledged and should be continued.	Satisfactory
	All countries exploring the stock		Stock: (fle-2232)Flounder in Subdivisions 22–32 (Baltic Sea) Reference:	as market price and cod catches. Given the high variability in the discard ratios, estimating discards is very uncertain without an extensive sampling programme	Denmark has very extensive discard sampling program in the Baltic Sea and data has been delivered on an annually basis. The discard sampling program is for the same métier as for the Baltic cod were the data is used in the assessment. The challenge with the flounder discard data is not within the sampling program but due to the fact that data cannot be raised in InterCatch if no landings are applied. Therefore if a country has discard for a given species but no landings (and this is the case for some flounder stocks in the Baltic) then the data cannot be raised in InterCatch.	Discard sampling by DK is not the problem, but raising procedures at ICES.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
4	Estonia	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Some information was provided in the previous data calls, but not in 2013.  Most of the aquaculture sector is represented by fresh water aquaculture.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Although the data were collected, Estonia did not submit aquaculture data in 2013 due to disagreement between the coordinating institution and institution engaged in economic data collection. The latter was not satisfied with the conditions of the new contract. In terms of production Estonia produces a small amount of freshwater aquaculture (rainbow trout predominantly). Eel and salmon are reared mainly for restocking by some fish farms and these data can not be presented in accordance with the requirement of confidentiality.	Acceptable, as no mandatory data collection except for eel and salmon is affected. And for those issues of confidentiality arises.	Satisfactory
22	Estonia	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	No economic data provided for 2011 (national and fleet segment levels), apart from landings income. Significant amount of missing data at fleet segment level. Employment data not submitted for 2011. Energy consumption data not submitted for 2011. Fishing enterprises not submitted for 2012.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Although the data were collected, Estonia did not submit economic data fo 2011 due to disagreement between the coordinating institution and institution engaged in economic data collection. The latter was not satisfied with the conditions of the new contract. Today, the situation has been resolved and missing data was provided this year.	Insufficient explanation for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
42	Estonia	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	Table A, catch: discards provided for flounder only (landings of cod over three times greater than flounder in 2012). Table A, catch: dome mesh size are inconsistent with the data call.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Discarding is not allowed in Estonian waters except discarding of live fish. The flounder was discarded mainly from pots where flounder survival is ver high. The total reported discard of flounder was 2.34 tons. Cod is taken by trawls where survival is low.  Estonian fishermen are obliged to record the mesh size in coastal fisheries by following ranges: up to 48, 48-72, 73-120 and over 120. Therefore, we do not have sufficient information in accordance with the mesh size ranges of the data call. During the same fishing trip the fishermen collect catch from different mesh sizes and it is impossible to record the weight of the catch at sea. The weight of the catch is recorded at port but then the catch from different mesh sizes is already mixed. The mesh-size ranges that we used are based on best knowledge from the ranges that are used for specific species in Estonian waters. We are exploring the possible options for being able to record the catch by mesh size before the catch gets mixed It would be interesting to know how other MS-s deal with this problem. We don't have this issue with trawlers.  The cod Intercatch database is updated currently in 2014. Age and and size data are added for 2008, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013; data from Estonian ships, SD 24, 25, 26.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
58	Estonia	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Values equal to zero: "extraordinary costs, net" (all years). See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	The data is collected from financial statements. In the absence of extraordinary costs and extraordinary income the value is equal to zero.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
108	Estonia	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder pelagic in Subdivisions 24 and 25(fle-2425) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards	Discarding is not allowed in the Estonian waters. There have been no biological flounder analysis from Sd 24 and 25.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
109	Estonia	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder pelagic in Subdivisions 26 and 28(fle-2628) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Discards data Age or length data for discards	In Estonia (SD28) discard is not allowed; bycatch can be up to 10 % of the total weigh of the catch . From SD 26 there have been no biological analysis and measurements of flounder. Estonian flounder catch in SD 26 is small.	·	Satisfactory
110	Estonia	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder demersal in Subdivisions 27 and 29-32(fle-2732) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Discards data Age or length data for discards	In Estonia (SD28, 29, 32) discard is not allowed; bycatch can be up to 10 % of the total weigh of the catch.		,
	l	l				Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
387	Estonia	NAFO	Biological information (Sex, Length, Age)	grenadier	30 RED: The fishing effort was very low in 2012 (only one fishing trip targeting finfish) and the observer concentrated on GHL and COD samples, so only 245 specimens of RED were sampled. The data was presented in Estonian Research Report for 2012. See: http://archive.nafo.int/open/sc/2013/scs13-15.pdf  3LNO YEL: This species is not in Estonian DCF.  SA2+3 RHG: This species is not in Estonian DCF.  All sampling programs were revised in 2013 and adjustments made so that in 2013 there were 30 RED, 3N YEL and SA2+3 RHG also sampled.	In NAFO Div. 3O, Estonia only employed minor fishing effort on finfish in the 3LMNO areas and had redfish landings of 181t (of 6400t in total, cf. NAFO SC report 2013). Nevertheless, NAFO SC should be asked if redfish biological data from Estonia are relevant for the assessment.	Unsatisfactory
317	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	Stock: (sol-kask)Sole in Division IIIa and Subdivisions 22–24 (Skagerrak, Kattegat, and the Belts)	Description: Sampling of landings is complicated by the low total landings which are dispersed spatially.  Comments: The problems of sampling intensity are due to the low landings	Estonia has no such quota in the area.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
377	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	=	Description: Ageing problems are a concern for the quality of the assessment.	In Estonian waters the cod is caught only as bycatch because of low abundance currently. In 2013, the age reading of the cod otoliths was started from SD 24, 25, and 26, which were collected from Estonoan ships from 2008 to 2013. The relative importance of confused tolithis is relatively high. Therefore ageing methods need to improve. However, true age of natural fish is unknown and mistakes of age reading cannot be directly estimated. Indirect methods are affected by many factors. Therefore the problems in age reading cannot be solved conclusively.	In generel, MSs should always be involved in age reading comparisons (otolith exchanges and workshops) to ensure international consistency in age determination.	Satisfactory
373	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	Stock: (fle-2232)Flounder in Subdivisions 22–32 (Baltic Sea) Reference:	Type of issue: Data quality - Improve discards sampling Description: The uncertainty of the discard estimates is of concern. Discarding practices are controlled by factors such as market price and cod catches. Given the high variability in the discard ratios, estimating discards is very uncertain without an extensive sampling programme	In Estonian waters discard is not allowed; bycatch can be up to 10 % of the weight of the catch.	MS response is justified (discards are not allowed according to MS legislation)	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
5	Finland	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	No major deviations from the data call. The only minor deviation is missing Net investment by segment for 2008. See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	When the data for 2008 was originally calculated according to the DCR, there was no obligation for segmentation by fishing technique and species. Thus the net investments were estimated for the total population only.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
23	Finland	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Capacity data for 2013 not submitted. Some minor missing data at the fleet segment level.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	In the Fleet data call, in the fleet segment AREA27 PG, VL1012, the capacity was under-reported by 2 vessels. The total number of vessels is actually 53 and not 51. The corrected data is presented in this Workbook in the sheets CAPACITY_TOT, CAPACITY, and CAPACITY_REGION.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
43	Finland	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	Data submitted in format inconsistent with the definitions of the data call on the grounds of the data confidentiality clause in the DCF. No mesh size information for any gear. For vessels over 10 m in length a specific vessel length category was not defined. Missing quarter information for vessels over 10 m in length. Data for areas 24, 25, 26, 27, 28 aggregated into a single category "24-28". Table C, effort by rectangle: contains no information or rectangles. Table D, Capacity: No data on fishing activity (days) for 2003-2011, (fishing activity (days) for 2003-2012 was requested for the first time in 2013). Table E, landings by rectangle: contains entries for invalid area "24-28" and these entries have no rectangle information.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	out by a very limited number of vessels. In many cases there are only one or few vessels operating in some of the given combinations of subdivisions, gear and quarter. According to	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
59	Finland	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Values equal to zero: subsidies (2010 and 2011). See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	According to 2010/93/EU, the subsidies should include only direct payments and exclude indirect subsidies. The processing companies have received investment subsidies in 2010 and 2011. However, to our knowledge the investment subsidies are regarded as indirect subsidies and thus they should not be reported under the subsidies, but rather under the other income.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
112	Finland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder pelagic in Subdivisions 26 and 28(fle-2628) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards	According to 2010/93/EU and the RCM Baltic, Finland is not required to sample flounder catches for lengths and ages, and therefore it has not been included in the Finnish NP. There were no discards in flounder stock fle-2628 from the Finnish fishery, which information was already reported to the WKBALFLAT within the InterCatch data call.	MS landings in 2010-2012 have only been 0-10 t per year (WGBFAS 2013).	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
113	Finland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder demersal in Subdivisions 27 and 29-32(fle-2732) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Age or length data for discards	According to 2010/93/EU and the RCM Baltic, Finland is not required to sample flounder catches for lengths and ages, and therefore it has not been included in the Finnish NP. However, the amount of discarded flounder in the stock fle-2732 from the Finnish fisheries (18 kg) has been reported to the WKBALFLAT within the InterCatch data call.	MS landings in 2010-2012 have only been 4-7 t per year (WGBFAS 2013).	Satisfactory
	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	Ecoregion: Baltic Sea Stock: (cod-2532)Cod in Subdivisions 25–32 (Eastern Baltic Sea) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publ ication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2 013/cod-2532_201304112231.pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Ageing inconsistencies Description: Ageing problems are a concern for the quality of the assessment.	According to 2010/93/EU and the RCM Baltic, Finland is not required to sample cod catches for lengths and ages and therefore cod has not been included in the Finnish NP.	MS has a derogation for Baltic cod sampling.	Satisfactory
	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	1 ' ''	Type of issue: Data quality - Improve discards sampling Description: The uncertainty of the discard estimates is of concern. Discarding practices are controlled by factors such as market price and cod catches. Given the high variability in the discard ratios, estimating discards is very uncertain without an extensive sampling programme	In 2013, the share of Finnish flounder catches were 0.16 % in the stock fle-2628 and 2.14 % in the stock fle-2732. The same year, the share of Finnish cod catches were 0.39 % in the stock cod-2224 and 1.27 % in the stock cod-2532. Therefore, based on the Commission decision 2010/93/EU, Finland is not required to sample neither flounder nor cod catches (landings and discards) and therefore they have not been included in the Finnish NP. There were no discards reported in the flounder stock fle-2628 in the Finnish fisheries and the amount of discarded flounder in the stock fle-2732 (18 kg) has been reported to the WKBALFLAT within the InterCatch data call.	MS has a derogation for flounder sampling.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
6	France	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Most of the economic variables for 2008-2009 (subsidies, other income, all costs items, debt, capital value and raw material) were missing. The full set of economic variables for France is available only for 2010-2011; however the national totals were not estimated, as not all aquaculture segments are fully covered by data collected. The missing segments represented 6-7% of overall turnover.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	It was mentioned in the NP that economic data in aquaculture have been collected from 2010 onwards. Data were provided for all segments except a few ones with a very small number of enterprises where it was not possible to produce reliable indicators.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
244	France	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	submitted for 2012. Most effort data not provided for 2008 and 2009; only energy consumption submitted for 2008. Limited data provided for fleet segments operating in OFR (Other fishing regions) and to a lesser extent Area 37. Capacity data not provided for 2012 and 2013 (national total	There were methodological difficulties to calculate capital variables. France has started implementing the PIM methodology in 2013 in order to provide 2012 data. Quality improvement is still needed and it is foreseen to aplly the method retroactively for 2011. Landing and effort data for 2012 could not be provided at the time of the data call. They could be available later in the year, given that the DCF segmentation of the fleet, as mentioned in the NP, could be produced only in October. This is the same as regards capacity data per segments. OFR covers very different regions and fleets, it is very difficult to collect data on small-scale fleets, it is possible only in some of the regions and in general these data are made available later in the year.	Justification for 2012 and 2013 data acceptable (provision of those data not mandatory). Aside from those data, insufficient explanation for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
44	France	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	No landings by rectangle data for 2003-2010. Table A, catch: no age information for 2009-2012. Table A catch: No discard data for 2003-2009 or 2012. Table A catch: no split of special condition CPart13 into CPart13a-d for 2009-2011. Table B, nominal effort: no fishing activity data for 2000-2009. Table B, nominal effort: no fishing capacity data for 2000-2011. Table C, effort by rectangle and Table E, landings by rectangle: records with missing rectangle information in years for which data is supplied.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage		No explanation for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
60	France	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Data on enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity has been provided for years 2009 and 2010 (requested but not mandatory), but not for 2008 and 2011 (mandatory).  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage		No explanation for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
77	France	JRC/DG MARE	Med and BS	No effort data from GSA 7 and 8 (Table D). No fisheries data from GSA 8 (Tables A,B,C,D). See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage		MS should give an answer in relation to the missing data (effort data from GSA 7 and 8 and surveys data for GSA 8).	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
114	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Division Illa and Subareas IV and VI(ang-ivvi) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Early 2013, IFREMER has initiated a new procedure in order to better respond to data calls and deliver data to end-users. Part of this procedure was the appointment of a dedicated engineer, the creation of an expert network and the development of writing protocols for each of the calls to ensure quality and repeatability.  The number of data calls IFREMER must deal with, associated with the organisation of this new procedure caused some delays but the essential objective was to deliver data in time for the expert working groups. It must be noticed that the new procedure improved in 2014 with all data delivered to all end-users but with still some delays. It is clearly an objective for the future to deliver all data to all end-users in full respect of the deadlines.	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call.	
115	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Divisions VIIe-k (Celtic Sea cod)(cod-7e-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that MS has tried as much as possible to respond acccording to the Data cal. In generall MS should respect the Data call deadline.	Satisfactory Satisfactory
116	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(cod-scow) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards Delay: after deadline	France had only 4 tonnes of cod caught in VIa (2% of the total catch in 2012, source cod VIa ICES advice). It is impossible to design a sampling plan to get any commercial information on such a scarce fishery.	, -	
117	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Divisions VIIb,c,e- k(had-7b-k) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards Delay: after deadline	This stock was eventually uploaded in InterCatch after some issues had to be resolved  As regards length and age data, these were all provided to the group, as mentionned in the ICES WGCSE 2013 report, section haddock VIIb-k.  Section 7.4.8 Landings: "Sampling levels of the landed catch for recent years are considered to be sufficient to support current assessment approaches"  Section 7.4.8 Discards: "French discard data exist from 2004 onwards[]. These proportions were estimated from the available discard and retained catch data provided by France."  On April 30 2013, all files were available for the group and InterCatch	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call. In generall MS should respect the Data call deadline	Satisfactory satisfactory
118	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(had-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call. In generall MS should respect the Data call deadline	satisfactory
119	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(had-scow) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call. In generall MS should respect the Data call deadline	satisfactory
120	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIIb,c (West of Ireland)(ple-7b-c) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call. In generall MS should respect the Data call deadline	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
121	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Divisions VIIh-k (Southwest of Ireland)(ple-7h- k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call. In generall MS should respect the Data call deadline	satisfactory
122	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Divisions VIIf,g (Celtic Sea)(ple-celt) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards Delay: after deadline	As regards InterCatch, in 2013, France did not upload all the stocks in InterCatch, only those requested by the stock assessor. This is not a will of not uploading data, as a proof, in 2014 all stocks were uploaded in InterCatch. France does not sample this stock for age because of the low landings (125 tonnes). This has always been the case, without too much prejudice for the assessment as proves excerpts from ICES WGCSE 2013 report, section Plaice Viligs. Section 7.10.8 Landings: "Sampling levels of the landed catch for recent years are considered to be sufficient to support current assessment approaches"  Section 7.10.8 Discards: "Estimates of discarding are now included in the assessment. []. From 2003 onwards, discard sampling for Ireland, Belgium, France and the UK(E&W) has been improved under the Data Collection Regulation. Nevertheless, only discard data from the UK, Ireland and Belgium was available in a suitable format required to raise the data to international level"  Since France provides a length structure of the discards, it is easy for the group to apply any Age Length Key to produce an age structure. It is to be noticed that this is not possible to do in Intercatch, but would be possible in an international database.  For the delay, see response cell F7	submitted. It is not up to the stock assessor to decide if data should be uploaded to InterCatch or not. In all cases upload to InterCatch has a documentery reason even in cases where the stoc coordinator isn't using InterCatch for compiling. In such case the the deadlines are less crusial but data has to	
123	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIIe (Western Channel)(ple-echw) WGCSE	-	This is partly correct France does not sample this stock for age because of the low and scattered landings (225 tonnes in 2012). This has always been the case, although this is a potential source of bias for the assessment as proves excerpts from ICES WGCSE 2013 report, section Plaice VIIe.  Section 8.2.7: "There is a heavy reliance on the age composition data derived from UK(E&W) sample data. Around 30% of the landings for this stock are taken by countries that do not provide age-based data and this situation is improved only slightly once the migration correction data from VIId is added"  France provides a length structure of the discards, it is easy for the group to apply any Age Length Key to produce an age structure. It is to be noticed that this is not possible to do in Intercatch, but would be possible in an international database.  for the delay, see response cell F7	In general MS should apply for derogation if there are a good reason for not sampling acording to DCF rules.	Unsatisfactory NA
124	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(ple-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call. In generall MS should respect the Data call deadline	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
125	5 France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIIb, c (West of Ireland)(sol-7b-c) WGCSE		idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call. In generall MS should respect the Data call deadline	satisfactory
126	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Divisions VIIh-k (Southwest of Ireland)(sol-7h-k) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Delay: after deadline	As regards InterCatch, in 2013, France did not upload all the stocks in InterCatch, only those requested by the stock assessor. This is not a will of not uploading data, as a proof, in 2014 all stocks were uploaded in InterCatch.  France does not sample this stock for age because of the low landings (85 tonnes). This has always been the case, without too much prejudice for the assessment as proves excerpts from ICES WGCSE 2013 report, section Sole VIIh-k: "Sampling appears to be sufficient to establish landings numbers-atage."  for the deadline, see response cell F7	the stoc coordinator isn't using InterCatch for compiling. In such case the the deadlines are less crusial but data has to uploade within a reasonable time frame.	Unsatisfactory
127	7 France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Divisions VIIf, g (Celtic Sea)(sol-celt) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Delay: after deadline	As regards InterCatch, in 2013, France did not upload all the stocks in InterCatch, only those requested by the stock assessor. This is not a will of not uploading data, as a proof, in 2014 all stocks were uploaded in InterCatch.  France does not sample this stock for age because of the very low landings (48 tonnes, 5% of the total). This has always been the case, without prejudice for the assessment as proves excerpts from ICES WGCSE 2013 report, section Sole VIIfg: "The major fleets fishing for VIIfg sole are sampled (approximately 95% of the total landings). Sampling is considered to be at a reasonable level (Table 2.1). "  for the deadline, see response cell F7	the stoc coordinator isn't using InterCatch for compiling. In such case the the deadlines are less crusial but data has to	Unsatisfactory
128	3 France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIIe (Western Channel)(sol-echw) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call. In generall MS should respect the Data call deadline	satisfactory
129	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(sol-iris) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Delay: after deadline	As regards InterCatch, in 2013, France did not upload all the stocks in InterCatch, only those requested by the stock assessor. This is not a will of not uploading data, as a proof, in 2014 all stocks were uploaded in InterCatch.  France does not sample this stock for age because there is not catch (<1 tonne in 2012).  for the deadline, see response cell F7	the stoc coordinator isn't using InterCatch for compiling. In	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
130	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIIe-k(whg- 7e-k) WGCSE		This stock was eventually uploaded in InterCatch after some issues had to be resolved As regards length and age data, these were all provided to the group, as mentionned in the ICES WGCSE 2013 report, section haddock VIIb-k.  Section 7.15.7 Landings: "Sampling levels of the landed catch for recent years are considered to be sufficient to support current assessment approaches."  Section 7.15.2 Discards: "Discard data are available from the Irish fishery since 1994 (ICES: SGDBI, 2002), from French sampling in 1991, 1997, and 2005–2012, and for the UK (E&W) fisheries from 2001–2012."  On May 3 2013, all files were available for the group and InterCatch:		satisfactory
131	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(whg-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call. In generall MS should respect the Data call deadline	satisfactory
132	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(whg-scow) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call. In generall MS should respect the Data call deadline	Satisfactory
133	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Grey gurnard in Subarea VI and Divisions VIIa-c and e-k (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland)(gug-celt) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call. In generall MS should respect the Data call deadline	Junification
134	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Pollack in Subareas VI and VII (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland)(pol-celt) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call. In generall MS should respect the Data call deadline	Satisfactory
135	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Subarea IV (North Sea), Divison VIId (Eastern Channel) and IIIa West (Skagerrak)(cod- 347d) WGNSSK		idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call. In generall MS should respect the Data call deadline	Satisfactory
136	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Subarea IV (North Sea) and Division IIIa West (Skagerrak)(had-34) WGNSSK	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards Delay: after deadline	France catches are 175 tonnes in 2012 (source ICES advice) or 0.5% of the total catches of this stock. No age or length data is provided or needed by the group.  As regards InterCatch, in 2013, France did not upload all the stocks in InterCatch, only those requested by the stock assessor. This is not a will of not uploading data, as a proof, in 2014 all stocks were uploaded in InterCatch.	order to get agreement for not sampling this stock MS should apply for a derogation in the future	unsatisfactory
137	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIId (Eastern Channel)(ple-eche) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call. In generall MS should respect the Data call deadline	Satisfactory
138	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice Subarea IV (North Sea)(ple-nsea) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call. In generall MS should respect the Data call deadline	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
139	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Saithe in Subarea IV (North Sea) Division IIIa West (Skagerrak) and Subarea VI (West of Scotland and Rockall)(sai-3a46) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call. In generall MS should respect the Data call deadline	
140	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIId (Eastern Channel)(sol-eche) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call. In generall MS should respect the Data call deadline	Satisfactory Satisfactory
141	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Subarea IV (North Sea)(sol-nsea) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call. In generall MS should respect the Data call deadline	Satisfactory
142	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting Subarea IV (North Sea) & Division VIId (Eastern Channel)(whg-47d) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call. In generall MS should respect the Data call deadline	
259	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIg (Celtic Sea, the Smalls, FU 22)(nep-22) WGCSE	Missing data: Landings data Delay: after deadline after EG	Data was reported to WGCSE and stock assessor on April 30 2014  As regards InterCatch, in 2013, France did not upload all the stocks in InterCatch, only those requested by the stock assessor. This is not a will of not uploading data, as a proof, in 2014 all stocks were uploaded in InterCatch.	It is not up to the stock assessor to decide if data should be uploaded to InterCatch or not. In all cases upload to InterCatch has a documentery reason even in cases where the stoc coordinator isn't using InterCatch for compiling. In such case the the deadlines are less crusial but data has to uploade within a reasonable time frame.	Satisfactory Unsatisfactory
278	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Megrim (Lepidorhombus spp) in Divisions IVa and VIa(meg- 4a6a) WGCSE	Missing data: Landings data Discards data Delay: after deadline after EG	France catches in VIa in 2012 is 140 tonnes et 4 tonnes in IVa. This is too small catches to design a specific sampling plan in order to provide robust estimates.  As regards InterCatch, in 2013, France did not upload all the stocks in InterCatch, only those requested by the stock assessor. This is not a will of not uploading data, as a proof, in 2014 all stocks were uploaded in InterCatch.	It is not up to the stock assessor to decide if data should be uploaded to InterCatch or not. In all cases upload to InterCatch has a documentery reason even in cases where the stoc coordinator isn't using InterCatch for compiling. In such case the the deadlines are less crusial but data has to uploade within a reasonable time frame.	Unsatisfactory
283	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIa,g,j (South East and West of IRL, FU 19)(nep-19) WGCSE	Missing data: Landings data Delay: after deadline after EG	France has caught 11 tonnes of Nephrops in 2012. There is nothing else than the official landings data to provide to the group.  As regards InterCatch, in 2013, France did not upload all the stocks in InterCatch, only those requested by the stock assessor. This is not a will of not uploading data, as a proof, in 2014 all stocks were uploaded in InterCatch.	It is not up to the stock assessor to decide if data should be uploaded to InterCatch or not. In all cases upload to InterCatch has a documentery reason even in cases where the stoc coordinator isn't using InterCatch for compiling. In such case the the deadlines are less crusial but data has to uploade within a reasonable time frame.	Unsatisfactory
284	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in the FU 20 (Labadie, Baltimore and Galley), FU 21 (Jones and Cockburn)(nep-2021) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call. In generall MS should respect the Data call deadline	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Hake in Division Illa, Subareas IV, VI and VII and Divisions VIIIa,b,d (Northern stock)(hke- nrtn) WKSOUTH	Missing data: Landings data Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards Delay: after deadline after EG	It is true that France could not provide the benchmark information in time. This is due to several difficulties related to the earlier part of the time series. It was extremely difficult and time consuming to resolve these issues but eventually it was solved. We believe that the difficulties encountered at the end of 2013 and early 2014 were exceptional and will not repeat.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
300	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: European seabass in Divisions IVbc,VIIa and VIIId-h (Irish Sea, English Channel and southern North Sea)(bss-47) WGCSE	Missing data: Landings data Age or length data for landings Delay: after deadline after EG	France did not upload all the stocks in InterCatch in 2013, only those requested by the stock assessor. This is not a will of not uploading data, as a proof, in 2014 all stocks were uploaded in InterCatch.  Concerning this seabass stock, all data were provided to the group in time for conducting the assessment.	It is not up to the stock assessor to decide if data should be uploaded to InterCatch or not. In all cases upload to InterCatch has a documentery reason even in cases where the stoc coordinator isn't using InterCatch for compiling. In such case the the deadlines are less crusial but data has to uploade within a reasonable time frame.	Satisfactory
303	France	ICES	Ecoregion: Widely distributed stocks Stock: (hom-west)Horse mackerel (Trachurus trachurus) in Divisions IIa, IVa, Vb, VIa, VIIIa-c, e-k, and Subarea VIII (Western stock) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/hom-west.pdf	Type of issue: Data transmission - Transmission of discard data Description: Discards are included in the assessment. However, not all countries provide data on discards; consequently, there is no estimate of the total amount of discards in the horse mackerel fisheries.	the vas majority of the horse mackerel catches is taken by industrial vessels landing in the Netherlands. The sampling of this fishery is covered by a bilateral agreement with the Netherlands.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
323	France	ICES	of Scotland Stock: (ang-78ab)Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Divisions VIIb–k and VIIIa,b,d Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/	in discarding may be related to larger year classes recruiting in the fishery. Information from research surveys indicates an increase in smaller fish on the fishing grounds in recent years. Discarding is also known to be partly dependent on market conditions and quota restrictions. Efforts should be made to	The stock was benchmarked in 2012 (ICES WKFLAT) and no assessment method was found acceptable. After an extensive analysis of discard data by WKFLAT 2012, discard estimates were considered not to be precise enough to be used in the assessment. WGHMM 2013 recommanded improvement in the field of surveys tracking recent good recruitment and ageing validation (see cell below) and did not mention the need for discards. Discard estimates is a sensitive exercice which needs to be guided and validated in a benchmark forum. The effort to obtain reliable estimates of total catches should be stirred by the WG in conjunction with all the main countries participating to the fishery. This could be also a discussion to be held in the RCM NA 2014.	MS is obliged to deliver dat according to the DCF until a derogation is approved.	Unsatisfactory
326	France	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ang-78ab)Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Divisions VIIb–k and VIIIa,b,d Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ang-78ab.pdf	Description: Improved sampling of length composition and accurate estimates of growth parameters are needed to facilitate the development of an analytical assessment. An	France participated to the otolith and illicia exchange. The length distribution of anglerfish is correctly estimated and all information provided to the group.  Growth parameter is an issue which could be tackled in the RCM NA 2014 in order to propose a common international approach in 2015	MS is obliged to deliver dat according to the DCF until a derogation is approved.	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
330	France	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (cod-scow)Cod in Division Vla (West of Scotland) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/ Publication%20Reports/Advice /2013/2013/cod-scow.pdf	Description: Discard information is imprecise compared to landings data because of lower sampling coverage. Because catch is now dominated by discards it is very important to maintain the highest possible sampling (observer) coverage o	France reached a coverage of 10% of trips in 2012 (21 trips sampled out of 212 in total, see table III.C.3 or the Annual Report 2013). Although France is catching less than 10% of the total catch, the discard rates could be investigated and the information brought to WGCSE 2015.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
333	France	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (gug-celt)Grey gurnard in Subarea VI and Divisions VIIa—c and e—k (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/ Publication%20Reports/Advice /2013/2013/gug-celt.pdf	data do not reflect the actual catches.  Comments: The landings values of the MS listed are very low	In the advice it is also stated: The EVHOE-WIBTS-Q4 survey could be used as an indicator of abundance of grey gurnard ir Divisions VIIf,g,h,j. The availability of the time series of abundance from the Spanish, UK, Russian, and Irish surveys should provide indications of trend in the northern and central parts of the ecoregion (Subarea VI and Divisions VIIa and VIIb,c)	The MS is nor obliged to submit the data according to the DCF. Nevertheless, it is good practice to provide additional data if collected and needed.	
338	France	ICES	of Scotland Stock: (had-7b-k)Haddock in Divisions VIIb–k Reference:	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: There is considerable uncertainty around the estimated discard numbers-at-age due to the diverse fishing (and discarding) practices and relatively low numbers of discard samples. Improving discard estimates would require a significant increase in the number of observer trips or other monitoring means.	To be discussed in RCM NA 2014	Ok	Satisfactory
341	France	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (mgw-78)Megrim (Lepidorhombus whiffiagonis) in Divisions VIIb–k and VIIIa,b,d Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/mgw-78.pdf	Description: An important contributor to the megrim catches, France, has not provided discard estimates in the last decade.		MS has not fulfilled the obligations in the DCF.	Unsatisfactory
348	France	ICES	of Scotland	Type of issue: Data quality - Discards sampling intensity Description: Discards of Nephrops are thought to be extensive, but observations are insufficient to provide a reliable time-series. The data from sampling programmes in France and Ireland are patchy, leading to some uncertainty in the estimation of mean weight in the landings and discard rates.	The sampling is done, how to improve the estimates is something to consider and discuss in the next RCM NA. There is no easy answer to this comment.F53	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
352	France	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ple-echw)Plaice in Division VIIe (Western Channel) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/ Publication%20Reports/Advice /2013/2013/ple-echw.pdf	Type of issue: Data transmission - Age composition Description: This assessment would benefit from the addition of age composition information from both the French and Belgian fleets who collectively account for 30% of the total landings for this stock.	We have tried to collect data for ages for plaice VIIe following a former recommendation by the group but never succeeded in doing so, because of the scatter landings of this species in the western channel harbour.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
354	France	ICES	of Scotland Stock: (ple-7h-k)Plaice in	Type of issue: Data quality - Age composition of younger individuals Description: The assessment is only based on age 4 and older, ICES does not have information on younger ages.	ages can be put in place for such a low volume of catches.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
357	France	ICES	of Scotland Stock: (ple-7b-c)Plaice in Divisions VIIb,c (West of Ireland) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Catches in this area are too low to support the collection of the necessary information for an assessment of the stock status. Comments: This stocks is a category 6 stock (by-catch) and landings(the necessary data for that category) data are available. Additional data to "upgrade" the stock is not available. The total landings of this stock is 29 tonnes.		In general, MS should provide an answer to requests concerning deficiencies in DCF data.	NA NA
361	France	ICES	of Scotland Stock: (pol-celt)Pollack in Subareas VI and VII (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/	Type of issue: Data quality - Biological data and landings figures  Description: Some length frequency data are available for recent years, but area-specific data on life history parameters are missing and should be collected in surveys and through market sampling. Data on growth and maturity, as well as more information from the fisheries, are needed. Landings figures are incomplete and erratic and further scrutiny of this information is required.  More information is needed on: stock identity of pollack within the ICES area; details of the fisheries (more spatial detail in landings data – especially for the earlier years in the time-series, landings by gear, length compositions, discards); life history/biological parameters (surveys and commercial sampling); and recreational fisheries (catch and effort statistics).	set up a phD on this specific issue. The phD will start in October 2014 and will work on every aspects related to the pollock assessment issues.	In general, it is not suficient only to established long term solutions when immidiate action is required.	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
363	France	ICES	of Scotland Stock: (sol-7b-c)Sole in Divisions VIIb,c (West of Ireland) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Catches in this area are too low to support the collection of the necessary information for an assessment of the stock status. Comments: This stocks is a category 6 stock (by-catch) and landings(the necessary data for that category) data are available. Additional data to "upgrade" the stock is not available. The total landings of this stock is 44 tonnes.	Same comment as for Plaice VIIbc	MS should provide an answer to the request of data and the missing data submission	Satisfactory
366	France	ICES	of Scotland Stock: (whg-7e-k)Whiting in	Type of issue: Data transmission - Lack of French Ipue Description: The main quality consideration is [], the lack of update of the French commercial Ipue series since 2009 is an additional uncertainty.		Despite questnable issues about data quality, data should be provided unless a derogation is approved.	
367	France	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (whg-7e-k)Whiting in Divisions VIIe–k Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/ Publication%20Reports/Advice /2012/2012/whg-7e-k.pdf	in future assessments after a benchmark procedure. Comments: French landings are 19% of the total landings	Discards estimates are provided to the group (Discard data are available from [] French sampling in 1991, 1997, and 2005–2012', ICES WGCSE 2013)	ICES WG should confirm if the data have been received and the time of transmission	Unsatisfactory
380	France	ICCAT	Task 2	Missing data for: ALB-AN, ALB-MED, BET-AT and SKJ-AE	TaskII for tropical tuna fisheries has been communicated in time to Iccat secretary and include all ALB, BET and SKJ catches for this fishery.	ICCAT should confirm if the data have been received and the time of transmission	NA
390	France	ЮТС	Artisanal and long line fleet	No length frequency for sharks and only partial for nominal catches and effort. No length frequencies of relevant species	,	It seems that MS should be in position to provide more completed data.	unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
391	France	ІОТС	Purse seiners	Partial information on sharks catches and no info on effort and length frequency for sharks	Tropical Purse Seine Tuna fishery does not target sharks and does not land this group of species. The only information available on skarks bycatch and discards are issued from observers programmes which have presently low coverage (around 10%). Statistical studies conducted in 2012 (Amande et al, 2012, ICES Journal of Marine Science) showed that this coverage does not permit to estimate neither total catch nor length structure at the fisheries level with sufficent precision. This is the reason why global estimates of sharks discarded has been presented and discussed in different papers relative to IOTC based on observer programmes but no formal data transmission of estimates has been done to IOTC secretary. However, it is worth underlining that France does submit to IOTC secretariat all detailed information (trip by trip) of observer programme as asked in resolution 11/04 on regiona observer programme. Furthermore In order to progress on this subject, we will submit formally in 2014 a synthesis of raw observations on sharks catches and size frecuencies made by observers but without any elevation at the fishery's level.		unsatisfactory
407	France	GFCM	Task 1 3 Economic component variables	Mostly completed (75%)		In general the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call	
415	France	GFCM	Task 1.4 Catch and effort variables catch effort discard bycacth	Scarcely completed (25%)	The main catches were provided for GSA07 and GSA08 as required. 25% must refer the fact that no discards, effort or bycatch were provided.	In general the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call	
425	France	GFCM	Task 1 5 Provisional biological parameters	No data provided	This type of data is not used in any assessment WG. The development of a Task 2 for structuring this biological information is currently ongoing	Requested biological data are collected under the Modules III.C and III.E of the current DCF. MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
7	Germany	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Germany provided full set of data required under DCF. The data covers only marine aquaculture segments. Due to confidentiality reasons, no data have been provided for oyster aquaculture, so the national totals correspond only to mussel production in marine waters. See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Germany can only confirm that we have fulfilled our commitments under the DCF concerning the Aquaculture Sector and appreciate that this has been stated by the evaluator.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
25	Germany	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Only capacity data provided for the pelagic fleet over 40 meters (TM VL40XX).  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	As in previous years and as indicated in the NP, Germany has collected the data on the pelagic fleet but cannot publish them for confidentiality reasons as all vessels belong to one owner.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
45	Germany	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	No mesh size or discards data for vessels <8m in length. See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	No detailed logbook information is available for vessels under 10m in the North Sea and under 8m in the Baltic. According to the legislation, vessel owners only have to fill out monthly landings declarations. Information on mesh sizes used are therefore not available. Germany has no specific sampling program for vessels under 10m or under 8m, respectively. This is in accordance with principles of the DCF, as landings of these vessels are overall very small.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
61	Germany	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	No information on enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity has been provided for one of the two mandatory years (i.e. 2008). However, these data were provided for years 2009 (requested but not mandatory) and 2011 (mandatory). Values equal to zero: "imputed value of unpaid labour" (all years); "extraordinary costs, net" (2008, 2009 and 2011).  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	As Germany reports, in particular cost data, only for enterprises with ≥20 employees, there is no unpaid labour. Work of owners is paid by profit. Extraordinary costs have not been reported by the enterprises.     The delay in receiving the data was described and accepted in the German Annual Report 2010, section IV.B.1: "Germany planned to use the register of EU veterinary approval numbers for fish processors to identify those enterprises. Unfortunately, a complete version of this register was not available before late 2010." When we sent out questionnaires early 2011, the most recent, i.e. 2009 data were requested. The year 2008 is not clearly covered by the DCF, as Decision 2008/949/EC (chapter IV.B.2.2) only refers to sampling in 2009, but not to the reference year: "For enterprises that carry out fish processing but not as a main activity, it is mandatory to collect the following data, in the first year of each programming period" As mentioned, this has been accepted already and has also been stated in the reply to the Data transmission failures table for 2011.		Satisfactory
143	Germany	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(cod-scow) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	The deadline was 15 April 2013 (ICES letter ref. L.27/ACB/HKN of 13 March 2013, p. 2 of Data Call annex). We uploaded our data on 27 March 2013, i.e. <u>before</u> the deadline.	Seems the the MS has tried as much as possible to responded according to the data call	satisfactory
144	Germany	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(had-scow) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	The deadline was 15 April 2013 (ICES letter ref. L.27/ACB/HKN of 13 March 2013, p. 2 of Data Call annex). We uploaded our data on 27 March 2013, i.e. <u>before</u> the deadline.	Seems the the MS has tried as much as possible to responded according to the data call	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
145	Germany	ICES		Missing data: Age or length data for discards	The relevant fisheries were sampled, but no discards for this species occured, so no data on discards (age/length) could be collected.	As the absence of discard is not documented therefore MS do not responded according the the Data call	unsatisfactory
146	Germany	ICES	Whiting in Division IIIa	Missing data: Discards data Age or length data for discards	The relevant fisheries were sampled, but no discards for this species occured, so no data on discards (age/length) could be collected.	As the absence of discard is not documented therefore MS do not responded according the the Data call	unsatisfactory
305	Germany	ICES	stocks Stock: (hom-west)Horse mackerel (Trachurus trachurus) in Divisions IIa, IVa, Vb, VIa, VIIa-c, e-k, and Subarea VIII (Western stock) Reference:	Type of issue: Data transmission / Data quality - No biological sampling Description: The landings fraction sampled to estimate biological parameters has been declining in recent years; it is important to keep those levels on target. As in previous years, and despite the data sampling regulations for EU countries, some countries with major catches have not conducted biological sampling programmes.  Comments: Few biological samples available from the 2nd and 3rd quarter	Germany conducts a biological sampling programme with regard to horse mackerel. However, horse mackerel is only caught by pelagic freezer trawlers by Germany. The target species in this metier depends highly on the fishing season. In 2012, it was not possible to place an observer on a fishing trip targeting horse mackerel which usally takes place only in the 4th quarter. Germany was, however, able to sample horse mackerel as by-catch in the mackerel fishery in the 1st quarter. Those biological parameters were delivered to ICES.		satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
8	Greece	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Most of DCF economic variables (other income, all costs parameters, capital value raw material and employment (by gender and in FTE)) are missing. Only variables, covered by other data collections are provided for 2008-2011.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Due to administrative and financial obstacles, DCF has not been applied in Greece from 2007 (with the exception of 2nd half of 2008)to 2011. Thus, no data were collected for aquaculture. However some data were collected by the DG Fisheries, Directorate of Aquaculture and transmitted to JRC.	No justification for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
26	Greece	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	No data submitted for the 2013 call for economic data on the EU fishing fleet See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	The 2013 data call for economic variables referred to 2011 economic data information. DCF hadn't implemented in Greece that year. Therefore there are not available data. The 2014 data call for economic variables referred to 2012 data information. These information is available and already supplied.	No justification for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
62	Greece	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	No data provided for years 2008-2010. See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Due to administrative and financial obstacles, DCF has not been applied in Greece from 2007 (with the exception of 2nd half of 2008)to 2011. However, some data on the processing industry were transmitted to JRC by the DG Fisheries, Directorate of Fisheries Extensions.	No justification for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
78	Greece	JRC/DG MARE	Med and BS	No fisheries data submitted (Tables A,B,C,D) . Only Medits data was uploaded, for 2013 only for GSA 22 (partial number of tows in Northern Aegean), lack of TE file. No hydroacoustic survey data (Table M, N, O) uploaded.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage		Greece has not implemented DCF from 2009 to 2012. Data collection in 2012 started in December. MS was not in the position to fulfill the requirements of the different data calls.	NA
381	Greece	ICCAT	Task 2	Missing data for: ALB-MED	The 2013 data call is referred to 2012 data information. During 2012 DCF has been applied in Greece for a very short period (December) due to financial and administrative constrains. At that time there is no albacore fishing in Greece. Therefore no data were collected.	Greece has not implemented DCF from 2009 to 2012. Data collection in 2012 started in December. MS was not in the position to fulfill the requirements of the different data calls.	NA
396	Greece	GFCM	Task 1.1 Fleet and area variables	No data provided	The Task 1.1 statistical matrix for the reference year 2011 was submitted to the GFCM Secretariat on 31-5-2013 (protocol number 4301/66127). The submitted data included the best possible information available to the National Services.	Greece has not implemented DCF from 2009 to 2012. Data collection in 2012 started in December. MS was not in the position to fulfill the requirements of the different data calls.	NA
401	Greece	GFCM	Task 1 2 Main resource and activity components variables per Operational Units	No data provided	The Task 1.2 statistical matrix for the reference year 2011 was submitted to the GFCM Secretariat on 31-5-2013 (protocol number 4301/66127). The submitted data included the best possible information available to the National Services.	Greece has not implemented DCF from 2009 to 2012. Data collection in 2012 started in December. MS was not in the position to fulfill the requirements of the different data calls.	NA
408	Greece	GFCM	Task 1 3 Economic component variables	No data provided	The 2013 data call for economic variables referred to 2011 economic data information. DCF hadn't implemented in Greece that year. Therefore there are not available data.	Greece has not implemented DCF from 2009 to 2012. Data collection in 2012 started in December. MS was not in the position to fulfill the requirements of the different data calls.	NA

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
416	Greece	GFCM	Task 1.4 Catch and effort variables catch effort discard bycacth	, ,	The 2013 data call is referred to 2011 data information.  During 2011 DCF has been applied in Greece for a very short period (December) due to financial and administrative constrains. Thus, no data were collected.	Greece has not implemented DCF from 2009 to 2012. Data collection in 2012 started in December. MS was not in the position to fulfill the requirements of the different data calls.	NA
426	Greece	GFCM	Task 15 Provisional biological parameters	, ,	The 2013 data call is referred to 2011 data information. During 2011 DCF has been applied in Greece for a very short period (December) due to financial and administrative constrains.Thus, no data were collected.	Greece has not implemented DCF from 2009 to 2012. Data collection in 2012 started in December. MS was not in the position to fulfill the requirements of the different data calls.	NA

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
27	Ireland	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Substantial amount of missing data at the fleet segment level, in particular for small vessel length groups. Data inconsistencies and incomplete time series data for many fleet segments reported Landings data for 2012 (national and fleet segment levels) not provided. DCF capacity data for engine power under-reported at fleet segment level (2008-2012).  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	The small vessel length groups (under 10m) contain the largest number of vessels in the Irish fleet. Due to the lack of logbook data for these segments IRL conducts a targeted survey of these vessels. Due to the small sampling size (<10%) it is not possible to cover all of the segments within this group. Many of the fleet segments reported consist of a small number of vessels and there is insufficient data to submit. Additionally, fishing vessel's dominant gear may change from year to year so it is possible for the number of vessels within fleet segments to change temporally thus giving incomplete time series data. There are consistent and complete time series data for the most important Irish fleet segments. Due to the timing of the data call in 2013 the transversal data for 2012 (landings and effort) were not available from the national authority. By the time of the 2013 Annual Economic Report (AER) only Effort data were ready and these was submitted at the second AER. Ladnings data were submitted later in the year.	Justification for 2012 and 2013 data acceptable (provision of those data not mandatory).  Aside from those data, insufficient explanation for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
46	Ireland	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	No nominal effort, effective effort by rectangle and landings by rectangle information submitted for vessels <10m in length.	This information is not collected within the logbooks and therefore it is not possible to supply information for <10m vessels at the level of detail requested within the datacall. Specific information on missing gears or mesh sizes result from information missing within the offical logbooks and included for completness.	Insufficient justification for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
63	Ireland	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Values equal to zero: "extraordinary costs, net" (2008). See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Zero indicates that there were no extroardinary cost in 2008.	OK. MS provided reasonable explanation	Satisfactory
147	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Division IIIa and Subareas IV and VI(ang-ivvi) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline after EG	In 2013 ang-ivvi data were provided to ICES stock co- ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission dealine.	satisfactory
148	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Divisions VIIe-k (Celtic Sea cod)(cod-7e-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 cod-7e-k data were provided to ICES stock co- ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	As te upload delay was in agreement with the stock coordinator and had no consequence for the assessment it seems to be ok	Satifactory
149	Ireland		Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(cod-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	· ·	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission dealine.	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
150	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(cod-scow) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 cod-scow data were provided to ICES stock co- ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch and used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission dealine.	satisfactory
151	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(had-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 had-iris data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.		satisfactory
152	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Division VIb (Rockall)(had-rock) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Delay: after deadline	In 2013 had-rock data were provided to ICES stock co- ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission dealine.	satisfactory
153	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(had-scow) WGCSE	,	In 2013 had-scow data were provided to ICES stock co- ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch and used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission dealine.	satisfactory
154	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIa (North Minch, FU 11)(nep-11) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 Nephrops Data were provided to ICES stock co- ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch and used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission dealine.	satisfactory
155	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIa (South Minch, FU 12)(nep-12) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 Nephrops Data were provided to ICES stock co- ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission dealine.	satisfactory
156	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIa (Firth of Clyde + Sound of Jura, FU 13)(nep-13) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 Nephrops Data were provided to ICES stock co- ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission dealine.	satisfactory
157	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIa (Irish Sea East, FU 14)(nep-14) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 Nephrops Data were provided to ICES stock co- ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission dealine.	satisfactory
158	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIa (Irish Sea West, FU 15)(nep- 15) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 Nephrops Data were provided to ICES stock co- ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission dealine.	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
159	Ireland	ICES		Delay: after deadline after EG	In 2013 Nephrops Data were provided to ICES stock co- ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission dealine.	satisfactory
160	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIb (Aran Grounds, FU 17)(nep- 17) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 Nephrops Data were provided to ICES stock co- ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission dealine.	satisfactory
161	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIa,g,j (South East and West of IRL, FU 19)(nep-19) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 Nephrops Data were provided to ICES stock co- ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission dealine.	satisfactory
162	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in the FU 20 (Labadie, Baltimore and Galley), FU 21 (Jones and Cockburn)(nep-2021) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline after EG	In 2013 Nephrops Data were provided to ICES stock coordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission dealine.	satisfactory
163	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIg (Celtic Sea, the Smalls, FU 22)(nep-22) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 Nephrops Data were provided to ICES stock co- ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission dealine.	satisfactory
164	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIIb,c (West of Ireland)(ple-7b-c) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Ireland is stock coordinator for this stock; we prioritised uploading intercatch data for stock that are coordinated by other countries. The data were available and the delay did not impact on our ability to assess this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission dealine.	satisfactory
165	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Divisions VIIf,g (Celtic Sea)(ple-celt) WGCSE	· ·	In 2013 ple-celt Data were provided to ICES stock co- ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission dealine.	satisfactory
166	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(ple-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 ple-iris Data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.		satisfactory
167	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIIb, c (West of Ireland)(sol-7b-c) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Ireland is stock coordinator for this stock; we prioritised uploading intercatch data for stock that are coordinated by other countries. The data were available and the delay did not impact on our ability to assess this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission dealine.	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
168	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Divisions VIIf, g (Celtic Sea)(sol-celt) WGCSE	1 '	In 2013 ple-celt Data were provided to ICES stock co- ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission dealine.	satisfactory
169	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIIe (Western Channel)(sol-echw) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Ireland has no fisheries catching sol-echw	This stock was not planned in the MS NP 2013	satisfactory
170	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIIe-k(whg- 7e-k) WGCSE	l '	In 2013 ple-iris Data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.		satisfactory
171	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(whg-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 whg-iris Data were provided to ICES stock co- ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission dealine.	satisfactory
172	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(whg-scow) WGCSE	· ·	In 2013 whg-scow Data were provided to ICES stock co- ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch and used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission dealine.	satisfactory
173	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Pollack in Subareas VI and VII (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland)(pol-celt) WGCSE	1 '	In 2013 pol-celt Data were provided to ICES stock co- ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	This stock was not planned in the MS NP 2013	satisfactory
306	Ireland	ICES	stocks Stock: (hom-west)Horse mackerel (Trachurus trachurus) in Divisions IIa, IVa, Vb, VIa, VIIa-c, e-k, and Subarea VIII (Western stock) Reference:	Type of issue: Data transmission / Data quality - No biological sampling Description: The landings fraction sampled to estimate biological parameters has been declining in recent years; it is important to keep those levels on target. As in previous years, and despite the data sampling regulations for EU countries, some countries with major catches have not conducted biological sampling programmes. Comments: Few biological samples available from the 2nd and 3rd quarter	In 2012, Ireland reported zero catch in quarter 2. In quarter 3 1933t was reported of which 1134t was sampled. In total for 2012, 42665t was sampled from a total catch reported to the working group of 45307t (approximately 94%)	Seems that MS was in position to provide the requested data.	unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
320	Ireland	ICES	Stock: (her-irls)Herring in Divisions VIIa (South of	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Improved information on discards is required as this appears to have become a feature of this fishery in recent years; however, after the changes in the regulations of weekly quota allocations in 2012, the risk of discarding is reduced.	Improved data submited at subsequent ICES working group	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to obtain reliable estimation of discards.	satisfactory
324	Ireland	ICES	Stock: (ang-78ab)Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Divisions VIIb–k and VIIIa,b,d Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub /Publication%20Reports/Advi ce/2013/2013/ang-78ab.pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Discards Description: The increase in discarding in recent years has resulted in uncertainties in recent catch values.  Reliable estimates of discards are not available. The increase in discarding may be related to larger year classes recruiting in the fishery. Information from research surveys indicates an increase in smaller fish on the fishing grounds in recent years. Discarding is also known to be partly dependent on market conditions and quota restrictions. Efforts should be made to obtain reliable estimates of total catches in order to improve the assessment.	yes part of the programme	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to obtain reliable estimation of discards.	satisfactory
327	Ireland	ICES	Stock: (ang-78ab)Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Divisions VIIb–k and VIIIa,b,d Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub /Publication%20Reports/Advi ce/2013/2013/ang-78ab.pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Improved sampling of length composition and accurate estimates of growth parameters are needed to facilitate the development of an analytical assessment. An ageing exchange study for L. piscatorius took place in 2011 to compare the different approaches that are used (otoliths and illicia).  Improved sampling of length composition and accurate estimates of growth parameters are needed to facilitate the development of an analytical assessment.	Contribute to ICES data initiative in 2014	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve sampling intensity	satisfactory
329	Ireland	ICES	Stock: (cod-rock)Cod in Division VIb (Rockall) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub	Type of issue: Data quality - No biological sampling Description: Available data provide information on landings only. There are doubts on the accuracy of the reported landings as these are reported by vessels operating in both Divisions VIa and VIb. Comments: Landings of this stock are very low (32 tonnes on 2012), which is the reason for the lack of biological sampling	below threshold	Seems that MS was in position to provide the requested data.	unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
332	Ireland	ICES	Division VIa (West of Scotland) Reference:	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Discard information is imprecise compared to landings data because of lower sampling coverage. Because catch is now dominated by discards it is very important to maintain the highest possible sampling (observer) coverage of vessels in Division Vla. Comments: Note that discards are available from Scottish and Irish trawlers are used in the assessment.	sampling programme meets DCF targets ( 11 from 13)	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve sampling intensity	satisfactory
336	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (gug-celt)Grey gurnard in Subarea VI and Divisions VIIa–c and e–k (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub /Publication%20Reports/Advi ce/2013/2013/gug-celt.pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Quality of landings data Description: Because the species is largely discarded, landings data do not reflect the actual catches. Comments: The landings values of the MS listed are very low	yes	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve sampling intensity	satisfactory
339	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (had-7b-k)Haddock in Divisions VIIb–k Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub /Publication%20Reports/Advi ce/2013/2013/had-7b-k.pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: There is considerable uncertainty around the estimated discard numbers-at-age due to the diverse fishing (and discarding) practices and relatively low numbers of discard samples. Improving discard estimates would require a significant increase in the number of observer trips or other monitoring means.	Discard sampling has improved in recent years but discard numbers-at-age will neccesarily be a source of uncertainty.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve sampling intensity	satisfactory
343	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (nep-16)Nephrops on Porcupine Bank (FU 16) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub /Publication%20Reports/Advi ce/2013/2013/Nep-VII- FU%2016.pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Discards sampling intensity Description: Discard observer coverage is low and should be increased, to sample the landings and any discards that might be occurring.	Discard sampling has improved in recent years three trips were carried out in 2013 for this stock. Trips to this area are long in duration usually >14days and numbers of sampled trips will be low given the constraints of the national programme. Discard sampling to date has confirmed the assumption that discard rates were negligible.	Seems that MS should be in position to provide the requested data.	unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
346	Ireland		Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (nep-19)Nephrops off the southeastern and southwestern coasts of Ireland (FU 19) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub /Publication%20Reports/Advi ce/2013/2013/Nep-VII- FU%2019.pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Improve catch sampling Description: Adequate catch sampling remains difficult for such a heterogeneous area. Comments: The heterogeneous area turns the adequate sampling almost impossible.	Sampling has improved in recent years but the adequate sampling of the individual disparate mud patches is almost impossible. The resulting catch lenght for this FU are likely to have lower percision than most other areas.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve sampling intensity	satisfactory
347	Ireland		Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (nep-2021)Nephrops in FU 20 (Labadie, Baltimore, and Galley) and FU 21 (Jones and Cockburn) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub /Publication%20Reports/Advi ce/2013/2013/Nep-VII- FU%2020%20and%2021.pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Discards sampling intensity Description: Discards of Nephrops are thought to be extensive, but observations are insufficient to provide a reliable time-series. The data from sampling programmes in France and Ireland are patchy, leading to some uncertainty in the estimation of mean weight in the landings and discard rates.	Irish participation in this fishery has been increasing in recent years and sampling and monitoring programmes are developing to take this into account. Fishing activities in this FU usually are part of trips which take place in more than one FU making a target sampling programme difficult.	Seems that MS should be in position to provide the requested data.	unsatisfactory
350	Ireland		Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ple-iris)Plaice in Division VIIa (Irish Sea) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub /Publication%20Reports/Advi ce/2013/2013/ple-iris.pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Discards sampling intensity Description: The discard data are noisy and the assessment would benefit from increased sampling intensity. Discard information from Northern Irish and Irish Nephrops fleets became available for the first time this year, enabling improved discard estimates for the most recent years (2010–2012). Because no time-series of this information was available to be incorporated in the assessment model, the previous discards computation was used. However, the new discard information was used to quantify the catch advice.	Ireland has provided discard data since 1995 for this stock. During WKFLAT 2011, discard data from Ireland was raised and collated to the total international level for the years 2004 – 2010. Length distributions of landed and discarded fish estimates are presented in WGCSE 2013 for Ireland from 2004 2012.	Seems that MS should be in position to provide the requested data.	unsatisfactory
355	Ireland		Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ple-7h-k)Plaice in Divisions VIIh–k (Southwest of Ireland) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub /Publication%20Reports/Advi ce/2013/2013/ple-7h-k.pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Age composition of younger individuals Description: The assessment is only based on age 4 and older; ICES does not have information on younger ages.	Discard sampling in recent years has been adequate, there is a problem with the time-series of data. For this reason the WG decided to exclude younger ages from the assessment. This decision will affect the forecast but not the assessment of the state of the stock.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve sampling intensity	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
358	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ple-7b-c)Plaice in Divisions VIIb,c (West of Ireland) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub /Publication%20Reports/Advi ce/2013/2013/ple-7b-c.pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Catches in this area are too low to support the collection of the necessary information for an assessment of the stock status. Comments: This stocks is a category 6 stock (by-catch) and landings(the necessary data for that category) data are available. Additional data to "upgrade" the stock is not available. The total landings of this stock is 29 tonnes.	Indeed: Catches in this area are too low to support the collection of the necessary information for an assessment of the stock status. This stocks is a category 6 stock (by-catch) and landings(the necessary data for that category) data are available. Additional data to "upgrade" the stock is not available. The total landings of this stock is 29 tonnes.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve sampling intensity	satisfactory
362	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (pol-celt)Pollack in Subareas VI and VII (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub /Publication%20Reports/Advi ce/2013/2013/pol-celt.pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Biological data and landings figures  Description: Some length frequency data are available for recent years, but area-specific data on life history parameters are missing and should be collected in surveys and through market sampling. Data on growth and maturity, as well as more information from the fisheries, are needed. Landings figures are incomplete and erratic and further scrutiny of this information is required.  More information is needed on: stock identity of pollack within the ICES area; details of the fisheries (more spatial detail in landings data – especially for the earlier years in the time-series, landings by gear, length compositions, discards); life history/biological parameters (surveys and commercial sampling); and recreational fisheries (catch and effort statistics).	pollack data on surveys ,stock is complex and would require dedicated genetics programme	Seems that MS has responded according to the Data Call	satisfactory
364	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (sol-7b-c)Sole in Divisions VIIb,c (West of Ireland) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub /Publication%20Reports/Advi ce/2013/2013/sol-7b-c.pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Catches in this area are too low to support the collection of the necessary information for an assessment of the stock status. Comments: This stocks is a category 6 stock (by-catch) and landings(the necessary data for that category) data are available. Additional data to "upgrade" the stock is not available. The total landings of this stock is 44 tonnes.	Indeed: Catches in this area are too low to support the collection of the necessary information for an assessment of the stock status. This stocks is a category 6 stock (by-catch) and landings(the necessary data for that category) data are available. Additional data to "upgrade" the stock is not available. The total landings of this stock is 44 tonnes.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve sampling intensity	satisfactory
369	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (whg-rock)Whiting in Division VIb (Rockall) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub /Publication%20Reports/Advi ce/2013/2013/whg-rock.pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Quality of landings data Description: There are doubts on the accuracy of the reported landings as these are reported by vessels operating in both Divisions VIa and VIb. Comments: Official landings were 9 tonnes in 2011 and 1 tonne in 2012	Confirmed these were the landings	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve sampling intensity	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
370	Ireland		West of Scotland Stock: (wgh-iris)Whiting in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)	Description: Since 2003 the low landing levels have resulted in poor sampling coverage of the stock and no reliable estimates of catch numbers-at-age.  Comments: Landings of this stock are low (~ 50 tonnes on 2012)		Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call.	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
9	Italy	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Following Italian NP, Italy submitted all requested information for 2008-2010 in due time of the data call, 2011 data set has been submitted in August. Following JRC data quality checks corrections been done before the STECF EWG 13-10 meeting. The only minor deviation from the data call is missing debt parameter for 2008.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	2008 was the first reference year for the collection of economic data for aquaculture. The variable "debt" was wrongly translated in appendix X of EU Decision 93/2010. In fact it was translated as "total liabilities" and not as debts (in Italian "passivo, alla fine dell'anno fiscale" and not "debiti"). Therefore in the first year the variable "total liabilities" was wrongly collected (and not debts). In the subsequent years STECF clarified this point and Italy started with collecting the variable "debts". However data from balance sheets on debts referred to 2008 have been recovered and this data will be sent in the 2014 data call.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
28	Italy	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Capacity data for 2013 not submitted. Some minor missing data at the fleet segment level. Fishing Enterprise data missing for 2011 and 2012. DCF capacity data for number of vessels and kW under-reported for several years  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Capacity data for 2013 have to be delivered with a time lag of 6 months, according to Italian National Program. In fact, data from the fleet register have to be updated with the information on the prevalent fishing technique as required by Appendix III of the DCF. This is derived trough a field survey covering all the vessels.  Some minor missing data at the fleet segment level. Fishing Enterprise data missing for 2011 and 2012. There was a clear error in the submission of data as regards to fishing enterprise because these are administrative data available at any time. They do not imply any kind of data collection. In addition, we think that this error did not have a negative impact on the analysis because fleet has been quite stable in the period.  DCF capacity data for number of vessels and kW underreported for several years. Differences between DCF capacity data and the EU Fleet Register are due to the fact that the fleet uploaded is the average fleet over the year and not the fleet at the 1 January of the reference year. This motivation is also reported in the data coverage report (page 57).	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
64	Italy	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	No information on enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity has been provided for one of the two mandatory years (i.e. 2008). However, these data were provided for years 2009 (requested but not mandatory) and 2011 (mandatory).  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	EU Decision 93/2010 states that "For enterprises that carry out fish processing but not as a main activity, it is mandatory to collect the following data (data on non main activity enterprises), in the first year of each programming period". Therefore we to delivered data for 2009 (first year of the program 2009-2010) and 2011 (first year of the program 2011).	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
79	Italy	JRC/DG MARE	Med and BS	Part of the fisheries data was submitted late (Table A, B, C) according to the first deadline. Data from Tables (A,B,C) is lacking years 2002-2005 plus additional years (details in Section 4). Effort data (Table D) is entirely lacking 2010 Catch and landings datasets from GSA 11 are incomplete in temporal coverage and present substantial quality problems (details in reports of STECF EWG 13-09 and EWG 13-19). No Medits or hydroacoustic survey data sent according to the second deadline. Lack of Medits data from GSA 17 for period 1994-2002. In GSA 11 for years 2002-2005, 2007-2008 the reported number of species is approximately one third less. Lack of Medits TE file for GSA 10, 17 and 18.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Part of the fisheries data was submitted late (Table A, B, C) according to the first deadline.  On a total of 203 files uploaded, only 4 files, and precisely "CATCH_MEDBS-GSA 17_3.xls", "DISCARDS_MEDBS-GSA 17.xls", "LANDING_MEDBS_GSA 17_2.xls" and "DISCARDS_MEDBS_GSA 17_2.xls", have been successfully uploaded after the deadline. All the other files have been uploaded in time. For the future Italy will try to submit all the requested templates in due time.  Data from Tables (A,B,C) is lacking years 2002-2005 plus additional years (details in Section 4).  Data missing after 2005 are mainly related to age and discards data because, before 2011, there wasn't the obligation to collect annually these data for the concerned species. The temporal stratification, for discards and age data, was every three years.  Concerning the years from 2002-2005, it is worth mentioning that Italy has for the first time implemented the data collection of biological samples in 2002. The sampling protocols and methodology applied at that time for the data collection and elaboration, related to the biological samplings, were different from the standards subsequently adopted, which were fully developed and tested during 2005 and completely applied in 2006. These standards proved to be adequate and in line with the more commonly adopted methods for biological samplings. As a consequence, data from 2002-2005 have been collected, processed and stored in		Unsatisfactory
383	Italy	ICCAT	Task 2	Missing data for: BFT-MED	We can certify that data on task 2 ICCAT have been sent on the 18th and 29th of July 2013	Not possible to check. MS/End user to clarify.	NA
402	Italy	GFCM	Task 1 2 Main resource and activity components variables per Operational Units	Mostly completed (75%)	GFCM Task 1.2  We checked the submission to the GFCM and we can confirm that the requested data have been correctly uploaded.  According to our files all the components of task 1.2 have been submitted	In general the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call	
417	Italy	GFCM	Task 1.4 Catch and effort variables catch effort discard bycacth	Partially completed (50%)	GFCM Task 1.4 We checked the submission to the GFCM and we can confirm that the requested data have been correctly uploaded. According to our files most of the components of task 1.4 have been submitted (catch and effort). The few data missing are linked to some fields (discards and by catch), that due to the structure of the template, are problematic to be uploaded.	Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call	

	D Country		Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
4	27 Italy	GFCM	Task 15 Provisional biological parameters		GFCM Task 1.5  We checked the submission to the GFCM and we confirm that the requested data have been correctly uploaded. Italy has uploaded the information requested for the most important commercial species and for each GSA. Following the structure of the Task 1.5 has been possible to fulfil the 75% of the requested data. The few data missing are linked to some fields (e.g. id_CLPrecisionLevel; id_CLValueType; CPUEOrLPUEValue), that due the structure of the template, is problematic to upload in a correct way.		

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
29	Latvia	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Investment values and depreciation cost for 2008 not provided. DCF capacity data under-reported compared to FR See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Investment values and depreciation cost for 2008 not provided.  The questionnaire form for economic data was changed in 2008. The first investment and depreciation costs data were received for 2009.  DCF capacity data under-reported compared to FR In order to keep the principle of confidentiality for the long distance sea fleet segment >40 m operating in North Atlantic and CECAF areas economic and transversal data for these vessels were not reported. The economic and transversal data for the part of small coastal zone vessels less than 10m excluded from the Fleet economic request. These vessels are fishing only for self consumption and thus belong to the recreational fishery and were not involved in commercial fishing activity.	Lack of 2008 investment data not justified. Under-repored capacity data is sufficiently explained	Unsatisfactory
47	Latvia	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	Table A, catch: discards submitted only for cod. Table B, nominal effort: only 'days at sea' effort data for vessels <10m in length for 2005-2007. Table D, Capacity: no data for vessels <8m in length for 2003-2007.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Table A, catch: Discard data in 2012 were collected under the Latvian National Programme according to the sampling strategy. The discard volume was estimated in cod fishery: GNS_DEF_110- 156_0_0 and OTB_DEF_>=105_1_110. No discards in sprat and herring targeted fishery have been recorded during 2012 as well as in previous years.  Table B, nominal effort; Table D, Capacity: Information on the boat register number was included in the coastal logbooks since 2008. Therefore, detailed data such as number of active vessels aggregated by area (Table D, Capacity) as well as data on kW*days and Gt*days aggregated by quarter, vessel segments, gear and area (Table B, nominal effort) for boats less than 10 m can be provided only from 2008 and afterwards.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
65	Latvia	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Values equal to zero: "imputed value of unpaid labour" (2010 and 2011). See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	According to the questionnaire of Latvian Central Statistical Bureau the unpaid labour was not reported and therefore the variable "imputed value of unpaid labour" had zero values in 2010 and 2011.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
174	Latvia	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder pelagic in Subdivisions 24 and 25(fle- 2425) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Age or length data for discards	Latvia provided flounder discard length information in Excel spread sheet for SD 24-25 for 2006 to 2012 according to WKBALFLAT data call. The total amount of landings was low (less than 10 tons as bycatch in cod fishery)	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call, since the MS landings of flounder in SD 24-25 in 2012 were only 19 t (WGBFAS 2013).	

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
175	Latvia	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder pelagic in Subdivisions 26 and 28(fle- 2628) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Age or length data for discards	Latvia provided discard length information in Excel spread sheet for SD 26, 28 for 2004 to 2012 according to WKBALFLAT data call. No specific discard age samples were available. However due to the factor that a local market is the main limiting factor (not fish size or condition), age length key from landings are applicable to discard lenght distribution to calculate an age distribution of discards	OK, ICES may check why length data were not available to (or used by) WKBALFLAT. Not clear why age readings have not been conducted on the sampled discards.	Unsatisfactory
	All countries exploring the stock		Ecoregion: Baltic Sea Stock: (cod-2532)Cod in Subdivisions 25–32 (Eastern Baltic Sea) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/ Publication%20Reports/Advice /2013/2013/cod- 2532_201304112231.pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Ageing inconsistencies Description: Ageing problems are a concern for the quality of the assessment.	Age determination of the Eastern Baltic cod is a long-standing problem. Latvia has regularly participated in age reading workshops and otolith exchanges to improve the situation. Several age reading workshops took place in Latvia. Age reading of cod in Latvia is performed by experienced expert (experience is more than 30 years). For quality assessment every otolith is weighted, annual growth zones are measured. Analyses of otolith edge is performed to improve quality of age reading. The same procedure is applied for all otoliths from commercial and scientific surveys.	Ageing of cod is a general problem in the Baltic, and MS effort to improve cod age determination is acknowledged.	Satisfactory
	All countries exploring the stock		Subdivisions 22–32 (Baltic Sea) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/	Type of issue: Data quality - Improve discards sampling Description: The uncertainty of the discard estimates is of concern. Discarding practices are controlled by factors such as market price and cod catches. Given the high variability in the discard ratios, estimating discards is very uncertain without an extensive sampling programme	provide enough flexibility (inter year, inter species) to	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	Pre-screening comments	EWG1407 comment	STECF EWG - evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
30	Lithuania	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Energy consumption missing for 2008 (national and fleet segment level). Only capacity data submitted for TMVL40XX. See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Due to primary data transfer failure between administrating institutions, insignificant part of 2008 data were not provided to STECF, consequently, in 2013 Lithuania was charged with penalty. Afterwards, missing data, including energy consumption was estimated and reported in 2014 datacall. The data was unavailable for that period.	reasonable.  Missing data for VI 40xx due do confidentiality reasons	2008 fuel issue sufficiently explained. Data for VL40XX are contained in AER. Thus the resepctive data must have been submitted in due time. Data delivery apparently compliant with obligations. MS provided data clustered with other segment, in line with NP	Satisfactory
48	Lithuania	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	Table A, catch: no data for 2003-2004. Table A, catch: no (no zero) discards or age data for 2003-2008. Table B, nominal effort: no data for 2000-2004. Table C, effort by rectangle: no data for 2003-2008. Table D, Capacity: no data for 2003-2008. Table E, landings by rectangle: no data for 2003-2007. See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage		Some of the data should be available, at least from 2005 onwards. Additional view from biologist desirable. The coverage report as referred to under "ISSUE" is of no use in this context.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
66	Lithuania	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	No information on enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity. Values equal to zero: extraordinary costs, net" (2008 and 2009); "imputed value of unpaid labour" (all years); subsidies (2008 and 2011).  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Due to confidentiality reasons data for companies which carry out fish processing not as a main activity were not reported separately. The turnover and corresponding costs of processed fish as well as corresponding employment for those companies which do not perform fish processing as main activity was merged to rest of population (where fish processing is main activity) and was reported un-separately, providing a complete information of Lithuanian fish processing industry with regard to reported response rate. Reported zero values are not missed variables.		OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
176	Lithuania	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder pelagic in Subdivisions 24 and 25(fle- 2425) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards	Lithuania did not collect data from subdivisions 24-25 for flounder. The reasons are: 1. Observers are not allowed onboard due safety reasons and lack of space. Therefore it is not possible to collect discard data; 2. All catches are landed in Denmark. Therefore, biological data is not available; 3. There was a statement in one of the RCM Baltic reports (2011 or 2012) that cod discard data from subdiv 25 is sufficiently covered by Denmark and Sweden. It's assumed that data for flounder is also covered by concurent sampling at sea. Otherwise this issue will be clearified during the RCM Baltic 2014.	OK, Lithuanian landings of flounder in SD 24-25 in 2012 were	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call, since the MS landings of flounder in SD 24-25 in 2012 were only 19 t (WGBFAS 2013).	Satisfactory
386	Lithuania	NAFO	Biological information (Sex,	Missing data for: 3M Redfish, 3 LN Redfish	There were no fishery in NAFO area in 2013 at all	ок	CAb-ab MC bear area and a security about a security	Cabiafa at a m
	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	Length, Age) Ecoregion: Baltic Sea Stock: (cod-2532)Cod in Subdivisions 25–32 (Eastern Baltic Sea) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/ Publication%20Reports/Advice/ 2013/2013/cod- 2532_201304112231.pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Ageing inconsistencies Description: Ageing problems are a concern for the quality of the assessment.	provide good reading quality.	OK, however, MS should continue to be involved in age reading comparisons (otolith exchanges and workshops) to ensure international consistency in age determination.	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call Ageing of cod is a general problem in the Baltic, and MS effort to improve cod age determination is acknowledged.	Satisfactory Satisfactory
	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/	Type of issue: Data quality - Improve discards sampling Description: The uncertainty of the discard estimates is of concern. Discarding practices are controlled by factors such as market price and cod catches. Given the high variability in the discard ratios, estimating discards is very uncertain without an extensive sampling programme	Lithuania is sampling flounder discards routinely at sea during the cod fishery (concurent sampling). There are no plans to give special attention to flounder issue unless there will be special request from ICES or relevant expert group to do it	ОК	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
10	Malta	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	No major deviations from the data call. The only variable missing is live stock volume for 2008-2009 at national total level.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Livestock volume data for both 2008 and 2009 for segment 3.4 (Seabass and Seabream) could not be obtained, as none of the respondents included this information in their replies. Data on segment 6.4 (Other Marine Fish Cages) was provided for both years. Note that the number of aquaculture companies in Malta is relatively low, and aquaculture data is collected via means of a self-reporting questionnaire.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
31	Malta	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Significant amount of missing data at fleet segment level. DCF capacity data (GT) significantly under-reported in 2008- 09 compared to FR. Recreational catch data not submitted See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	In 2008 and 2009, due to a vessel registry oversight, a number of recreational vessels (MFC) were listed as part-time fishing vessels (MFB). This in turn contributed to an over reporting of capacity in the FR when compared to DCF capacity data. This error was fixed in 2009, and in fact no such discrepancies have re-occured. With respect to recreational data, as per the annual fleet economic data call, Malta is only required to submit recreational catches, if any, for blue fin tuna and european eel. Malta does not have a recreational fishery targeting eel (and this is explained in Malta's National Programme), while with respect to Blue-fin tuna, recreational catches recorded are usually nil, or as in the case for 2012, when only two individuals were caught, catches are very small. In all cases, any recreational BFT data obtained was submitted.	Insufficient explanation for failure of data delivery for missing data. Explanation of capacity discrepancy appears OK. Lack of Recreational catch data appears reasonably explained.	Unsatisfactory
67	Malta	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	No information on enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity. Values equal to zero: "Other income" (all years); "subsidies" (2010 and 2011); "imputed value of unpaid labour" (2011); "Extraordinary costs, net" (2010). See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	The Maltese processing industry is very small and all enterprises that carry out fish processing carry it out as their main activity. Data on the processing industry is collected through a questionnaire sent to the relevant entities. Responses are self-reported and are often not obtained from all entities by the deadline. In view of both the small size of the industry, as well as the self reporting nature of the data collection, the data for a given year for certain variables may either be skewed (due to the low number of responses) or zero.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
80	Malta	JRC/DG MARE	Med and BS	Late submission of Medits data after both deadlines. No MEDITS TE file See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Data required for the Med and BS data call was submitted on 29/05/2013 in time for the 3/6/2013 deadline. apart from the Medits TD, TT and TA files. This was due to errors in the tables that prevented the data being uploaded. Following correspondence with Mr Giacomo Chato Osio (Data Submission Team, JRC), the problem was tackled and data successfully uploaded on 3/7/2013 and 4/7/2013. The MEDITS TE file was not uploaded due to Malta not having otholith age reading data ready. While the samples required were collected, problems were encountered to subcontract the required work. A tender for this work was issued twice but no successful applicants resulted.	In general, the MS should try, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call. MS should try to improve for the future the work regarding the age reading to ensure the submission of the requested data. The end user however, should also take care of the data availability following the Data presentation chapter in the NP proposal	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
382	Malta	ICCAT	Task 2	Missing data for: ALB-MED		In general, MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. In this case Malta need to following the DCF and ICCAT exemption rules.	Unsatisfactory
418	Malta		Task 1 4 Catch and effort variables catch effort discard bycacth	Mostly completed (75%)	variables for Task 1.4 and available in the logbooks were	In general the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
11	Netherlands	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	The Netherlands has a two year data collection lag, i.e. data for 2011 had not been collected by the end of the STECF EWG 13-10 meeting. No data has been provided for 2011. For the rest of the time frame, the following parameters were not submitted: number of enterprises by size category and segment for 2008-2010; number of employees by gender; FTE total and by gender (not obligatory); imputed value of unpaid labour and volume of raw material have been either not provided or provided as zero values. According to the Dutch expert the imputed value of unpaid labour was not estimated.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	As stated in the NP the data from the aquaculture industry is based on financial accounts, which causes a substiantial delay. Therefore data on the aquaculture sector was not available defor the meeting, but has become available during autumn 2013. Some information such as the employees by gender could not be obtained from the accounts. Value of unpaid labour was not estimated before, but the methodology has been adapted. Volume of raw material is 0 for mussel and oyster sector. For inland fisheries, this could not be obtained from the financial accounts.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
32	Netherlands	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Some missing data at the fleet segment level, in particular for smaller vessel length groups. Reported DCF capacity data lower than FR for all parameters and years. Recreational catch data submitted only for 2010 See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	For a very limited number of segments, response was to low to provide some variables in the older years. For recent years, response is enough to facilitate full coverage of all segments. The capacity of the fleet register has always been higher, because the fleet register also covers some vessels of the inland fleet/aquaculture.	Missing data for smaller vessel groups not sufficiently justified. MS provided reasonable justification for capacity issue. No explanation for failure on recreational catch data	Unsatisfactory
49	Netherlands	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	Catch information available for only 3 species for years 2003-2008; cfr approximately 40 species for years 2009-2012.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	The catch information as delivered in 2003-2008 responded to the data requests as send out in those days. For The Netherlands, only 3 species were relevant based on the standing criteria at that time. Based on this request, The Netherlands will strive to update the time series to the current request, prior to the 2014 meeting.	Insufficient justification for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
68	Netherlands	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Late upload (16th of October). The following economic variables were not provided:  "male employees" and "female employees" (the variable "total employees" was  provided, although the delivery was not mandatory); "Extraordinary costs, net"  (provided for 2009 and 2010, not provided for 2008 and 2011). No information on  enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity has been provided for  2008, while for 2011, it was provided only the variable "Turnover attributed to fish  processing".  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	analysis (highest value was more than 50% of the total value of the variable);	No justification for failure of data delivery with respect to "enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity".  For all other issues M5 provided reasonable justification.  However, the coverage report is not correct with respect to the statement on number of enterprises and turnover (text contradicts table).	Unsatisfactory
177	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Hake in Division IIIa, Subareas IV, VI and VII and Divisions VIIIa,b,d (Northern stock)(hke- nrtn) WKSOUTH	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards		NL only have minor quota (0.1-3.3%; Reg. 43/2014: Illa - no quota, Ila/IV: 95t of 2874t, VI/VII: 272t of 45896t, VIIIabde: 27t of 30610t). Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
178	Netherlands		Data call under Intercatch for: Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Division IIIa and Subareas IV and VI(ang- ivvi) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline after EG	The deadline for data delivery set by WGCSE was set to April 15, 2013. The Netherlands provided the requested data on March 25, 2013. Hence, the data was delivered in time to the stock coordinator. The Dutch data for lophius is very limited as described in the approved 2012 Annual Report.	The data is only submitted to the stock coordinator and not uplaoded to InterCatch. Because IInterCatch isn't ussed for data processing the missing upload has probably no inpact on the assessment. In general data have to be uploaded to InterCatch for documentary purpose in all cases.	NA
	Netherlands		Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Subarea IV (North Sea), Divison VIId (Eastern Channel) and IIIa West (Skagerrak)(cod-347d) WGNSSK	Missing data: Age or length data for discards Delay: after deadline	In general, the deadlines for data deliveries are very tight. The Netherlands strives to deliver all data prior to the deadline. In this case the data was delivered in time for the WG, but the deadline was indeed missed. However, this was communicated with the stock coordinator and not considered as a problem.	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
180	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Subarea IV (North Sea) and Division Illa West (Skagerrak)(had-34) WGNSSK	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards Delay: after deadline	As described in the approved National Programme, no age nor length data has been collected from the landings of haddock as haddock is a limited by-catch species in The Netherlands. As with Cod, some other data was delivered in time for the WG, but the deadline was indeed missed. However, this was communicated with the stock coordinator and not considered as a problem.		Satisfactory
181	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IVb (Off Horn Reef, FU 33)(nep-33) WGNSSK	· ·	As with Cod, the data was delivered in time for the WG, but the deadline was indeed missed. However, this was communicated with the stock coordinator and not considered as a problem.	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
182	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IVbc (Botney Gut - Silver Pit, FU 5)(nep-5) WGNSSK	Missing data: Discards data Age or length data for discards Delay: after deadline	Virtully no discard data has been collected in FUS. The remaining data was indeed deliverd after the dead line, but as with the other WGNSSK species, this was not considered as a problem by the WG.	NL had landings of 497t (of 1240t total, WGNSSK 2013) and it is not clear <u>why</u> no discard data have been collected.	
							Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
183	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IVb (Farn Deeps, FU 6)(nep-6) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Limited data has been collected in FU6. The remaining data was indeed deliverd after the dead line, but as with the other WGNSSK species, this was not considered as a problem by the WG.	NL landings in FU6 are negligible. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
184	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIId (Eastern Channel)(ple-eche) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	The delay in data delivery was communicated with the stock coordinator and not considered as a problem. As mentioned above, The Netherlands always strives to deliver the data in time, however, due to tight dead lines and the increased number of data calls, deadlines can't always be met. In these cases, a solution is sought in close cooperation with the appropriate stock coordinator.	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
185	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice Subarea IV (North Sea)(ple-nsea) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	The delay in data delivery was communicated with the stock coordinator and not considered as a problem. As mentioned above, The Netherlands always strives to deliver the data in time, however, due to tight dead lines and the increased number of data calls, deadlines can't always be met. In these cases, a solution is sought in close cooperation with the appropriate stock coordinator.	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
186	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Saithe in Subarea IV (North Sea) Division Illa West (Skagerrak) and Subarea VI (West of Scotland and Rockall)(sai-3a46) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	The Netherlands only delivers very limited data for saithe as saithe is a by-catch species of little relevance. The delay in data delivery was communicated with the stock coordinator and not considered as a problem. As mentioned above, The Netherlands always strives to deliver the data in time, however, due to tight dead lines and the increased number of data calls, deadlines can't always be met. In these cases, a solution is sought in close cooperation with the appropiate stock coordinator.	OK, NL landings in 2012 were only 34t of approx. 70000t total (WGNSSK 2013). Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	
187 (	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIId (Eastern Channel)(sol-eche) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	The Netherlands only delivers very limited data for sole as sole landings from VIID are negligible. The delay was communicated with the stock coordinator. Given the virtual non-landings, this was not considered as a problem.	Duch sole landings from VIID are negligible. Seems that the MS has responded	Satisfactory
188	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in	Delay: after deadline	The delay in data delivery was communicated with the stock coordinator and not considered as a problem. As mentioned above, The Netherlands always strives to deliver the data in time, however, due to tight dead lines and the increased number of data calls, deadlines can't always be met. In these cases, a solution is sought in close cooperation with the appropriate stock coordinator.	according to the data call.  Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data	Satisfactory
189	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting Subarea IV (North Sea) & Division VIId (Eastern Channel)(whg-47d) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	The delay in data delivery was communicated with the stock coordinator and not considered as a problem. As mentioned above, The Netherlands always strives to deliver the data in time, however, due to tight dead lines and the increased number of data calls, deadlines can't always be met. In these cases, a solution is sought in close cooperation with the appropiate stock coordinator.	call.  Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data rall	Satisfactory  Satisfactory
301	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: European seabass in Divisions IVbc,VIIa and VIId-h (Irish Sea, English Channel and southern North Sea)(bss-47) WGCSE	Missing data: Landings data Age or length data for landings Delay: after deadline after fe	As planned, no age samples were collected in 2012. The age sampling for bass is triennial and based on international agreements through the RCMs, age sampling has taken place in 2010 and 2013. Due to apparent miscommunication, the dead line was not met. Measures have been taken to avoid these problems in the future.	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
307	Netherlands	ICES	Ecoregion: Widely distributed stocks Stock: (hom-west)Horse mackerel (Trachurus trachurus) in Divisions IIa, IVa, Vb, Vla, VIIa-c, e-k, and Subarea VIII (Western stock) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication %20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/hom- west.pdf	Type of issue: Data transmission / Data quality - No biological sampling Description: The landings fraction sampled to estimate biological parameters has been declining in recent years; it is important to keep those levels on target. As in previous years, and despite the data sampling regulations for EU countries, some countries with major catches have not conducted biological sampling programmes. Comments: Few biological samples available from the 2nd and 3rd quarter	The comment is not clear. As described in the approved Annual Report 2012, The Netherlands exactly met it targets in terms of number of fish to be sampled and the data was deliverd to the WG in time. The spatial distribution of the samples follows the fishery based on the sampling protocol designed to collect data at the most important fishing ground during the year. The sampling thus follows the Dutch fishery and this might not reflect the main fishing areas for other countries. The fishery for horse mackerel is a seasonal fishery in The Netherlands. During the 2nd and 3th quarter, horse mackerel is of lesser importance. Both quarters combined deliver less than 30% of the annual landings, hence the lower sampling effort in these quarters, reflecting the seasonality of the fishery.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
321	Netherlands		Stock: (her-irls)Herring in Divisions VIIa (South of 52°30'N) and VIIg,h,j,k (Celtic Sea		The Dutch herring fishery on the forementioned region is of limited relevance for The Netherlands, less than 4% of the annual Herring landings are derived from this area. As a result of the sampling design based on ranking as prescribed in the DCF, the sampling design is based on covering the major fisheries throughout the year by default. Hence, the fishery in this area might not be covered. However, The Netherlands will strive to cover this area when feasible.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve sampling intensity	satisfactory
337	Netherlands		Stock: (gug-celt)Grey gurnard in Subarea VI and Divisions VIIa-c and e-k (Celtic Sea	Type of issue: Data quality - Quality of landings data Description: Because the species is largely discarded, landings data do not reflect the actual catches. Comments: The landings values of the MS listed are very low	The Netherlands has virtually no bottom fishery in the region mentioned in the comment. Hence, landings data are very low, as are the discard rates in the pelagic fishery.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve sampling intensity	satisfactory
377	Netherlands	ICCAT	Task 1: fleet characteristics	Missing data	The Netherlands never received a request from ICCAT, probably due to the non- existence of tuna fishery in The Netherlands.	MS don't have to respond to the Data call	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	Pre-screening comments	EWG comment	STECF EWG - evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
	Poland	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Poland provided all economic indicators for 2009-2011 at the national totals and segment level. For 2008 the only variable provided is production by specie. Turnover and sales by specie covered all aquaculture production; while economic variables were collected and reported only for marine aquaculture.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Poland is required to collect and report only marine aquaculture for DCF. FAO and Eurostat data refers to total volume and value of aquaculture production for human consumption.	It is collected what is mandatory, so acceptable	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
	Poland	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Some missing data due to confidentiality issues . DCF vessel tonnage significantly over-reported in 2008 compared to fleet register.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage			OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
50	Poland	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	Table A, catch: discards information for cod only for years 2004-2010, (for 2011 herring, sprat and flounder and for 2012 for cod, flounder, perch, plaice and turbot). No information on uptake of special conditions in 2012, except in Table E, landings by rectangle.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage			OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
	Poland	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	"Imputed value of unpaid labour" was not provided (all years). See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	To estimate the imputed value of unpaid labour Poland use the methodology proposed by STECF-EWG 11-18 Expert Working Group of. October 17 – 21, 2011 (Salerno, Italy). This has been implemented in 2013.	For the future acceptable, not for the past, as it was obviously really not provided	No justification for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
374	Poland	ICES	Ecoregion: Baltic Sea Stock: (trt-bal)Sea trout in Subdivisions 22–32 (Baltic Sea) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/ Publication%20Reports/Advice /2013/2013/trt-bal.pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Misreporting Description: There are doubts on the accuracy of the reported landings. []Salmon catches are to some extent misreported as trout.	Poland makes continuous effort to decrease the misreporting. There is improving fisheries control made by inspectors confirmed by audit of EC, which will give more realistic number of salmon reported as a sea trout.  Misreporting can happen mainly to offshore catch while	OK, MS efforts on improved reporting are acknowledged.	MS effort to use fisheries control and DCF observed fishing trips to improve the reporting quality is highly acknowledged.	Satisfactory

Issu	e ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	Pre-screening comments	EWG comment	STECF EWG - evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
	375 Pc	bland	ICES	Stock: (sal-22-31)Salmon in Subdivisions 22–31 (Main Basin and Gulf of Bothnia) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/ Publication%20Reports/Advice /2013/2013/sal-2231.pdf	reported species composition between Polish and other countries' longline fisheries indicate substantial misreporting of salmon as sea trout in the Polish fishery. Even though the magnitude of the misreporting has likely decreased, it still constitutes a significant catch. Internationally coordinated	Poland makes continuous effort to decrease the misreporting. There is improving fisheries control made by inspectors confirmed by audit of EC, which will give more realistic number of salmon reported as a sea trout.  Misreporting can bannen mainly to offshore catch while	OK, MS efforts on improved reporting are acknowledged.	MS effort to use fisheries control and DCF observed fishing trips to improve the reporting quality is highly acknowledged.	Satisfactory

## Data Transmission 2013 - Portugal

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
13	Portugal	JRC/DG MARE	,	The following parameters were not submitted for 2008: wages and salaries; imputed value of unpaid labour; repair and maintenance; capital costs; extraordinary costs; capital value; employment (except total employees) See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	The Portuguese National Programme stated that data was to be collected for Aquaculture starting 2009, in line with the derogation for Eurostat. Some data was already available at the Directorate-General, but it was provided on a voluntary basis	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
34	Portugal	JRC/DG MARE		Some minor missing data at the fleet segment level. Recreational catch data not submitted. See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	The pilot survey to touristic operators show low levels of catches for sea bass, of about 400 kg. This level of activity doesn't show significant impact on the stock, so no furthers studies were made.	The MS has to refer to an approved derogation in order not to sample the recreational fishery. It is not possible to judge if "minor missing data" is important or not.	Unsatisfactory
51	Portugal	JRC/DG MARE		Table A, catch: age data provided for black scabbard fish only. Table C, effort by rectangle: no data for vessels < 10m in length. Table E, landings by rectangle: no data for vessels < 10m in length. See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Vessels with less than 10 m don't have logbook and data is collected from sales notes. The resolution of the sales note doesn't allow to collect data by rectangle. We observe that this vessels, according to appendix II needs to be collected with a resolution of FAO level 3 only and, as so, out of scope with the Regulation.	MS provided reasonable justification	NA
70	Portugal	JRC/DG MARE		No information on enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity has been provided for one of the two mandatory years (i.e. 2011). However, these data were provided for years 2008 (mandatory) and 2010 (requested but not mandatory).  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Accordingly to Decision 2010/93/EU, IV.B.2.2, "For enterprises that carry out fish processing but not as a main activity, it is mandatory to collect the following data, in the first year of each programming period". Accordingly to the national programme, in 2011, the first year of the programming period, we collected data related to 2010.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
309	Portugal	ICES	Stock: (anp-8c9a)White anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius) in Divisions VIIIc and IXa	Type of issue: Data quality - Improve sampling Description: The stock is assessed using a length-based model, so length sampling is key information for this stock. Due to the broad size range of the species the length sampling should be increased to ensure adequate data for the assessment.	Portugal has already increased the sampling, and is also conducting a Pilot Study directed to anglerfish. The way of integrate both samples is understudy and will be discused in the next ICES Data Collection Working Group (DCWK Anglerfish) in November 2014	Seems that the MS has responded to the Data call	Satisfactory
311	Portugal	ICES	Stock: (anb-8c9a)Black-bellied	Type of issue: Data quality - Improve sampling Description: Due to the broad size range of the species, length sampling should be increased to ensure adequate data for future development of improved assessment methods. Comments:	Portugal has already increased the sampling, and is also conducting a Pilot Study directed to anglerfish. The way of integrate both samples is understudy and will be discused in the next ICES Data Collection Working Group (DCWK Anglerfish) in November 2014	Seems that the MS has responded to the Data call	Satisfactory

## Data Transmission 2013 - Portugal

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
313	Portugal	ICES	Stock: (hke-soth)Hake in Divisions VIIIc and IXa (Southern stock) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Pu	used in the analytical assessment Description: The trawl survey (PtGFS-WIBTS-Q4) used to calibrate the model was not performed in 2012. []These indices were used to calibrate the model without the years	No action possible. None of the planned surveys in the Iberian waters was performed in 2012. Nation-wide budgetary and administrative constraints made the necessary reparations to R/V Noruega impossible, as well as the chartering of another research vessel. During 2013, and in the surveys already carried out in 2014, constraints have been overcome and survey data collection is being achieved as planned.	Seems that the MS has responded to the Data call	Satisfactory
314	Portugal	ICES	Stock: (hke-soth)Hake in Divisions VIIIc and IXa (Southern stock) Reference:	Type of issue: Data transmission - Lack of commercial tunning fleet used in the analytical assessment Description: []The LPUE (P-TR), also used to calibrate the model, was not updated in 2011 and 2012. These indices were used to calibrate the model without the years mentioned.	Due to incomplete logbook data (mostly due to the transition period from the paper logbooks to electronic logbooks), it was not possible to estimate the CPUE according to the rules established in the Benchmark. The issue is still being addressed and has not been entirely resolved. Further action is planned for the second half of 2014 to resolve this issue in future and homogenize CPUE standardization procedures for several ICES WG that require the same source data.	Seems that the MS has responded to the Data call	Satisfactory
315	Portugal	ICES	Stock: (hom-south)Horse mackerel (Trachurus trachurus) in Division IXa (Southern stock) Reference:	Type of issue: Data transmission - Lack of survey information used in the analytical assessment Description: There was no survey index for 2012 from the Portuguese survey due to engine problems, so this index was not included in the assessment. Comments: The survey didn't took place, due to engine problems. That is the reason why ICES didn't get the data.	Iberian waters was performed in 2012. Nation-wide budgetary and administrative constraints made the necessary	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond to the Data call	Satisfactory
316	Portugal	ICES	Stock: (sar-south)Sardine in Divisions VIIIc and IXa	used in the assessment Description: [] lack of an acoustic index for 2012 Comments: The survey didn't took place, due to engine problems. That is the reason why ICES didn't get the data.	No action possible. None of the planned surveys in the lberian waters was performed in 2012. Nation-wide budgetary and administrative constraints made the necessary reparations to R/V Noruega impossible, as well as the chartering of another research vessel. During 2013, and in the surveys already carried out in 2014, constraints have been overcome and survey data collection is being achieved as planned.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond to the Data call	Satisfactory
388	Portugal	NAFO	Biological information (Sex, Length, Age)	Missing data for: 3M American Plaice	Portuguese length composition has been presented in the Portuguese Research Report (NAFO SCS Doc). Data is collected by sex but is provided together. Portugal is in charge of produce the American plaice ALK of the Flemish Cap Survey and the results has been presented in the NAFO SCR Doc. The ALK used in the assessment is the ALK of the Flemish Cap Groundfish Survey.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond to the Data call. To be dounle check by NAFO.	NA

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
14	Romania	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Romania didn't provide data for 2008. Number of enterprises by size category, employment indicators and total sales volume by segment are missing for 2011.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Romanian NP has begun in 2009 and so that 2008 is not covered. Regarding the number of enterprises by size category, employment indicators and total sales volume by segment, unfortunatelly, due to human error, was omitted to submitt the data although the total values of these indicators was submitted. The adjustment was made, and in May - June 2014, when we will upload the 2012 data for aquaculture, we will upload again the correct/up-dated data 2011 year on JRC server.	Insufficient justification for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
35	Romania	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Capital values and investments data not submitted for 2008- 2010. Capacity data under-reported for several years. Missing and data inconsistencies, significant inter-annual variations See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Romania up dated data for the irespective years. Data has been transmitted in 08/04/2014, uploaded on JRC server.	Insufficient justification for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
71	Romania	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Values equal to zero: "subsidies" (2008, 2009 and 2011); "extraordinary costs, net" (all years). See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	In 2008, 2009, 2011 processing units in Romania did not have subsidies. In 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011 were not recorded/declared by operators extraordinary costs for the processing industry. So, for both variables the value is equal to zero.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
84	Romania	JRC/DG MARE	Med and BS	Table A missing data from 2005-2007, Table B landings in tons missing 2006-2009, landings at length missing 2005-2006. Table C discards and Table D effort missing 2005-2007. See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Romanian National Datta Collection Program started in 2008; as per the Annual Reports sent to the EC-DG MARE we stated this fact every year.	The implementation of Romanian National Data Collection Program started in 2008. No data have been collected before	Satisfactory
397	Romania	GFCM	Task 1.1 Fleet and area variables	No data provided	Romanian vessels records have been transmited in 3 July 2013 (confirmation by DeRossi, Federico ) and also have been transmited on 23.05.2014.	GFCM should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	NA
403	Romania	GFCM	Task 12 Main resource and activity components variables per Operational Units	No data provided	Data has been transmitted in 23.05.2014.	GFCM should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	NA
409	Romania	GFCM	Task 1 3 Economic component variables	No data provided	Data has been transmitted in 23.05.2014.	GFCM should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	NA
419	Romania	GFCM	Task 1 4 Catch and effort variables catch effort discard bycacth	No data provided	Data has been transmitted in 23.05.2014	GFCM should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	NA
428	Romania	GFCM	Task 15 Provisional biological parameters	No data provided	Biological parameters have been transmitted annualy by scientists at GFCM stock assessment meetings.	GFCM should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	NA

Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	Pre-screening comments	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
Slovenia	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	DCF vessel tonnage and engine power under-reported in 2012 compared to fleet register. See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	In years 2012 and 2013 Slovenia performed the measure of permanent cessation of fishing vessels under the EFF. In 2012 6 vessels were permanently removed from the fishing fleet and 2 vessels were removed in 2013. With the implementation of the measure permanent cessation of fishing activities Slovenia reduced the capacity of the fishing fleet for 397,75 GT and 2.106,88 kW. The data that have been sent to the JRC are correct and in order.	Justification appears sensible. FR data of 2013 as listed in coverage report are very similar to data submitted for 2012 in data call.  Discrepancy appears to be an end-of-the-year problem.	OK. MS provided reasonable explanation	Satisfactory
Slovenia	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Values equal to zero: "subsidies" (2009 and 2011). See: http://datacollection.irc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	In 2009 and 2011 there were no subsidies in the Slovenian fisheries processing industry.	ок	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
Slovenia	JRC/DG MARE	Med and BS	No MEDITS data for 2013 and TE file was submitted but contained no age readings. No submission of Medits data in response to the second deadline See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	We have submitted all data including MEDITS data at the first deadline. Nobody in Slovenia is able to read the otholits of Mullus barbatus.	Slovenian NP planned to provide ALKs only for anchovy and sardine. The MEDITS protocol plans age reading obligations for several species. If MS is not able to do them, bilateral agreements shall be established with foreign MS Croatia or Italy.	In general, MS should try to fully comply with the request of the end users. The end user however, should also take care of the data availability following the Data presentation chapter in the NP proposal. Slovenian NP planned to provide ALKs only for anchovy and sardine. The MEDITS protocol plans age reading obligations for several species. If MS is not able to do them, bilateral agreements could be established with foreign MS. MS should try to improve for the future the work regarding the age reading.	NA
Slovenia	GFCM	Task 1 1 Fleet and area variables		Our database system is designed to fulfill requirements of the DCF. And all data are processed in accordance with the DCF. GFCM Task 1 represents completely different aproach to date collection (different segmentation, different operational units, different calculations). For enabling us to fulfill the demands of the Task 1 it requires a lot of manual work with the data and/or upgrading of the database from the national budged. Since the national resources are very limited and our staff is full time employed with other tasks, we didn't reported the data for Task 1. Please take in the consideration also that our administrative capacity is very limited and our fisheries sectio is very small, on the other hand our obligations are the same like for the large fisheries sectors and countries with bigger administrative capacity. However until the end of May 2014 we will provide to the GFCM all the data for TASK 1 including the missing data.		In general, the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. It seems that the MS will try to respond, as much as possible, to the data call. There after end user should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	Unsatisfactory
Slovenia	GFCM	Task 1 2 Main resource and activity components variables per Operational Units		Our database system is designed to fulfill requirements of the DCF. And all data are processed in accordance with the DCF. GFCM Task 1 represents completely different approach to data collection (different segmentation, different operational units, different calculations). For enabling us to fulfill the demands of the Task 1 it requires a lot of manual work with the data and/or upgrading of the database from the national budget. Since the national resources are very limited and our staff is full time employed with other tasks, we didn't reported the data for Task 1. Please take in the consideration also that our administrative capacity is very limited and our fisheries sector is very small, on the other hand our obligations are the same like for the large fisheries sectors and countries with bigger administrative capacity. However until the end of May 2014 we will provide to the GFCM all the data for TASK 1 including the missing data.		In general, the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. It seems that the MS will try to respond, as much as possible, to the data call. There after end user should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	Unsatisfactory

Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	Pre-screening comments	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
Slovenia	GFCM	Task 1 3 Economic component variables	No data provided	Our database system is designed to fulfill requirements of the DCF. And all data are processed in accordance with the DCF. GFCM Task 1 represents completely different approach to data collection (different segmentation, different operational units, different calculations). For enabling us to fulfill the demands of the Task 1 it requires a lot of manual work with the data and/or upgrading of the database from the national budget. Since the national resources are very limited and our staff is full time employed with other tasks, we didn't reported the data for Task 1. Please take in the consideration also that our administrative capacity is very limited and our fisheries sector is very small, on the other hand our obligations are the same like for the large fisheries sectors and countries with bigger administrative capacity. However until the end of May 2014 we will provide to the GFCM all the data for TASK 1 including the missing data.		In general, the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. It seems that the MS will try to respond, as much as possible, to the data call. There after end user should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	Unsatisfactory
Slovenia	GFCM	Task 1.4 Catch and effort variables catch effort discard bycacth	No data provided	Our database system is designed to fulfill requirements of the DCF. And all data are processed in accordance with the DCF. GFCM Task 1 represents completely different approach to data collection (different segmentation, different operational units, different calculations). For enabling us to fulfill the demands of the Task 1 it requires a lot of manual work with the data and/or upgrading of the database from the national budget. Since the national resources are very limited and our staff is full time employed with other tasks, we didn't reported the data for Task 1. Please take in the consideration also that our administrative capacity is very limited and our fisheries sector is very small, on the other hand our obligations are the same like for the large fisheries sectors and countries with bigger administrative capacity. However until the end of May 2014 we will provide to the GFCM all the data for TASK 1 including the missing data.	Not acceptable. According to 2012 AR, 18 trips were sampled by MS, with sampling of retained and discarded parts of the catches for anchovy and sardine. Data to be provided by MS.	In general, the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. According to 2012 AR, 18 trips were sampled by MS, with sampling of retained and discarded parts of the catches for anchovy and sardine. It seems that the MS will try to respond, as much as possible, to the data call. There after end user should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	Unsatisfactory
Slovenia		Task 1 5 Provisional biological parameters	No data provided	Our database system is designed to fulfill requirements of the DCF. And all data are processed in accordance with the DCF. GFCM Task 1 represents completely different approach to data collection (different segmentation, different operational units, different calculations). For enabling us to fulfill the demands of the Task 1 it requires a lot of manual work with the data and/or upgrading of the database from the national budget. Since the national resources are very limited and our staff is full time employed with other tasks, we didn't reported the data for Task 1. Please take in the consideration also that our administrative capacity is very limited and our fisheries sector is very small, on the other hand our obligations are the same like for the large fisheries sectors and countries with bigger administrative capacity. However until the end of May 2014 we will provide to the GFCM all the data for TASK 1 including the missing data.	reporting that data. MS should provide at least data on	In general, the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Under Module III.C and III.E of the current DCF, MS is collecting the request biological data. It seems that the MS will try to respond, as much as possible, to the data call. There after end user should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
15	Spain	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Data has been submitted for all economic parameters for years 2008-2011. Turnover by species was provided for 2008-2011 but sales volume as well as livestock volume was missing for 2008-2010.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Information sources provide data from heterogeneous measures volume. We did not have the coefficients of transformation to go from the number of units, which come some productions, to weight in tonnes. This homogenization is needed to add the partial yields and obtain total. The above coefficients were collected in the survey from 2011.	Insufficient explanation for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
37	Spain	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	data at fleet segment level. Capacity data for 2013 not submitted.	Energy consumption are included in the annual economic survey conducted in Spain. Initially they were not sent due to a confussion because they are included with the transversal varaibles. As soon as it was clarified all energy consumptions were submited in the JRC web.  Data from the value of capital (depreciated replacement value and depreciated historical value) began to calculate based on data from 2011, previously we have not the information requiered for the calculation. In reference to capacity data for 2013, at the date of the data call it is impossible to know	Insufficient explanation for failure of data delivery. However, not all listed failures refer to data which are mandatory to be collected (e.g. 2013 capacity data, 2012 data)	Unsatisfactory
52	Spain	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	activity and fishing capacity were not identified in data from	No data before 2012 were uploaded because the action plan accorded between Comission and Spain for reviewed the systems for those years. Respect to "No Information on special conditions in 2012 data": There were no information on special conditions in 2012 because no Spanish vessel asked to be excluded from the effort regime, therefore there were no vessels under special conditions, all the vessels were under the effort regime of the recovery plan. This is explained in the report "Evaluation of Fishing Effort Regimes in European Waters - Part 1 (STECF-13-13)", page 480, first paragraph, last line: "In 2012 there is no Spanish effort under special	1st part not acceptable, unless the mentioned "action plan" provides any derogation (plan nat accessible for prescreening) "Special conditions" issue: seems ok, but PScr is not in depth familiar with the issue. "Vessel length categories" - no explanation for failure (unless the issue refers to "Special conditions" as well)	Unsatisfactory
73	Spain	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	employees" was provided, although the delivery was not mandatory); "imputed value of unpaid labour"; "depreciation of capital"; "debt"; "total value of assets". No information on	and the allocation of the value of non-wage earners. For other information, the necessary modifying for their achievement	Insufficient explanation for failure of data delivery. The collection and the delivery of the data are mandatory under DCF, regardless of Eurostat regulations.	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	·	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
82	Spain	JRC/DG MARE	Med and BS	Spain was late on both deadline submissions. Fishing effort before 2009 is missing for all GSAs (Table D) In Tables A, B and C before 2009 there seems to be one third of under-reporting of the number of species recorded in subsequent years Discards at age (Table A) and discards at length (Table C) data is incomplete in some years before 2009. The second upload of Medits data was after the second deadline and the second STECF meeting, Medits TE files contain no age readings. See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	collection. In the case of the DG Mare data call, the date to send the data will be 1rst of July. In the tables A, B and C	Seems that the MS has responded according to the EU regulations. Data missing are related to the requirements of the DCF before 2009: there was not the obligation to collect requested effort parameters. Concerning surveys, JRC should consider RCM Med&BS recommendation on delay for having effective avaibility and access to data collected.	Satisfactory
190	Spain	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Hake in Division IIIa, Subareas IV, VI and VII and Divisions VIIIa,b,d (Northern stock)(hke-nrtn) WKSOUTH	Delay: after deadline	Spain received the data call about hke-nrth on 11 October 2013. Deadline was November 11th. 12 November 2013: Spain started the Intercatch uploading process that had many problems. 13 November 2013: a) Spain offered the stock coordinator send the data files by email while the uploading process was not finished. She said no because, due to other member states problems, she had postponed the download of the data until next week. b) Spain discovered that the uploading problem was that the metiers related to the hke-nrth stock were not included in Intercatch and contacted ICES,	impossible for the pre-screener to verify if they were effectively sent at the date mentioned by MS. Seems that the	NA
191	Spain	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Division Illa and Subareas IV and VI(ang-ivvi) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline after EG	All the files were transmited to ICES and chairs on 9 th May 2013 as official data by the General Secretary for Fisheries (National Correspondent Unit). Due to the high workload in this time of the year with several ICES WGs (WGHMM, etc) there was an oversight and this information was sent with a delay	according to the Data call. Data call deadline should try to	NA
279	Spain	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Megrim (Lepidorhombus spp) in Divisions IVa and VIa(meg- 4a6a) WGCSE	Missing data: Landings data Discards data Delay: after deadline after EG	All the files were transmited to ICES and chairs on 9 th May 2013 as official data by General Secretary for Fisheries (National Correspondent Unit). Due to the high workload in this time of the year with several ICES WGs (WGHMM, etc) there was an oversight and this information was sent with a delay	according to the Data call. Data call deadline should try to	NA
308	Spain	ICES	Ecoregion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian waters Stock: (ane-pore)Anchovy in Division IXa Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/ pub/Publication%20Repor ts/Advice/2013/2013/ane- pore.pdf	Type of issue: Data transmission - Lack of survey information used in the analytical assessment Description: No survey estimates in Division IXa South were available in 2012 []. Comments: The survey didn't took place. That is the reason why ICES didn't get the data.	These are not comments about supposed data transmission fails. These are comments about technical aspects of the sampling. They must be made inside the questions about the corresponding Annual Technical Report (Commission-Member State ping-pong process). The standard summer acoustic survey ECOCADIZ (not financed by the DCR) was not conducted in 2012 by the IEO due to lack of funding. In order to overcome this lack of information on the pelagic stocks, the Spanish Fisheries Secretariat funded that year an autumn acoustic survey, the ECOCADIZ-RECLUTAS 1112 (10 <sup>th</sup> – 27 <sup>th</sup> November 2012), aimed at the acoustic assessment of Gulf of	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
310	Spain	ICES	Ecoregion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian waters Stock: (anp-8c9a)White anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius) in Divisions VIIIc and IXa Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/ pub/Publication%20Repor ts/Advice/2013/2013/anp-	be increased to ensure adequate data for the assessment.	These are not comments about supposed data transmission fails. These are comments about technical aspects of the sampling. They must be made inside the questions about the corresponding Annual Technical Report (Commission-Member State ping-pong process). Spain does not agree with this comment. The anp-8c9a length sampling quality is the standar in Europe. In 2013 we have sampled 10% of the trips for the most important metiers, which is very high level.		satisfactory
312	Spain	ICES	Ecoregion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian waters Stock: (anb-8c9a)Black-bellied anglerfish (Lophius budegassa) in Divisions VIIIc and IXa Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/anb-8c9a.pdf	future development of improved assessment methods.	These are not comments about supposed data transmission fails. These are comments about technical aspects of the sampling. They must be made inside the questions about the corresponding Annual Technical Report (Commission-Member State ping-pong process). Spain does not agree with this comment. The anb-8c9a length sampling quality is the standar in Europe. In 2013 we have sampled 10% of the trips for the most important metiers, which is very high level.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage in increasing the sampling in the furture.	satisfactory
322	Spain	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ang-78ab)Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Divisions VIIb–k and VIIIa,b,d Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/	in discarding may be related to larger year classes recruiting in the fishery. Information from research surveys indicates an increase in smaller fish on the fishing grounds in recent years. Discarding is also known to be partly dependent on market	These are not comments about supposed data transmission fails. These are comments about technical aspects of the sampling. They must be made inside the questions about the corresponding Annual Technical Report (Commission-Member State ping-pong process). Spanish Anglerfish discards series since 2003 is sent updated each year to the WGBIE (former WGHMM) since 2007, but sistematically the Working Group finds deficiencies in the input data. WGHMM 2013 also mentioned that after an extensive analysis of discard data by WKFLAT 2012, discard estimates were considered not to be precise enough to be used in the assessment. Spain does not agree at all about that technical consideration, discard data are correct and with good quality. The rejection of discards	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to obtain reliable estimation of discards.	satisfactory

Issue ID	Í	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
325	Spain	ICES		1 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	These are not comments about supposed data transmission fails. These are comments about technical aspects of the sampling. They must be made inside the questions about the corresponding Annual Technical Report (Commission-Member State ping-pong process). Accurate estimates of growth parameters (Lee: 162.31; k: 0.088; t0:-0.894) for the Divisions VIIb-k of this stock of L. piscatorius were presented in the IEO study (Landa et al., 2013) and are available for the assessment of this stock using growth information. In addition to these growth parameters provided by IEO, it would useful to have also those from the other areas of this stock estimated by other European institutes for the stock assessment. Recommendation for an international collaborative study in age and growth of L. piscatorius was proposed by ICES (2014) and it could help improve.References: ICES. 2014. Report of	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve age & growth data.	satisfactory
344	Spain	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (nep-16)Nephrops on Porcupine Bank (FU 16) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/ pub/Publication%20Repor ts/Advice/2013/2013/Nep- VII-FU%2016.pdf	, , ,	These are not comments about supposed data transmission fails. These are comments about technical aspects of the sampling. They must be made inside the questions about the corresponding Annual Technical Report (Commission-Member State ping-pong process). Sampling coverage is not specific for Nephrops. Around 300 hauls and 10 to 12 ships are sampled each year for discards estimations in ICES Subarea VII. Spain does not agree about the supposed low coverage of discard sampling. A big quantity of information about FU 16 Nephrops was provided by Spain to the 2013 ICES Nephrops Benchmark (February), including discard rates and weight discard	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call	satisfactory
376	Spain	ICCAT	Task 1: fleet characteristics	Missing data	Please, check this comment because this information is sent	End-user/Commission to double chexk about missing data.EG	NA
379	Spain	ICCAT	Task 2	Missing data for: ALB-AN, ALB-AS, ALB-MED, BFT-MED, BET-AT and SKJ-AE	periodically by the Control Unit. Perhaps the problem is that it Please, chech this comment because this information has been sent as usual. We have not comments from ICCAT about	End-user/Commission to double chexk about missing data.EG	NA
	Spain	NAFO	Biological information (Sex, Length, Age)	Missing data for: 3M American Plaice	Fishery with TAC=0. This species was sampled in the international Flemish Cap Groundfish Survey and by observers on board. Achieved data of weight, sex-ratio an maturity@length transmitted in AR on Spanish Data Collection Programme 2012. Age data were performed by	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data cal. End-user/Commission to double chexk about missing data.	NA
392	Spain	IOTC	Longliners	No info on effort and length frequencies for any species but swordfish	We are checking this point	Seems that MS was in position to respond to the Data call but as not perform it properly.	unsatisfactory
393	Spain	IOTC	Purse seiners	No info at all on sharks	There are no data about sharks because they are collected by observers on board and the observers programme is cancelled since 2009 due to the insecurity provoked by piracy.	Seems that MS should be in position to respond to the Data call but as not perform it properly. MS to find a way to collect	unsatisfactory
395	Spain	WCPFC	TASK II data (Aggregate catch/effort data) and TASK III (operational data)	Missing the NUMBERS OF FISH information (considered as "HIGH" priority for assessments) Missing the HOOKS. (An estimate of hooks was provided but actual "HOOKs" for each set should be provided, according to the requirements) Missing HOOKS BETWEEN FLOATS (considered as "LOW" priority for assessments although it is a requirement in the data provision rules)	This information is complicate to obtain from the official data	Seems that MS was in position to respond to the Data call but as not perform it properly.	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatifactory
411	Spain	GFCM	Task 1 3 Economic component variables		2010/93.GFCM ask for information no stablished in the mencioned DecisionThe aggregation of the Task1 sent in 2013	In general the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users.  Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call	Satisfactory
421	Spain	GFCM	Task 1 4 Catch and effort variables catch effort discard bycacth		May 2014 Spain sent to the GFCM the Task1 2013 completed	In general the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call	Satisfactory
430	Spain	GFCM	Task 1 5 Provisional biological parameters		May 2014 Spain sent to the GFCM the Task1 2013 completed	In general the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call	Satisfactory

			Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatisfactory)
16	Sweden	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	No major deviations from the data call. FTE by gender by segment, which is optional for aquaculture data collection, was missing. The data set also covered aquaculture activities in fresh water.  See: http://datacollection.irc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Most of the data on aquaculture comes from registers. Collecting data on FTE by gender by segment separately has not been done so far.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
38	Sweden	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Capacity data for 2013 not submitted. See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Data is not reported for 2013 since there is no possibility to do the segmentation, which by the DCF definition is built on how the vessels fish, before the end of the year.	OK. No failure.	Satisfactory
74	Sweden	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Values equal to zero: "extraordinary costs, net" (all years). See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	SE confirms that "extraordinary costs, net" are zero.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
192	Sweden		Data call under Intercatch for: Dab in Subdivisions 22 - 32 (Baltic Sea)(dab-2232) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Age or length data for discards	Due to small landings of Dab, no biological sampling for landings are planned according to Swedish NP 2011-2013. Length distributions sampled in seasampling submitted in a separate document (as requested by WGBALFLAT). Intercatch requires mean individual weights for length data and could therefore not be used for lengths.	MS explanation is accepteble, MS landings of dab have been negligible in 2010-2012 according to WGBFAS 2013.	Satisfactory
193	Sweden		Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder pelagic in Subdivisions 22 and 23(fle- 2223) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Age or length data for discards	No biological sampling of landings of flounder in this area. Length distributions collected in sea sampling submitted in a separate document (as requested by WGBALFLAT). Intercatch requires mean individual weights for length data and could therefore not be used for lengths.	MS explanation is accepteble, MS landings of flounder have been 22 t in SD 22-23 in2012 according to WGBFAS 2013.	Satisfactory
194	Sweden		Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder pelagic in Subdivisions 26 and 28(fle- 2628) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Age or length data for landings	Limited biological sampling of flounder in this area. Length distributions submitted in a separate document (as requested by WGBALFLAT). Intercatch requires mean individual weights for length data and could therefore not be used for lengths.	MS explanation is accepteble, MS landings of flounder have been 15 t in SD 26 and -28 in 2012 according to WGBFAS 2013.	Satisfactory
195	Sweden		Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder demersal in Subdivisions 27 and 29-32(fle- 2732) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards	No biological sampling of flounder in this area. Length distributions submitted in a separate document (as requested by WGBALFLAT). Intercatch requires mean individual weights for length data and could therefore not be used for lengths. Estimates of discards not possible since for main fishery in this area (gillnet) no discard sampling is done fior this stock.	MS explanation is accepteble, MS does not perform the biological sampling of flounder in this area.	Satisfactory
196	Sweden		Data call under Intercatch for: Hake in Division IIIa, Subareas IV, VI and VII and Divisions VIIIa,b,d (Northern stock)(hkenrtn) WKSOUTH	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Age or length data for discards	Due to small landings of Hake, no biological sampling for landings are planned according to Swedish NP 2011-2013. Length distributions collected in sea sampling provided in a separate document. Intercatch requires mean individual weights for length data and could therefore not be used for lengths.	Sweden only has a small quota of hake in IIIa (<10% of Union TAC, ref. Reg. 43/2014) and negligible landings of the total stock. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
197	Sweden		Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Subarea IV (North Sea) and Division Illa West (Skagerrak)(had-34) WGNSSK	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Age or length data for discards	Due to small landings of haddock, no biological sampling of landings are planned according to Swedish NP 2011-2013.	Sweden has derogation for haddock and only small quota in Illa and IV (<10% and 0.5% of Union TAC, ref. Reg. 43/2014) and negligible landings (Illa: 209 of 2481 t, IV: 103 of 30379 t; WGNSSK 2013). Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
198	Sweden		Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IIIa (Skagerak Kattegat, FU 3.4)(nep-3-4) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	The data was sent one day after deadline since quality checks of data was not taken place as planned. However, the delay in data delivery did not have any impact on the assessment work in WGNSSK.	Explanation acceptable	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatisfactory)
319	Sweden		Ecoregion: North Sea Stock: (spr-kask)Sprat in Division Illa (Skagerrak – Kattegat) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Pu blication%20Reports/Advice/20 13/2013/spr- kask_201303102249.pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Even though the sampling intensity conforms to the DCF regulation, it does not provide a good enough representation of the fishery catches for use in an analytical assessment. Sampling intensity of commercial catches should be increased.	Presently, there are more problem with the surveys indices than with the commercial catches for the assessment of this stock. Main reason is that the surveys cover only part of the sprat distribution, commercial catches show coastal aggregations in areas not covered by the survey. Overall, sampling intensity of Swedish commercial catches in IIIA reflects the amount of landings. In 2012 we could have done a better job in Q1 (approx 4 samples per 1000 t), while in Q4 (when 79% of SWE catches are concentrated) our sampling effort has been much higher compared to the other countries (approx 9 samples per 1000 t vs. an average of 4 samples collected by DNK and zero samples collected by NOR). As shown in table 9.2.3 of the 2013 HAWG report the level of sampling of the Swedish commercial catches is not the bottleneck for the assessment of this stock.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call. In this contxt it is irrelevant what other MS do and what might be right sampling intensity considering the stock situationn. Nevertheless, it is good practice to adjust the sampling intensity to the actual requirements for the given situation.	Satisfactory
317	All countries exploring the stock		Ecoregion: North Sea Stock: (sol-kask)Sole in Division Illa and Subdivisions 22–24 (Skagerrak, Kattegat, and the Belts) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Pu blication%20Reports/Advice/20 13/2013/sol-kask pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Sampling of landings is complicated by the low total landings which are dispersed spatially. Comments: The problems of sampling intensity are due to the low landings.	Due to small landings of sole, no biological sampling of landings are planned according to Swedish NP 2011-2013.	Swedish landings of sole in Div. III and SD 22-24 have been 30 t (<10% of total). Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
372	All countries exploring the stock		Ecoregion: Baltic Sea Stock: (cod-2532)Cod in Subdivisions 25–32 (Eastern Baltic Sea) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Pu blication%20Reports/Advice/20 13/2013/cod- 2532_201304112231.pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Ageing inconsistencies Description: Ageing problems are a concern for the quality of the assessment.	Ageing is one area of quality concerns important for the stock assessment of cod in the Baltic. Ageing discrepancies between countries have been recognised for a long time but the recent trend in growth rate may have increased the consequence of this problem. Large inconsistencies exist in age determinations for the Baltic cod stocks owing to the lack of clear growth rings in the otoliths. ICES has attempted to resolve these inconsistencies in age determinations for this stock, but no consensus was reached on the age determinations. A EU-funded study initiated in 2007 (project DECODE) has taken a different approach to delivering validated aging data for the assessment, but this method is not fully validated from tagging studies. The SSB index used to provide this year's advice (2014), being based on lengths, excludes the problem connected with age estimation, bit as viewed only as an interim solution and the ageing problems needs to be resolved in order to generate an accepted analytical assessment.	MS effort to improve age determination quality is highly acknowledged.	Satisfactory
373	All countries exploring the stock			Type of issue: Data quality - Improve discards sampling Description: The uncertainty of the discard estimates is of concern. Discarding practices are controlled by factors such as market price and cod catches. Given the high variability in the discard ratios, estimating discards is very uncertain without an extensive sampling programme	The statement that discarding practices of flounder are controlled by factors such as market price and cod catches is of relevance. Also the statement that the high variability in the discard ratios, estimating discards is very uncertain without an extensive sampling programme.  Discard data on flounder are collected in sea sampling on trawlers targeting cod, and follows the planned sampling level for that fishery. To increase sampling level due to flounder would just not be economically justifiable.	MS explanation is accepteble.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatisfactory)
17	United Kingdom	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	UK didn't respect the deadline of the data call. During 2013 data call for aquaculture data UK provided data for 2011, the other part of the data set been imported from 2012 data call data base. Compared to 2012 data call the coverage of UK data (reference year 2011) improved, however most of indicators were still missing on the segment level. For DCF data, the following parameters were missing: Turnover 2008-2010 segment level; Subsidies and other income 2008-2011 segment level; Wages and salaries and other operating costs 2008-2010 segment level; Imputed value of unpaid labour 2009-2010, no data on the segment level for 2008-2011; Energy costs, raw material costs and repair and maintenance 2008-2010; Depreciation, financial costs net, Extraordinary costs net, net investments, debt, raw material volume 2008-2010, 2011 data provided only on national total level; Total value of assets no data on segment level; Total sales volume 2008-2010; Employment - no data on segment level; Number of enterprises by size category – no data on segment level. See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	The UK is aware of the deficiencies in supply of aquaculture data including scope of collection, timeliness and quality. A pilot study was conducted in 2013 to determine DCF obligations could best be met. The pilot is being transitioned to full data collection to address the 2014 data call.	Insufficient justification for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
39	United Kingdom	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Capacity data for 2013 not submitted. See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Total capacity was provided but figures by segment for 2013 only were omitted in error. The more detailed data were available as for the other years that were provided.	OK. No failure.	Satisfactory
53	United Kingdom	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	GBR (without Scotland) no data provided until during EWG 13 06. Data submitted to the upload facility only between EWG 13-06 and EWG 13-13.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Data were provided electronically in advance of the meeting. There was confusion caused by problems with FTP upload during the meeting. JRC agreed to delete this comment - see email chain	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
75	United Kingdom	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Although the data were submitted only one day after the deadline, the final figures uploaded after the conclusion of the STECF EWG 13-15 meetings. The following economic variables were not provided: "male employees" and "female employees" (also "total employees", which was requested although not mandatory, was not provided); "subsidies"; "extraordinary costs, net"; "other income". No information on enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity.  See: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage	Seafish will collect data on subsidies, other income, unpaid labour costs and extraordinary costs in the future and the survey form has been updated to reflect this. As work is already underway for the 2012 financial data survey, Seafish will ensure to contact processors who participate in the survey in order to obtain this additional data for reference year 2012.	Insufficient justification for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
199	United Kingdom (Channel Island Guernsey)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Divisions VIIe-k (Celtic Sea cod)(cod-7e-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Guernsey has never supplied data directly to ICES working groups and their landings data has always been requested by UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days after the deadline.	Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatisfactory)
200	United	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for:	Delay:	Guernsey has never supplied data directly to ICES working		Satisfactory
	Kingdom		Plaice in Division VIIe	after deadline	groups and their landings data has always been requested by		
	(Channel		(Western Channel)(ple-echw)		UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by		
	Island		WGCSE		UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days	Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are	
	Guernsey)				after the deadline.	communicated to the stock coordinator.	
201	United	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for:	Delay:	Guernsey has never supplied data directly to ICES working		Satisfactory
	Kingdom		Sole in Division VIIe (Western	after deadline	groups and their landings data has always been requested by		
	(Channel		Channel)(sol-echw) WGCSE		UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by		
	Island				UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days	Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are	
	Guernsey)				after the deadline.	communicated to the stock coordinator.	
202	United	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for:	Delay:	Guernsey has never supplied data directly to ICES working		Satisfactory
	Kingdom		Whiting in Division VIIe-k(whg-	after deadline	groups and their landings data has always been requested by		
	(Channel		7e-k) WGCSE		UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by		
	Island				UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days	Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are	
	Guernsey)				after the deadline.	communicated to the stock coordinator.	
203	United	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for:	Delay:	Guernsey has never supplied data directly to ICES working		Satisfactory
	Kingdom		Pollack in Subareas VI and VII	after deadline	groups and their landings data has always been requested by		
	(Channel		(Celtic Sea and West of		UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by		
	Island		Scotland)(pol-celt) WGCSE		UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days	Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are	
	Guernsey)				after the deadline.	communicated to the stock coordinator.	
204	United	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for:	Delay:	Jersey has never supplied data directly to ICES working		Satisfactory
	Kingdom		Cod in Divisions VIIe-k (Celtic	after deadline	groups and their landings data has always been requested by		
	(Channel		Sea cod)(cod-7e-k) WGCSE		UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by		
	Island Jersey)				UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days	Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are	
					after the deadline.	communicated to the stock coordinator.	
205	United	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for:	Delay:	Jersey has never supplied data directly to ICES working		Satisfactory
	Kingdom		Plaice in Division VIIe	after deadline	groups and their landings data has always been requested by		
	(Channel		(Western Channel)(ple-echw)		UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by		
	Island Jersey)		WGCSE		UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days	Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are	
					after the deadline.	communicated to the stock coordinator.	
206	United	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for:	Delay:	Jersey has never supplied data directly to ICES working		Satisfactory
	Kingdom		Sole in Division VIIe (Western	after deadline	groups and their landings data has always been requested by		
	(Channel		Channel)(sol-echw) WGCSE		UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by		
	Island Jersey)				UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days	Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are	
					after the deadline.	communicated to the stock coordinator.	
207	United	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for:	Delay:	Jersey has never supplied data directly to ICES working		Satisfactory
	Kingdom		Pollack in Subareas VI and VII	after deadline	groups and their landings data has always been requested by		
	(Channel		(Celtic Sea and West of		UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by		
	Island Jersey)		Scotland)(pol-celt) WGCSE		UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days	Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are	
					after the deadline.	communicated to the stock coordinator.	
208	United	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for:	Delay:	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively	Satisfactory
	Kingdom		Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius	after deadline	are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a	of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and	
	(England)		and L. budegassa) in Division		final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG	particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock	
			IIIa and Subareas IV and		commences. This deadline was met but was just after the	coordinator.	
			VI(ang-ivvi) WGCSE		official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior		
					to the WG).		

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatisfactory)
209	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Divisions VIIe-k (Celtic Sea cod)(cod-7e-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
210	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(cod-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
211	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(cod-scow) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
212	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Divisions VIIb,c,e- k(had-7b-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
213	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(had-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
214	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(had-scow) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
215	United Kingdom (England)	ICES		Missing data: Discards data Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatisfactory)
216	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIb,c,j,k (Porcupine Bank, FU 16)(nep- 16) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings	No data collected so none to report.	Nephrops FU16 not planned in MS NP 2012. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
217	United Kingdom (England)	ICES		Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
218	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Divisions VIIh-k (Southwest of Ireland)(ple-7h- k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
219	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Divisions VIIf,g (Celtic Sea)(ple-celt) WGCSE	· ·	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
220	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIIe (Western Channel)(ple-echw) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
221	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(ple-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
222	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Divisions VIIIk (Southwest of Ireland)(sol-7h- k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatisfactory)
223	United Kingdom (England)	ICES		Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIIe (Western Channel)(sol-echw) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
225	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(sol-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
226	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIIe-k(whg- 7e-k) WGCSE	,	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(whg-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
228	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(whg-scow) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
229	United Kingdom (England)	ICES		Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatisfactory)
	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Subarea IV (North Sea), Divison VIId (Eastern Channel) and IIIa West (Skagerrak)(cod- 347d) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 5 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Five days are serious but not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
231	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Subarea IV (North Sea) and Division Illa West (Skagerrak)(had-34) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 5 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Five days are serious but not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
232	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IVa (Norwegian Deeps, FU 32)(nep- 32) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	All Nephrops data for IV are uploaded in the same file, so I have no idea why FU32 is reporting data as being late.	Nephrops FU32 not planned in MS NP 2012. Only FU05 to FU10 are identified in the NP for North Sea. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
233	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IVbc (Botney Gut - Silver Pit, FU 5)(nep-5) WGNSSK	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards	No data collected so none to report.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
234	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIId (Eastern Channel)(ple-eche) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 5 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Five days are serious but not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
235	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice Subarea IV (North Sea)(ple-nsea) WGNSSK	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Age or length data for discards Delay: after deadline	ditto. Stock is not sampled for age or length. Most landings are made into overseas ports and landings cannot be sampled.	According to 2012 AR, 23749 plaices were measured by UK in subarea IV (landings + discards, table III.C.5). MS to provide data. Bi-lateral agreements (contracts) should be established if significant landings are made	Unsatisfactory
236	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Saithe in Subarea IV (North Sea) Division Illa West (Skagerrak) and Subarea VI (West of Scotland and Rockall)(sai-3a46) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 5 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Five days are serious but not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
237	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIId (Eastern Channel)(sol-eche) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 5 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Five days are serious but not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatisfactory)
238	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Subarea IV (North Sea)(sol-nsea) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 5 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Five days are serious but not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
239	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting Subarea IV (North Sea) & Division VIId (Eastern Channel)(whg-47d) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 5 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Five days are serious but not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
	United Kingdom (Isle of Man)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(cod-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	The Isle of Man has never supplied data directly to ICES working groups and their landings data has always been requested by UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
	United Kingdom (Isle of Man)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(had-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	The Isle of Man has never supplied data directly to ICES working groups and their landings data has always been requested by UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercat	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
	United Kingdom (Isle of Man)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(ple-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	The Isle of Man has never supplied data directly to ICES working groups and their landings data has always been requested by UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercat	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
243	United Kingdom (Isle of Man)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(sol-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	The Isle of Man has never supplied data directly to ICES working groups and their landings data has always been requested by UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercat	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
	United Kingdom (Isle of Man)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(whg-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	The Isle of Man has never supplied data directly to ICES working groups and their landings data has always been requested by UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercat	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
	United Kingdom (Isle of Man)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Pollack in Subareas VI and VII (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland)(pol-celt) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	The Isle of Man has never supplied data directly to ICES working groups and their landings data has always been requested by UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercat	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crusial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
246	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Hake in Division IIIa, Subareas IV, VI and VII and Divisions VIIIa,b,d (Northern stock)(hkenrtn) WKSOUTH	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Age or length data for discards	Data call for WKSOUTH not recievd. Landings and discard data provided for Hake in VII under WGBIE	Based on the informationn ready available, it is impossible to sort out who to blaime in this situation.	NA

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatisfactory)
247	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Division IIIa and Subareas IV and VI(ang-ivvi) WGCSE	-	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
248	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Divisions VIIe-k (Celtic Sea cod)(cod-7e-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
249	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(cod-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
250	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(cod-scow) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
251	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Divisions VIIb,c,e- k(had-7b-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
252	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES		Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
253	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES		Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
254	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Megrim (Lepidorhombus spp) in Divisions IVa and VIa(meg- 4a6a) WGCSE	Missing data: Discards data Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatisfactory)
255	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIa (South Minch, FU 12)(nep-12) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIa (Firth of Clyde + Sound of Jura, FU 13)(nep-13) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIa (Irish Sea East, FU 14)(nep-14) WGCSE	· · ·	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIa (Irish Sea West, FU 15)(nep-15) WGCSE	•	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
260	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIg (Celtic Sea, the Smalls, FU 22)(nep-22) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Divisions VIIf,g (Celtic Sea)(ple-celt) WGCSE	•	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES		Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
263	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES		Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatisfactory)
264	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(sol-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
265	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIIe-k(whg- 7e-k) WGCSE	· ·	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
266	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(whg-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
267	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES		Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
268	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Grey gurnard in Subarea VI and Divisions VIIa-c and e-k (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland)(gug-celt) WGCSE	Missing data: Landings data Delay: after deadline	All relevant and mandatory data avaiable uploaded. Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
269	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Pollack in Subareas VI and VII (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland)(pol-celt) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
270	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Hake in Division IIIa, Subareas IV, VI and VII and Divisions VIIIa,b,d (Northern stock)(hkenrtn) WKSOUTH	Delay: after deadline	Many years data requested within a short time (20 days) . They were submitted to stock coordinator on 15 Nov (provided for benchmark meeting WKSOUTH)	Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
271	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Division Illa and Subareas IV and VI(ang-ivvi) WGCSE	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Scotland are the stock coordinators for anglerfish. Knowing that work would not be started until all other MS had uploaded, this wasn't regarded as late. S Coor intent in making sure data supplied for other stocks first so the other S Coords were not delayed.	Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatisfactory)
272	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	European seabass in Divisions IVbc,VIIa and VIId-h (Irish Sea,	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Delay: after deadline	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not upload. Only 10T landed mainly into France.	Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
273	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Divisions VIIe-k (Celtic Sea cod)(cod-7e-k) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Delay: after deadline	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not upload. Only around 20T landed - mainly into Ireland	Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Cod in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(cod-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not upload.	Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
275	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Division VIb (Rockall)(cod-rock) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not upload.	Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
276	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Divisions VIIb,c,e- k(had-7b-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not upload.	Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
277	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES		Delay: after deadline	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not upload.	Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
280	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Megrim (Lepidorhombus spp)	Missing data: Discards data Delay: after deadline	Landings data submitted 2 days late. Discards estimates calculated for VI rather than VIa so could not be re-process within deadline.	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
281	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES		Delay: after deadline	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not upload.	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crusial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
282	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIb,c,j,k (Porcupine Bank, FU 16)(nep- 16) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings	From 2013 data call, the stock assessors were <b>not expecting</b> length frequency data from FU16. Also, all catches by Scottish vessels are landed into Ireland. All catches from this FU are, apparently, frozen at sea so no sampling is possible.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatisfactory)
285	United	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for:	Delay:	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much		Satisfactory
	Kingdom		Plaice in Divisions VIIh-k	after deadline	of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to		
	(Scotland)		(Southwest of Ireland)(ple-7h-		IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond	
			k) WGCSE		upload.	according to the data call.	
286	United	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for:	1 '	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much		Satisfactory
	Kingdom		Plaice in Divisions VIIf,g (Celtic	after deadline	of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to		
	(Scotland)		Sea)(ple-celt) WGCSE		IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond	
					upload.	according to the data call.	
-	United	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for:	,	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much		Satisfactory
	Kingdom		Plaice in Division VIIe	after deadline	of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to		
	(Scotland)		(Western Channel)(ple-echw)		IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond	
			WGCSE		upload.	according to the data call.	
288	United	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for:	Delay:	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much		Satisfactory
	Kingdom		Plaice in Division VIIa (Irish	after deadline	of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to		
	(Scotland)		Sea)(ple-iris) WGCSE		IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond	
					upload.	according to the data call.	
289	United	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for:	Delay:	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much		Satisfactory
	Kingdom		Sole in Divisions VIIf, g (Celtic	after deadline	of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to		
	(Scotland)		Sea)(sol-celt) WGCSE		IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond	
					upload.	according to the data call.	
290	United	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for:	Delay:	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much		Satisfactory
	Kingdom		Sole in Division VIIa (Irish	after deadline	of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to		
	(Scotland)		Sea)(sol-iris) WGCSE		IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond	
					upload.	according to the data call.	
291	United	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for:	Delay:	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much		Satisfactory
	Kingdom		Whiting in Division VIIe-k(whg-	after deadline	of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to		
	(Scotland)		7e-k) WGCSE		IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond	
					upload.	according to the data call.	
292	United	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for:	Delay:	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much		Satisfactory
	Kingdom		Whiting in Division VIb	after deadline	of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to		
	(Scotland)		(Rockall)(whg-rock) WGCSE		IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond	
					upload.	according to the data call.	
293	United	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for:	Delay:	This was inadvernently missed in the data call. Once		Satisfactory
	Kingdom		Grey gurnard in Subarea VI	after deadline	informed, Scotland provided data within 3 days.		
	(Scotland)		and Divisions VIIa-c and e-k				
			(Celtic Sea and West of				
			Scotland)(gug-celt) WGCSE			Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond	
						according to the data call.	
294	United	ICES		Delay:	This was inadvernently missed in the data call. Once		Satisfactory
	Kingdom		Pollack in Subareas VI and VII	after deadline	informed, Scotland provided data within 3 days.		
	(Scotland)	1	(Celtic Sea and West of				
			Scotland)(pol-celt) WGCSE			Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond	
						according to the data call.	

Issue ID	,	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatisfactory)
295	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIId (Eastern Channel)(ple-eche) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Attempted to upload within time limit. Upload failed. MS was only aware of the problem of failure some days later (at that point no email was automatically sent to report success or failure of upload). Attempted upload twice more with no success. Data were sent to the stock coordinator who attempted to upload 3 times with no success. Problem eventually solved.	In general it is advisable for the MS to plan the national deadlines in such ways that a certain margin is available to handle unforseen problems such as problem with upload etc. without violating the data call deadline.	Satisfactory
296	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice Subarea IV (North Sea)(ple-nsea) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Attempted to upload within time limit. Upload failed. MS was only aware of the problem of failure some days later (at that point no email was automatically sent to report success or failure of upload). Attempted upload twice more with no success. Data were sent to the stock coordinator who attempted to upload 3 times with no success. Problem eventually solved.	In general it is advisable for the MS to plan the national deadlines in such ways that a certain margin is available to handle unforseen problems such as problem with upload etc. without violating the data call deadline.	Satisfactory
297	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Saithe in Subarea IV (North Sea) Division Illa West (Skagerrak) and Subarea VI (West of Scotland and Rockall)(sai-3a46) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Data were submitted 10 minutes (GMT) after deadline	Is to be regarded as being within the deadline.	Satisfactory
298	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES		Delay: after deadline	Attempted to upload within time limit. Upload failed. MS was only aware of the problem of failure some days later (at that point no email was automatically sent to report success or failure of upload). Attempted upload twice more with no success. Data were sent to the stock coordinator who attempted to upload 3 times with no success. Problem eventually solved.	ě ě	Satisfactory
302	United Kingdom	ICES	stocks Stock: (hom-west)Horse mackerel (Trachurus trachurus) in Divisions IIa, IVa,		UK(England) - No discard data. UK (Scotland) - no discard data	According to table III.C.5 of the 2012 AR, 2576 horse mackrels were sampled in length, of wich 1808 from the discards. This refute the excuse given in the responce from the MS.	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatisfactory)
328	United Kingdom	ICES	Stock: (cod-rock)Cod in Division VIb (Rockall) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/	Type of issue: Data quality - No biological sampling Description: Available data provide information on landings only. There are doubts on the accuracy of the reported landings as these are reported by vessels operating in both Divisions VIa and VIb.  Comments: Landings of this stock are very low (32 tonnes on 2012), which is the reason for the lack of biological sampling	UK(England) - no sampling! UK(Scotland) - no sampling, but note: this stock is not assessed by ICES and as the comments under the 'Issue' column makes clear itself, landings are very low; it is meaningless to consider biological sampling for assessment/mangement purposes	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call. MS to be encourage to put in place biological sampling	Satisfactory
331	United Kingdom	ICES	Stock: (cod-scow)Cod in Division VIa (West of Scotland) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/ Publication%20Reports/Advice	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Discard information is imprecise compared to landings data because of lower sampling coverage. Because catch is now dominated by discards it is very important to maintain the highest possible sampling (observer) coverage of vessels in Division VIa. Comments: Note that discards are available from Scottish and Irish trawlers are used in the assessment.	UK (England) No sampling MSS samples according to clearly defined sampling frames within a statistically sound sampling scheme as developed within ICES expert groups. Market-based sampling intensity across sample frames are distributed in proportion to landings and observer 'at-sea' sampling is also proportionate. For both market and at-sea observations, sampling is probabilistic.	Seems that MS should be in position to provide the	Unsatisfactory
334	United Kingdom	ICES	Stock: (gug-celt)Grey gurnard	data do not reflect the actual catches.  Comments: The landings values of the MS listed are very low	UK(England) most landings are recorded as GUX (mixed gurnards). Attempt made to provide estimate of grey gurnard component using relevant survey data. UK(Scotland) MSS samples according clearly defined sampling frames within a statistically sound sampling scheme as developed within ICES expert groups. Market-based sampling intensity across sample frames are distributed in proportion to landings and observer 'at-sea' sampling is also proportionate. For both market and at-sea observations, sampling is probabilistic.	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond according to the data call.	satisfactory
340	United Kingdom	ICES	Stock: (had-7b-k)Haddock in Divisions VIIb–k Reference:	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: There is considerable uncertainty around the estimated discard numbers-at-age due to the diverse fishing (and discarding) practices and relatively low numbers of discard samples. Improving discard estimates would require a significant increase in the number of observer trips or other monitoring means.	UK(England) - no sampling! UK(Scotland) - not a stock of relevance to Scotland	Seems that MS should be in position to provide the requested data. MS to improve discard sampling.	unsatisfactory
342	United Kingdom	ICES	Stock: (nep-14)Nephrops in Irish Sea East (FU 14)	Type of issue: Data quality - Discards and length distribution data quality Description: No reliable length composition has been available since 2010 due to reduced sampling by the United Kingdom, and no up-to-date estimates of discard rates exist.	Increased sampling effort has been made in 2013 and 2014.	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond.	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatisfactory)
345	United Kingdom	ICES	Stock: (nep-16)Nephrops on	Type of issue: Data quality - Discards sampling intensity Description: Discard observer coverage is low and should be increased, to sample the landings and any discards that might be occurring.	E&W landings represent 2% of international landings. UK (Scotland) - all Scottish vessels land into Ireland. All catches are frozen at sea (by box) due to long fishing trip length. They cannot be sampled at port.		Satisfactory
351	United Kingdom	ICES	Stock: (ple-iris)Plaice in Division VIIa (Irish Sea) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/ Publication%20Reports/Advice /2013/2013/ple-iris.pdf	Type of issue: Data quality - Discards sampling intensity Description: The discard data are noisy and the assessment would benefit from increased sampling intensity. Discard information from Northern Irish and Irish Nephrops fleets became available for the first time this year, enabling improved discard estimates for the most recent years (2010–2012). Because no time-series of this information was available to be incorporated in the assessment model, the previous discards computation was used. However, the new discard information was used to quantify the catch advice.	? (WG benchmark issue)		Satisfactory
356	United Kingdom	ICES		Type of issue: Data quality - Age composition of younger individuals Description: The assessment is only based on age 4 and older; ICES does not have information on younger ages.	UK(England) - no sampling - minimal landings! UK(Scotland) - not a stock of relevance to Scotland	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond.	Satisfactory
359	United Kingdom	ICES	West of Scotland Stock: (ple-7b-c)Plaice in Divisions VIIb,c (West of Ireland) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Catches in this area are too low to support the collection of the necessary information for an assessment of the stock status. Comments: This stocks is a category 6 stock (by-catch) and landings(the necessary data for that category) data are available. Additional data to "upgrade" the stock is not available. The total landings of this stock is 29 tonnes.	UK(England) - no sampling - minimal landings! UK(Scotland) - not a stock of relevance to Scotland	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatisfactory)
360	United Kingdom	ICES	and West of Scotland) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/	Type of issue: Data quality - Biological data and landings figures Description: Some length frequency data are available for recent years, but area-specific data on life history parameters are missing and should be collected in surveys and through market sampling. Data on growth and maturity, as well as more information from the fisheries, are needed. Landings figures are incomplete and erratic and further scrutiny of this information is required.  More information is needed on: stock identity of pollack within the ICES area; details of the fisheries (more spatial detail in landings data – especially for the earlier years in the time-series, landings by gear, length compositions, discards); life history/biological parameters (surveys and commercial sampling); and recreational fisheries (catch and effort statistics).	? (WG benchmark issue) Reference to 'failures' can only be made to data collected from 2009 onwards under the present DCF as these are the only data that can be requested under the current regulation (Commission correspondence passim).		Satisfactory
265	United	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and	T (1 D) 19 (2 11 1 1 1	UK(England) - no sampling - minimal landings!	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond.	C .: C .
303	Kingdom	ices	West of Scotland Stock: (sol-7b-c)Sole in Divisions VIIb,c (West of Ireland) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Catches in this area are too low to support the collection of the necessary information for an assessment of the stock status. Comments: This stocks is a category 6 stock (by-catch) and landings(the necessary data for that category) data are available. Additional data to "upgrade" the stock is not available. The total landings of this stock is 44 tonnes.	UK(Scotland) - not a stock of relevance to Scotland		Satisfactory
			/2013/2013/301 70 c.pui			Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond.	
368	United Kingdom	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (whg-rock)Whiting in Division VIb (Rockall) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/ Publication%20Reports/Advice /2013/2013/whg-rock.pdf		UK(England) - no sampling - minimal landings! UK(Scotland) - no sampling, but note: this stock is not assessed by ICES and as the comments under the 'Issue' column makes clear itself, landings are very low. It is meaningless to consider biological sampling for assessment/mangement purposes	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond.	Satisfactory
371	United Kingdom	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (wgh-iris)Whiting in Division VIIa (Irish Sea) Reference: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/ Publication%20Reports/Advice /2013/2013/whg-iris.pdf	·	As the comments under the 'Issue' column makes clear itself, landings are very low. It is meaningless to consider biological sampling for assessment/mangement purposes	Seems that the MS has tried as musch as possible to respond.	Satisfactory
378	United	ICCAT	Task 1: fleet characteristics	Missing data	Task 1 and 2 forms sent but Task 1 fleet characteristics	AAC has to reply on this issue	NA
	Kingdom United Kingdom	ICCAT	Task 2	Missing data for: YFT	omitted in error.  No Yellowfin Tuna were landed in 2012	MS has to reply on this issue	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satifactory, unsatisfactory)
38	United	NAFO	Biological information (Sex,	Missing data for: 3M COD	there were no landings into the UK from the NAFO region		NA
	Kingdom		Length, Age)			Seems that the MS has reply possible to respond.	
39	United	IOTC	Long line	No info on length frequencies for any species	All was landed abroad into South Africa and Mauritania . Only		Unsatisfactory
	Kingdom				3 trips / 513 days fishing in 2013 attributable to the UK	Seems that MS should be in position to provide the	
						requested data. MS to improve discard sampling.	

# ANNEX 4 – TEMPLATE OF THE EVALUATION FORM FOR THE ANNUAL REPORT EVALUATION

	Membe	er State:				lgement levels
			AR year Version of the AR reviewed	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level <10%
			Version of the NP proposal		No Partly	10-50%
				EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance		Yes NA	>90%
				!	INA	not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
General fr	amew ork		Are derogations listed?			Action needed?
National d	lata collect	ion organisation	Are delogations listed?			
Α		correspondent ar	nd participating institutes			
			Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?			
			Is there a national DCF website available?			
			Is the information provided on the website in line with legal			
			requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)? Is there an overview and description of contents of national			
			coordination meetings?			
	D		If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?			
В		and International Attendance of int	ternational meetings			
			Is Table II.B.1 complete?			
			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?			
	B2		ional and international recommendations			
			Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting			
			listed?			
			Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
			The the responsive details decopiable.			
		ation of the fishin				
Α	General c	lescription of the	fishing sector Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on			
			the NP implementation well described?			
В			Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?			
SUPRA-R	EGION Ba	Itic Sea, North Se	ea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic			
			Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
			Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
	B1 .	Achievements: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			
			Are the deviations explained?			
			Are the deviations justified?			
	B2		ults and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?			
			Are the deviations explained?			
			Are the deviations justified?			
	B3		onal and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?			
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
	B4	Actions to avoid s				
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?			
SUPR A-R	EGION Me	diterranean Sea	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
001 101 11			Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
	B1		esults and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
			proposal?			
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?			
	B2		ults and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given?			
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?			
	В3		onal and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			
			Are the responsive actions described?		<u> </u>	
	B4		Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
	B4	Actions to avoid s	shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
SUPRA-R	EGION Ot	her regions	to Table III D 4 complete and the control of the co			
			Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
			Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
	B1 .	Achievements: Re	esults and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			
			Are the deviations explained?			
			Are the deviations justified?			
	B2		ults and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?			
			Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?			
	В3	Follow-up of Regi	onal and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			
			Are the responsive actions described?			
	В4	Actions to avoid s	Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
•	Diele!-	l motio= ==!!	ariables			
С	Biologica	I metier related v	ariables Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?			
Region Ba	altic Sea		.ssautori ori ino. 1-4 given for edoff regions			
			lesults and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR			
			Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR			
			Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
			proposal? Are the deviations explained?			
			Are the deviations justified?			<del> </del>

Meml	ber State:				gement levels
		AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal		No Partly	<10% 10-50%
			EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
				NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
C2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal			
		Were CV estimates provided?			
		Were CV targets met?			
		Are the deviations explained?			
СЗ	Follow-up of Po	Are the deviations justified? egional and international recommendations			
C3	rollow-up of Ke	Were the relevant derogations listed?			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			
		Are the responsive actions described?			
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
C4	Actions to avoid			ı	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?			
Region North Sea	and Fastern Arctic	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
C1		Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR			
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR			
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
		proposal?		<u> </u>	
		Are the deviations explained?			
		Are the deviations justified?			
C2		sults and deviation from NP proposal		T	
		Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?			
		Are the deviations explained?			
		Are the deviations justified?			
C3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations			
		Were the relevant derogations listed?			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		,	
		Are the responsive actions described?			
C4	Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		<u>I</u>	
U4	ACTIONS TO SAOID	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
Region North Atlar	ntic			I .	
C1	Achievements: I	Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR			
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR			
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
		proposal?			
		Are the deviations explained?			
		Are the deviations justified?			
C2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?			
		Were CV targets met?			
		Are the deviations explained?			
		Are the deviations justified?			
C3	•	gional and international recommendations		T	
		Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			_
		Are the responsive actions described?			
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
C4	Actions to avoid				
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?			
Posion Made -	oon Con and Divis	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			L
Region Mediterran C1		k Sea Results and deviation from NP proposal			
01	.nomevenlents: I	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR			
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR			
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR			
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
		proposal?			
		Are the deviations explained?			
		Are the deviations justified?			
C2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal			
		Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?			
		Are the deviations explained?			
		Are the deviations justified?			
C3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations			
		Were the relevant derogations listed?		,	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			
		Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
C4	Actions to avoid		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
٠.		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
Region Other region			<del></del>		<del></del>
C1	Achievements: I	Results and deviation from NP proposal		I	
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR			
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR			
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
		proposal?			
		Are the deviations explained?			
	Data quality: Po-	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal	L	<u> </u>	
Co	quanty. INC				
C2		Were CV estimates provided?			
C2		Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?			
C2		Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?			
C2 C3		Were CV targets met?			

	Member State:			Judgement levels						
			AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level				
			Version of the AR reviewed		No	<10%				
			Version of the NP proposal	EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%				
			Overall compliance		Yes	>90%				
			o roran compilario		NA NA	not applicable				
					=======================================					
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG				
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?							
			Are the responsive actions described?							
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?							
	C4	Actions to avoid								
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?							
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?							
D	Recreation	onal fisheries								
			Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?							
Region Ba		A - I. I	Descrite and description from ND accounts							
	D1	Achievements: i	Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			1				
			proposal?							
			Are obtained derogations mentioned?							
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?							
	D2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal							
		Data quality: 110	Were data quality targets provided?							
			Were data quality targets met?							
			Are the deviations explained?							
	<b>D</b> 0	E-II	Are the deviations justified?							
	D3	rollow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?							
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?							
			Are the responsive actions described ?							
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?							
	D4	Actions to avoid								
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?							
Region No	orth Sea a	nd Eastern Arctic								
			Results and deviation from NP proposal							
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?							
			Are obtained derogations mentioned?							
			Are the deviations explained?							
	D2	Data quality: Bo	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal							
	DZ	Data quality. Ne	Were data quality targets provided?							
			Were data quality targets met?							
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?							
	D3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations							
		•	Were the relevant derogations listed?							
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?							
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?							
	D4	Actions to avoid	i shortfalls							
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?							
Region No	orth Atlant	ic	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?							
	D1	Achievements: I	Results and deviation from NP proposal							
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?							
			Are obtained derogations mentioned?							
			Are the deviations explained?							
	D2	Data quality: Re	Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal							
	J_	Data quality. No.	Were data quality targets provided?							
			Were data quality targets met?							
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?							
	D3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations							
			Were the relevant derogations listed?							
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?							
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?							
	D4	Actions to avoid	I shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?							
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?							
Region Me		an Sea and Blac	k Sea							
	D1	Achievements: I	Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP							
			proposal?							
			Are obtained derogations mentioned?		-					
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?							
	D2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal							
			Were data quality targets provided?							
			Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained?							
			Are the deviations justified?							
	D3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations							
			Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?							
			Are the responsive actions described?							
	D4	Actions to	Are the responsive actions acceptable?							
	D4	Actions to avoid	I shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?							
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?							
Region Ot	her regior									
	D1	Achievements: I	Results and deviation from NP proposal  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP							
			proposal?							
			Are obtained derogations mentioned?							
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?							
	D2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal		i					
			Were data quality targets provided?							
			Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained?							
			Are the deviations justified?							
	D3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations							
			Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?							

Member State:		er State:		Judgement levels							
			AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level					
			Version of the AR reviewed		No Double	<10%					
			Version of the NP proposal	EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%					
			Overall compliance		Yes	>90%					
					NA	not applicable					
				FINO COMMENTO	FWO hadanamant	FIMO					
			Are the responsive actions described ?	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG					
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?								
	D4	Actions to avoid									
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?								
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?								
E	Biologica	l stock-related v	ariables								
			Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?								
Region Ba											
	E1	Achievements: I	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?								
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP								
			proposal?								
			Are the deviations explained?								
	E2	D-1 B-	Are the deviations justified?								
	E2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?								
			Were CV targets met?								
			Are the deviations explained?								
			Are the deviations justified?								
	E3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations								
			Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?								
			Are the responsive actions described?								
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?								
	E4	Actions to avoid	shortfalls		<del></del>						
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?								
Region No	rth Sec -	nd Eastern Arcti	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		<u> </u>						
			Results and deviation from NP proposal								
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?								
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP								
			proposal? Are the deviations explained?								
			Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?								
	E2	Data quality: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal								
			Were CV estimates provided?								
			Were CV targets met?								
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?								
	E3	Follow-up of Re	gional and international recommendations								
		rollow up or no	Were the relevant derogations listed?								
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?								
			Are the responsive actions described?								
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?								
	E4	Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls								
	E4	Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?								
Region No			Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls								
Region No	rth Atlant	ic	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal								
Region No	rth Atlant	ic	Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?								
Region No	rth Atlant	ic	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal								
Region No	rth Atlant	ic	Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP								
Region No	rth Atlant E1	i <mark>c</mark> Achievements: I	Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?								
Region No	rth Atlant E1	i <mark>c</mark> Achievements: I	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal								
Region No	rth Atlant E1	i <mark>c</mark> Achievements: I	Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustfiled? sults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?								
Region No	rth Atlant E1	i <mark>c</mark> Achievements: I	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal								
Region No	rth Atlant E1	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re:	Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations sexplained? Are the deviations pushified?								
Region No	rth Atlant E1	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re:	Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? glonal and international recommendations								
Region No	rth Atlant E1	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re:	Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?								
Region No	rth Atlant E1	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re:	Are the responsive actions acceptable? shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? glonal and international recommendations								
Region No	rth Atlant E1 E2 E3	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re Follow-up of Re	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?								
Region No	rth Atlant E1 E2 E3	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re:	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? sults and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? glonal and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?								
Region No	rth Atlant E1 E2 E3	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re Follow-up of Re	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pushlified?  gional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is hortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?								
Region No	rth Atlant E1 E2 E3	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations yiustified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Ishortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?								
Region No	E2 E3 E4 diterrane	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re- Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pushtified?  gional and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  K Sea  Results and deviation from NP proposal								
Region No	E2 E3 E4 diterrane	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re- Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  Sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV stimates provided?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Ishortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  K Sea  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?								
Region No	E2 E3 E4 diterrane	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re- Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  & Sea  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP								
Region No	E2 E3 E4 diterrane	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re- Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV actimates provided?  Are the deviations justified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  & Sea  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with NP proposal								
Region No	E2 E3 E4 diterrane	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re- Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  & Sea  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP								
Region No	E2 E3 E4 diterrane:	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re: Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid an Sea and Black Achievements: I	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations putified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV astimates provided?  Are the deviations justified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant accommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  & Sea  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pusitified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal								
Region No	E2 E3 E4 diterrane:	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re: Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid an Sea and Black Achievements: I	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV stimates provided?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Ishortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  K Sea  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation from NP proposal								
Region No	E2 E3 E4 diterrane:	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re: Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid an Sea and Black Achievements: I	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pusified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  K Sea  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation seplained?  Are the deviation seplained?  Are the deviation prom NP proposal  Were CV targets met?								
Region No	E2 E3 E4 diterrane:	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re: Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid an Sea and Black Achievements: I	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pusitified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Are the deviations justified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  & Sea  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pusitified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?								
Region No	E2 E3 E4 diterrane:	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re- Follow-up of Re- Actions to avoid an Sea and Black Achievements: I Data quality: Re-	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pusified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  K Sea  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation seplained?  Are the deviation seplained?  Are the deviation prom NP proposal  Were CV targets met?								
Region No	E2 E3 E4 diterrane:	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re- Follow-up of Re- Actions to avoid an Sea and Black Achievements: I Data quality: Re-	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation spusitifed?  sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  k Sea  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pusifiled?  sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pusifiled?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?								
Region No	E2 E3 E4 diterrane:	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re- Follow-up of Re- Actions to avoid an Sea and Black Achievements: I Data quality: Re-	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation sustified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV stimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  k Sea  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  Sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV stimates provided?  Were the deviations pustified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant derogations from LM listed?								
Region No	E2 E3 E4 diterrane:	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re- Follow-up of Re- Actions to avoid an Sea and Black Achievements: I Data quality: Re-	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation spusitified?  Sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations spusitified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  k Sea  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pusitified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?								
Region No	E2 E3 E4 diterrane: E1 E2	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re: Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid an Sea and Blact Achievements: I Data quality: Re:	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pusitified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Are the deviations justified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  & Sea  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pusitified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pusitified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?								
Region No	E2 E3 E4 diterrane: E1 E2	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re- Follow-up of Re- Actions to avoid an Sea and Black Achievements: I Data quality: Re-	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV stripets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  k Sea  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  Sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV stimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations pustified?  Sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV estimates provided?  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the deviations pustified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls								
Region No	E2 E3 E4 diterrane: E1 E2	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re: Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid an Sea and Blact Achievements: I Data quality: Re:	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pusitified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Are the deviations justified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  & Sea  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pusitified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pusitified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?								
Region Me	E2 E3 E4 diterrane: E1 E2 E3	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re: Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid an Sea and Black Achievements: I Data quality: Re: Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation sustified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV stepts met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  K Sea  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  Sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV estimates provided?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?								
Region Me	E2 E3 E4 diterrane: E1 E2 E3	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re: Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid an Sea and Black Achievements: I Data quality: Re: Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation spusitified?  Sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations spusitified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions from LM listed?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  k Sea  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pusitified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations pusitified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Ishortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?								
Region Me	E2 E3 E4 diterrane: E1 E2 E3	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re: Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid an Sea and Black Achievements: I Data quality: Re: Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation sustified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Kesa  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  Sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the deviations pustified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the terevant deviation from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the treations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Is Nortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?								
Region Me	E2 E3 E4 diterrane: E1 E2 E3	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re: Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid an Sea and Black Achievements: I Data quality: Re: Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  (Sea  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  guonal and international recommendations  Were CV targets met?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?								
Region No	E2 E3 E4 diterrane: E1 E2 E3	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re: Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid an Sea and Black Achievements: I Data quality: Re: Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation sustified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is a cations to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  K Sea  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  Sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the deviations to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the deviations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines?								
Region Me	E2 E3 E4 diterrane: E1 E2 E3 E4 E1	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re: Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid an Sea and Black Achievements: I Data quality: Re: Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid sea Achievements: I	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation suptified?  Sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV stimates provided?  Were CV stimates provided?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is hortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  K Sea  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation Proposal  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviation sylustified?  Sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV estimates provided?  Are the deviations justified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future ac								
Region Me	E2 E3 E4 diterrane: E1 E2 E3 E4 E1	ic Achievements: I Data quality: Re: Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid an Sea and Black Achievements: I Data quality: Re: Follow-up of Re Actions to avoid sea Achievements: I	Are the responsive actions acceptable?  shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviation sustified?  sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant derogations listed?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?  Is a cations to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  K Sea  Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  Sults and deviation from NP proposal  Were CV targets met?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations pustified?  glonal and international recommendations  Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the deviations to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are the responsive actions described?  Are the deviations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines?								

Mem	ber Stat					Igement levels
			AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal		No Partly	<10% 10-50%
			version of the NF proposal	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
			,		NA	not applicable
				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
			Are the deviations explained?			
E3	Follow		Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations			
LJ	i Ollow-u		Were the relevant derogations listed?			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			
			Are the responsive actions described?			
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
E4	Actions t		shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
Transv	ersal varial	oles				_
			Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
F1	Capacity		13 Table III. 1 Complete and consistent with Art guidelines:			
	F11		ements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
			proposal?			
			Are the deviations explained?			
	F13		Are the deviations justified?			
	F13		s to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
F2	Effort		The delicits to avoid shortians in the ratale deceptable:			L
	F11	Achiev	ements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
			proposal?			
			Are the deviations explained?			
	F40		Are the deviations justified?			<u> </u>
	F12		uality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?			
			Are the deviations justified?			
	F13		-up of Regional and international recommendations	•		•
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			
			Are the responsive actions described?			
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
	F14		s to avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?			
F3	Landinaa		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
гэ	Landings F11		ements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
			proposal?			
			Are the deviations explained?			
			Are the deviations justified?			
	F12		uality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?			
			Are the deviations justified?			
	F13		-up of Regional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			
			Are the responsive actions described?			
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
	F14		s to avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?			
D			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
G1	rch surveys		Results and deviation from NP proposal			
٥.			Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP			
			proposal?			
			Are the deviations explained?			
			Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling			
			activities?			
G2	Data qua		sults and deviation from NP proposal			
	-	-	Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g.			
			no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?			
			Are the deviations explained?			
			Are the deviations justified?			
G3	Follow-u	of Reg	gional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning			
			Groups listed?			
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
G4	Actions +		shortfalls	L	I	1
	ouono t		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
of the eva	aluation of t		nomic situation of the aquaculture and processing industr	у		
			ning the aquaculture			
			Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?			
			Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR			
_			Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
A1	Achievem	ents: R	esults and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			
			Are the deviations explained?			
			Are the deviations justified?			
A2	Data qual		ults and deviation from NP proposal			
	•	-	Is respective data quality information given?			
			Are the deviations explained?			
			Are the deviations justified?			
A3	Follow-up		ional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			
			Are the responsive actions described?  Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
A4	Actions to		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	L		I.
~~	, willia ll	uvoid 3	or rotation o			

Member State:		her State:		Judgement levels						
			boi Giaio.	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level			
				Version of the AR reviewed		No	<10%			
				Version of the NP proposal		Partly	10-50%			
					EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%			
				Overall compliance		Yes	>90%			
						NA	not applicable			
					EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG			
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	EVVG COMMENTS	LWG judgement	EWG			
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?						
	В	Collect	ion of data concer	ning the processing industry		l .	l			
	_	0000		Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR						
				Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR						
		B1	Achievements: R	lesults and deviation from NP proposal						
				Are design and achievements consistent with the NP						
				proposal?						
				Are the deviations explained?						
				Are the deviations justified?						
		B2	Data quality: Res	sults and deviation from NP proposal			,			
				Is respective data quality information given?						
				Are the deviations explained?						
		В3	Fallow up of Doo	Are the deviations justified? gional and international recommendations						
		ь	rollow-up of Reg	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			1			
				Are the responsive actions described?						
				Are the responsive actions acceptable?						
		В4	Actions to avoid			l .				
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?						
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?						
٧	Module of	evaluat	ion of the effects o	of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem						
				d deviation from NP proposal						
				Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?						
				Are the relevant derogations listed?						
	4	Actions	to avoid shortfalls	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		1	1			
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?						
VI	Module fo	r manan	ement and use of	·		1				
٧.				d deviation from NP proposal						
		710111041	monto. Nesatis and							
				Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent						
				with the NP proposal?						
				Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?						
				Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?						
				Are the deviations explained?						
				Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?						
	2	2 Actions	to avoid shortfalls	The the deviations justified.		l .				
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?						
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?						
VII	Follow-up	of STE	CF recommendation	ons						
				Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?						
				Are the responsive actions described?						
				Are the responsive actions acceptable?						
VIII	List of acı	ronyms a	and abbreviations							
				Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?						
IX	Comment	s, sugge	estions and reflecti							
				Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?						
Х	Reference	es								
	_			Is there a complete list of references?						
ΧI	Annexes			Do the provided expense contribute ordered later of		1	1			
				Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?						
				support statements made in the main text:		i e	1			

ANNEX 5 – Exercise on the use of a qualitative evaluation

Compliance class		Compliance level	Points
No	N	<10%	0
Partly	Р	10-50%	3
Mostly	Σ	50-90%	7
Yes	Υ	>90%	10
NA	NA	not applicable	ı

2014	Module	BEL	BUL	CYP	DEN	EST	FIN	FRA	GER	GRE	IRL	ITA	LAT	LTU	MAL	NLD	POL	POR	ROM	SVN	ESP	SWE	GBR	HRV
	Compliance class	М	Ν	М	М	М	10	М	10	М	М	М	М	М	М	М	Υ	М	М	М	М	10	М	М
	OVERALL COMPLIANCE (%)	69.0%	0.0%	83.2%	86.2%	67.0%	90.0%	73.8%	91.6%	57.4%	79.6%	87.4%	80.2%	67.4%	68.8%	79.6%	94.6%	72.0%	61.4%	79.0%	74.8%	96.4%	77.2%	62.6%
Weight	OVERALL COMPLIANCE (points)	6.9	0	8.32	8.62	6.7	9	7.38	9.16	5.74	7.96	8.74	8.02	6.74	6.88	7.96	9.46	7.2	6.14	7.9	7.48	9.64	7.72	6.26
0.04	Module I	10	0	10	10	0	10	10	10	7	10	10	10	0	10	10	10	10	0	10	10	10	10	10
0.04	Module II	3	0	7	7	7	7	7	10	7	10	7	3	3	3	7	10	7	7	3	7	10	7	3
0.02	IIIA	10	0	10	10	10	7	10	10	10	10	10	3	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
0.12	IIIB	7		7	10	10	10	7	10	7	3	10	10	10	7	7	10	7	7	10	10	7	7	
0.14	IIIC	7	0	10	10	3	10	3	10	3	7	7	10	3	3	7	7	10	0	3	7	10	7	7
0.06	IIID	3			3	10	10	7	3	10	10	7	10	7	10	10	10	3	10	7	10	10	7	3
0.14	IIIE	7	0	10	7	3	10	3	7	7	7	10	7	7	10	7	10	7	3	7	7	10	7	7
0.06	IIIF	10	0	10	10	3	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	7	7	10	3	10	10	3	10	10	10
0.14	IIIG	7	0	10	7	10	7	10	10	3	10	7	7	10	10	10	10	7	7	10	7	10	7	10
0.06	Module IV.A			7	10	10	10	10	10	3	7	10			0	7	10	7	7	10	7	10	7	10
0.06	Module IV.B	7	0	7	10	10	10	10	10	7	7	10	10	10	0	10	10	7	10	10	3	10	7	0
0.04	Module V	10	0	7	10	7	10	10	10	3	10	7	7	10	10	7	10	10	10	7	10	10	10	10
0.04	Module VI	10	0	7	10	10	10	10	10	3	10	10	10	7	7	7	10	3	10	7	7	10	10	10
0.04	Module VII	10	0	10	10	3	0	10	10	7	10	10	10	3	10	7	7	10	10	10	10	10	10	0

Comments on the exercise on the adoption of a use numbers (3, 2, 1, 0) instead of using compliance class (Yes, Mostly, Partly, No) to create an overall compliance by MS, following methodology suggested by STECF EWG 13-07.

- 1. The EWG is of the opinion that the current subjective system should be replaced by a more objective way of calculating the overall compliance.
- 2. The EWG (13-07) have discussed and agreed the different modules in the Annual Report are not equally important and therefore a weighting factor for each module has to be agreed upon. Suggestions were made in 2013 but needs to be revised.
- 3. Instead of using No, Partly, Mostly, Yes in the overall compliance table, the numbers 0, 1, 2, 3 could be used accordingly. The top score for a MS would then be 3.0.
- 4. To calculate the overall compliance, the weighted average over all modules divided by 3 would result in a percentage fulfillment either presented in % or converted to a Yes, Mostly, Partly, No using the current limits (N=0-10%; P=10-50%; M=50-90 %; Y=90-100%)

#### ANNEX 6 - REPORT ON IMPROVEMENT OF EVALUATION PROCESS, STECF EWG 14-07

#### 1. Term of reference

"Evaluate how the exercise of Annual Report preparation and evaluation by STECF could be simplified in future, including through electronic filling in, and pre-screening of the Annual Reports, simplification of the Annual Report formats taking into account the achievements and conclusions from the STECF EWG 13-25."

The conclusions from STECF EWG report 13-25 (meeting STECF EWG 13-08) are in Annex I.

## 2. Current situation

## **Member states**

- Hand in a NP proposal which contains the plans for the data collection, including number of samples, days at sea, etc.
- Have to make their data collected publicly available, and often upload the data collected under DCF in international databases.
- Respond to data calls from end-users.
- Spend a lot of time and effort in preparing Annual Reports by compiling data, recommendations, clarifying deviations, and providing actions to avoid shortfalls.

#### **STECF EWG:**

- Carries out (a) pre-screening work, and then (b) a (re-) evaluation of the pre-screening results by 30 experts during a 5-day meeting.
- Although all experts do their best to focus on the content of the report and tables and on the data collection carried out -or deviations in the data collection-, it is difficult to study the AR in depth due to time constraints.
- The evaluation sheet used by pre-screeners and the EWG mainly focuses on completeness of tables, and consistency with the guidelines. The questions in the evaluation sheet are sometimes twofold, e.g. 'Are design AND achievements consistent with the NP proposal?', which in some cases complicates the evaluation.
- (pre-)screeners spend a lot of time on checking if the information is complete, if the reports contain all information, and if any deviations apply.

All in all, many hours and manpower is spent to provide and evaluate the Annual Reports. STECF EWG 14-07 assumes that the (pre-)screeners are the only experts that read the full report submitted by a MS, which means that in total approx. 15 (4 pre-screeners and 8 STECF EWG members, and may be some others) read (parts of) one report in detail. One could wonder if this is worth the effort spent by the MS in compiling the report.

# 3. Long-term scenario

# 7. Assumptions

The Commission is interested in:

- 1. Data collection:
  - a. If the data collection was carried out in accordance with internationally agreed best practice standards;
  - b. Which deviations occurred from the NP;
  - c. How the problems were solved/will be avoided in future;
  - d. If the data collected is useful, i.e. whether the data is fit for purpose.
- 2. Data transmission:
  - a. Whether data were transmitted (to international databases, by responding to data calls)
  - b. What required data has not been transmitted, and the impact of this non transmission, on the data end users i.e. Which data transmission deviations have occurred
  - c. Are those transmitted data in line with what has been reported in the previous years' AR as collected and achieved.
  - d. How problems with data transmission were solved/will be avoided in future.
- 3. How MS followed-up recommendations from end-users

## 8. The way forward

Given the still unclear situation on the future of the DCF, in particular with regards to the model to be adopted for the data provision, data storage and data management; and on the current regional differences in terms of the development and implementation of regional databases; this scenario shall be further developed when more detailed information on the future becomes available. However it shall be highlighted that regardless on the model adopted, for some regions much of the information the Commission is interested in is already available in international databases, which could be thought as one of the starting points to develop more efficient and effective methods to evaluate the MS's Annual Reports

By using the current databases as one of the sources of information for the DCF AR's, it may be as simple as developing a number of extra reports in order to support the evaluation process. It is clearly important that any reports would use standardised tables across all MS's to provide comparative reports. Database reports (extracts) can be used as the basis for consistency checks between NP, AR and data transmission. Deviations can then be spotted easily and automatically.

Evident problems could be automatically highlighted by using databases and the time of experts could then be used to focus on problems.

# 4. Improvement of AR evaluation process on the short term (for evaluation process AR 2014)

## 9. Assumptions

As the current reporting period is being concluded, there is little to be gained by putting an extra burden on MS to change fundamental things in reporting. Only functional changes in tables and/or text formats should be made. The current evaluation can be improved without major impacts on the MS.

The evaluation process should be made more effective. This means that the effort spent might not decrease, but at least means that the effort is spent in a better way.

## 10. Things to be kept

Apart from the improvements listed in the text below, it is important to keep in mind that the following things should be kept.

The information pre-screeners and STECF EWG 14-07 received prior to or during the meeting consisted of:

- AR tables by MS
- AR text by MS
- Evaluation sheets by MS (for STECF EWG 14-07 filled in with pre-screeners' comments)
- Data transmission information by MS, provided by end-users, with MS reply

and the following reference documents:

- AR reporting guidelines
- DCF derogations by MS
- Overview of ICES data calls
- ICES recommendations database

This information should be provided to the pre-screeners and evaluation EWG in future years. The pre-screeners were also provided with the most recent versions of the National Programme proposals (text and tables). Ideally, the subsequent EWG should also have easy access to these files.

The current system of pre-screening and evaluation by STECF EWG works well and should be continued in future.

During STECF EWG 14-07, the transversal variables were checked by a combined subgroup of economists and biologists. This should be continued in future.

## 11. Improvements: (First priority, easy implementation)

Many suggestions from STECF EWG 13-07 (report STECF-13-25) have been taken into account, which contributed to the evaluation efficiency and consistency. Below, topics listed in that reports as well as new suggestions for improvements are listed.

#### a. Reference years

There are two important things to mention related to reference years:

1. Due to the (unexpectedly) long running time of the current programme, there is a time-lag between the reference years as used in the NP (2007-2008) and the reporting year. Especially in the commercial fisheries, many changes have taken place. STECF EWG 14-07 recommends that MS are asked to update a limited number of targets in a separate table which can be used by the STECF EWG evaluating the AR2014. The update should be arranged in a simple way so MS will not have to spend much time on adding the information and sending the update. It should be checked if the update of the information also influences the text part of the report.

2. In the AR guidelines, 'reference year' is being used as the reporting year. In the AR tables, 'reference year(s)' sometimes seems to relate to the sampling/reporting year (e.g. III.B.3), and sometimes to the NP reference years (e.g. Table III.C.3). This should be clarified.

# b. Evaluation consistency

- 3. There shall be explicit and clear evaluation guidelines for the pre-screeners and the STECF-EWG. The guidelines should be publicly available well before the (pre-) screening of the ARs. The guidelines should **at least** contain:
  - a. Guidance on the allowable text/values in the columns of the evaluation sheet;
  - b. Guidance (decision tree) on how to report on follow-up questions, like 'Are deviations justified?' if no deviations were mentioned;
  - c. Guidance on how to evaluate and follow-up on Module IX (comments, suggestions, reflections);
  - d. Guidance on how to report on minor issues that do not need immediate follow-up but might be taken into account by the MS in next year's AR (e.g. make a comment with suggestion and write 'No action needed', or recommend action for next year's report);
  - e. Information on the final evaluation report format to be created for the MS;
  - f. For the comments of the pre-screeners', language standards should be introduced. The experts felt that at times the language used to describe data failure issues was too strong or unjustified. Some experts felt that diplomatic language should be used at all times. (Recommended by STECF EWG 13-07).
- 4. For consistency over years, provide evaluation results for the full period of the program (already recommended by STECF EWG 12-08) to the (pre-) screeners.
- 5. It is hard to evaluate information that is not in the report, especially regarding the "Actions to avoid shortfalls." Proposal: Add category 'Cannot be judged' in the evaluation sheet (recommendation from STECF EWG 13-07).
- 6. The questions in the evaluation sheet are sometimes twofold, e.g. 'Are design AND achievements consistent with the NP proposal?' which sometimes complicates the evaluation. E.g. in section III.G (surveys), the design can be consistent with the NP proposal, but the achievements might not be, as a result of unexpected problems (technical, weather, etc.). Suggestion: Split question into two where twofold complicates evaluation, being:
  - c. Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? (all modules where question occurs)
  - d. Is Table XXXX complete and consistent with AR guidelines? (all modules where question occurs) –the alternative is to change the question into 'Is Table XXXX consistent with the AR guidelines?', assuming that completeness is part of that, as splitting the question might only add information to the reporting quality of the MS.

## 7. Follow-up of STECF recommendations:

a. Prepare a list of the relevant STECF recommendations by MS (Module VII) before the EWG meeting evaluating the AR 2014.

b. Prepare a list of the relevant LM recommendations by MS (Modules III.A.3, III.B.3, III.C.3, III.D.3, III.E.3, III.F.2, III.F.3)

These preparations could be conducted by ad-hoc contract or EWG 14-18.

- 8. Module III.D (recreational fisheries):
  - a. Data quality targets: it is not clear how relevant the current quality targets are. It is recommended that either the evaluation questions are modified, or that sensible data quality targets are being developed.
  - b. Questions on derogations in III.D.1 and III.D.3 are confusing. It is not clear what the difference is. It is recommended that one of the questions is deleted.
- 9. It is not clear how to evaluate B3 "Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations", in the cases where MS don't explicitly mention their recommendations of the Liaison Meeting. Specifically, when the MS states that there are no relevant recommendations, should the evaluation of the EWG be "Not applicable (NA)" or "YES"?

# e. Reporting consistency by MS

#### 10. Related to the AR Tables:

- a. Module III.C:
  - i. Revise/merge tables III.C.3/III.C.4 and III.C.5/III.C.6 and remove redundancy, as it creates unnecessary work for MS and evaluation.
  - ii. Revise table III.C.5 as there are internal inconsistencies and the table is inconsistent with the requirements from the Decision. AR2013 of SWE and NED (section IX) contain details on the inconsistencies, which are also complied in STECF EWG 14-07 subgroup 4 report.
  - iii. Use current fish stock definitions in Tables III.C.5 and III.C.6.
  - iv. It must be clear in the guidelines that Table III.C.6 (when kept) should contain all species encountered during concurrent sampling, even those not included in Appendix VII of COM Decision 2010/93/EU.
  - v. For MS who now use statistically sound sampling procedures (in line with WKACCU, MERGE, PRECISE) different tables are required for the NP/AR as sampling by metier is not pursued. Eg III\_C\_3. A change to the scrutiny is also required as 'achievements by metier' are not relevant.
- b. Module III.D: add table as proposed by STECF EWG 14-07 (see figure below).

Table III.D.1 - Achiever	nents in recre	ational fisheries s	ampling [NEW TAB	LE]				NP years	
								AR year	
Region	R(FM)O	Species	Country	Year	Applicable	Derogation in place?	Type of survey	No. of samples planned	No. of samples achieved
Baltic Sea	ICES	Cod	DK	2013	yes	no	Questionnaires	125	110
Baltic Sea	ICES	Salmon	DK	2013	yes	no	Questionnaires	125	110
Baltic Sea	ICES	Eels	DK	2013	yes	yes			
Baltic Sea	ICES	Sharks	DK	2013	yes	yes			
North Sea & EA	ICES	Cod	DK	2013	yes	no	Questionnaires	125	110
North Sea & EA	ICES	Eels	DK	2013	yes	yes			
North Sea & EA	ICES	Sharks	DK	2013	yes	yes			
North Atlantic	ICES / NAFO	Salmon	DK	2013	na				
North Atlantic	ICES / NAFO	Sea bass	DK	2013	na				
North Atlantic	ICES / NAFO	Eels	DK	2013	na				
North Atlantic	ICES / NAFO	Sharks	DK	2013	na				
Mediterraen and Black Sea	ICCAT / GFCM	Bluefin Tuna	DK	2013	na				
Mediterraen and Black Sea	ICCAT / GFCM	Eels	DK	2013	na				
Mediterraen and Black Sea	ICCAT / GFCM	Sharks	DK	2013	na				

- c. Module III.G: Change the header of column L ("Planned target") into "Planned target according to NP" in order to be more specific and avoid misunderstandings.
- d. Table IV.B.1: The guidelines are not clear and can be misguiding regarding the segmentation of the companies by the number of employees. The segmentation mentioned in the guidelines is not mentioned in the regulation.
- e. Module VI.1: modify Table VI.1 in a way that data sampled under foreign flag also can be taken into account.
- f. Some AR tables (e.g. III.B.3, III.F.1) have become different from the NP tables in contrast to the original intention. This makes a sound comparison almost impossible and should by all means be avoided in the future.
- g. Synchronise column headers. E.g. in Tables III.B.1 and III.B.3, the Fleet segment length classes should be filled in. In Table III.B.1 the column header is 'Length classes' and in Table III.B.3 the column header is 'Fleet segments vessels length classes'.
- h. III.B: Separate reporting by each supra-region should only be mandatory when the MS does not apply the same methodology for all supra-regions. In all other cases, there should be one common text for all supra-regions under a heading that states all the supra-regions.
- i. It should be clear that in Tables III.B.1., III.B.2. and III.B.3., the reference year should be the same.
- j. Data in Table III.B.1 has to be presented separately for active and inactive vessels.
- k. It is not clear whether the data presented in Table III.B.3. must refer on unclustered as well as clustered segments. Specifically, guidelines are misleading in the following sentence: "Table III.B.2 should contain information on clustered segments, while information on clustering and on unclustered segments is to be provided in Tables III.B.1 and III.B.3.". It should rather read: "Table III.B.1 should contain information on segments which are not clustered or, in case of clustering, for clusters. Table III.B.2 should contain information on the clustering scheme. Table III.B.3 should contain information on all segments without having them clustered".

#### 11. Related to AR text:

a. Provide suggestions on how to report on Pilot studies (Portugal might serve as a good example for a suggestion: the pilot study reporting format is along the same lines as the AR reporting format.)

#### f. Data transmission evaluation

- 12. Split up 'non-submissions' for data calls by MS into the following categories:
  - a. Data collected by MS (following NP) and requested by end-user, but not submitted by MS
  - b. Data requested by end-user, but no data collection by MS (following NP)
  - c. Data requested by end-user before the planned date of data transmission defined by MS in the NP
  - d. Data submitted by MS in response to data call, but not used by the end-user

## g. Overall judgement

13. Change over-all judgement levels to "done well", "minor issues" and "serious problems"

#### h. Practicalities

- 14. Facilitate multiple file download at once from the web folder
- 15. Discuss screening guidelines for STECF EWG at the start of the meeting, by showing an example on the screen in plenary
- 16. Stick to the deadline for AR delivery. In exceptional cases, a postponed update of report prior to pre-screening might be accepted, but there should never be AR re-submissions between pre-screening and EWG evaluation. In case re-submissions occur, be clear to pre-screeners and STECF EWG which version to evaluate.

## 12. Further improvements in the medium term

## i. Evaluation consistency

- 17. Use a numerical scale and pre-defined weighting factors in the evaluation sheets. A first version was created and tested by STECF EWG 14-07. Scaling suggestions were provided and presented. It is important to further investigate how to combine the information into a final result. Based on the results of the exercise carried out during STECF EWG 14-07, the group recommends that this is taken into account by the subgroup that will work on the long-term perspective during the AR2014 evaluation STECF EWG.
- 18. (Re-)develop/update an electronic tool in order to support (pre-)screening with respect to terminologies and formats used and with NP figures. Some years ago, an R script was developed to do this exercise. There is one condition for automatic screening: formats should be consistent throughout MS. Although an electronic check will not be able to fully carry out the (pre-)screening exercise, a mix of automated screening and human screening is most adequate as by using electronic screening (pre-)screeners can concentrate on conceptual and compliance issues.

#### j. Reporting consistency by MS

## 19. Related to the AR Tables:

- a. Where possible and useful, facilitate consistent input, e.g. by the use of drop down lists. This action requires complete reference lists for a number of variables, listed in section 5 (Reference Tables) of this report.
- b. The stock area descriptions in the DCF do not always correspond with the ICES working group stock areas. Especially for data transmission, it is extremely important to compare

- the right stocks. It is recommended that stock description consistency between DCF/DC-MAP and ICES descriptions is checked for all stocks. Ideally, there should be no deviations between stock assessment units and stocks listed in DCF/EU-MAP tables.
- c. Table VI.1 (Data transmission): It is difficult to get a complete overview of all data calls relevant for the DCF. It is advisable to have a list of relevant data calls compiled on the basis of inputs from all end users (ICES, STECF, GFCM etc.). These lists should be available both for MS, pre-screeners and the EWG evaluating Annual Reports.

## 20. Related to text report:

a. VII (follow-up of STECF recommendations): store and update recommendations and their follow-up in a central electronic document, which MS can refer to. The ICES recommendations database might serve as an example, see <a href="http://community.ices.dk/admin/Recomendations/layouts/15/start.aspx#/SitePages/Home.aspx">http://community.ices.dk/admin/Recomendations/layouts/15/start.aspx#/SitePages/Home.aspx</a>

## 5. Reference tables

Variable	Used in AR table(s)	Reference list	Reference list to be
A 1,	NIA 2 NIA 2	available	developed by
Aquaculture	IV.A.2, IV.A.3		
segments	W.D.O. W.C.A. W.D.A		
Data collection	III.B.3, III.C.4, III.F.1,		
scheme	IV.A.2, IV.A.3		
Data sources	III.B.3, III.E.3, III.F.1,		
	IV.A.3, IV.B.2		
Expert/planning	II.B.1, III.G.1, VI.1		
groups and project			
acronyms			
Fish and shellfish	IV.A.1		
farming techniques			
Fishing ground	III.C.1, III.C.2, III.C.3,		
	III.C.5, III.C.6, III.E.3		
Fleet segments	III.B.1, III.B.2, III.F.1		
Fleet segments	III.B.3		
vessels			
Fleet segments	III.B.1, III.B.3		
vessels length classes			
Gear			
Indicator code	V.1		
Indicator description	V.1		
Metier	III.C.1, III.C.2, III.C.3,		
	III.C.6		
MS short codes	All		
Presentation	III.F.2		
Processing industry	IV.B.1, IV.B.2		
segments	,		
Region	III.A.1, III.C.1, III.C.2,		
	III.C.3, III.C.4, III.C.5,		

	III.C.6, III.E.1, III.E.2,		
	III.E.3		
RFMO	II.B.1, III.C.3, III.C.4,	Yes	
	III.C.5, III.C.6, III.E.1,		
	III.E.2, III.E.3		
Sampling frame	III.C.3, III.C.4		
(fishing activities,			
geographical			
location, seasonality)			
Sampling activities	III.G.1		
Sampling scheme	III.C.3, III.C.4		
Sampling strategy	III.C.3, III.C.4		
Species group	III.C.5, III.C.6, III.E.2,		
	III.E.3		
Species	III.C.5, III.C.6, III.E.1,		
	III.E.2, III.E.3, III.F.2, VI.1		
Stock	III.E.1, III.E.2, III.E.3, VI.1		
Sub-area	III.A.1		
Supra region	III.B.1, III.B.2, III.B.3		
Target assemblage	III.C.1, III.C.3		
Variable	III.B.3, III.E.3, III.F.1,	Yes for:	
	IV.A.2, IV.B.2	IV.A.2 (Annex	
		X of ??)	
		IV.B.2 (Annex	
		XII of ??)	
Variable group	III.B.3, III.F.1		

#### European Commission

EUR 26811 EN - Joint Research Centre - Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

Title: Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries. Evaluation of 2013 MS DCF Annual Reports & Data Transmission (STECF-14-13)

#### Authors:

STECF members: Abella, J. A., Andersen, J., Bailey, N., Bertignac, M., Cardinale, M., Curtis, H., Daskalov, G., Delaney, A., Döring, R., Garcia Rodriguez, M., Gascuel, D., Graham, N., Gustavsson, T., Jennings, S., Kenny, A., Kraak, S., Kuikka, S., Malvarosa, L., Martin, P., Murua, H., Nord, J., Nowakowski, P., Prellezo, R., Sala, A., Scarcella, G., Somarakis, S., Stransky, C., Theret, F., Ulrich, C., Vanhee, W. & Van Oostenbrugge, H..

EWG-14-07 members: Adamidou Angeliki, Armesto Angeles, Avdic Edo, Bell Margaret, Berkenhagen Jörg, Brigaudeau Cecile, Carpentieri Paolo, Davidjuka Irina, de Boois Ingeborg, Degel Henrik, Dias Marina, Ebeling, Michael, Hansson Maria, Jung Armelle ,Kazlauskas Edvardas, Knittweis Leyla, Moura Carlos, Nermer Tomasz, Ní Chonchúir Gráinne, RADU Gheorghe, Raid Tiit, Raykov Violin, Gambino Monica, Sintori Alexandra, Stransky Christoph, Stroie Constantin, Ulleweit Jens, Vandemaele Sofie, Yankova Maria, Zarauz Lucia.

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union

2014 -257 pp. - 21 x 29.7 cm

EUR - Scientific and Technical Research series - ISSN 1831-9424 (online), ISSN 1018-5593 (print)

ISBN 978-92-79-39783-7

doi:10.2788/12174

Abstract: The Expert Working Group meeting of the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries EWG 14-07 was held from 23 –27 June in Oostende to evaluate MS Annual Reports for 2013, the MS's data transmission to the end-users over 2013 and to identify actions to improve these exercises in the future. At the end 22 ARs were evaluated, 439 data transmissions issues from seven end-users were assesses and judged and the actions for the future were identified. The EWG report was reviewed by the STECF plenary14-02 held from 7 to 11 July 2014 in Copenhagen (Denmark).

# How to obtain EU publications

Our priced publications are available from EU Bookshop (http://bookshop.europa.eu), where you can place an order with the sales agent of your choice.

The Publications Office has a worldwide network of sales agents. You can obtain their contact details by sending a fax to (352) 29 29-42758.

As the Commission's in-house science service, the Joint Research Centre's mission is to provide EU policies with independent, evidence-based scientific and technical support throughout the whole policy cycle. Working in close cooperation with policy Directorates-General, the JRC addresses key societal challenges while stimulating innovation through developing new standards, methods and tools, and sharing and transferring its know-how with the Member States, the scientific community and international partners.

-----

The Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) has been established by the European Commission. The STECF is being consulted at regular intervals on matters pertaining to the conservation and management of living aquatic resources, including biological, economic, environmental, social and technical considerations.



doi:10.2788/12174