

National Coordination Meeting [IRELAND]

Data Collection Framework

Marine Institute, Oranmore, July 29th, 2016

Minutes and Action Points

Present:

Marine Institute (MI): Leonie O'Dowd (*LOD*) – National Correspondent, Gráinne Ni Chonchuir (*GNC*), Helen McCormick (*HMC*), Niamh Slattery (*NS*), Russell Poole (*RP*), Hans Gerritsen (*HG*)

Bord Iascaigh Mhara (BIM) (Irish Sea Fisheries Board): Herbie Dennis (*HD*), Emmet Jackson (*EJ*), Cathriona McCarthy (*CMC*).

1. Review of Action Points

Under 10m workshop: A workshop is planned as part of PGECON in Autumn 2016.

★ Action point: BIM to keep MI in the loop with regards to an under 10 workshop (*EJ*).

Open Access DCF website: Current MI DCF website needs to be updated.

★ Action point: Review MI DCF website and whether parts of it can be open access with some parts restricted to project partners. Check with DAFM if this could be linked to the DAFM EMFF website or if there needs to be a separate EMFF UP3 DCF website component as part of the DAFM EMFF site (*LOD*).

2. National Programme 2015 Annual Report and data transmission

DCF reports and evaluations, including annual report, cost statement and STECF comments: Annual report was well received; improvement in the fleet economics has been noted. In the other modules only minor issues have been noted.

★ Action point: Everybody to review circulated issues and get back to GNC by the end of week 5th of August.

Data calls: missing data for under 10s. This is a reoccurring issue and will be much improved for 2016. Clustering can cause issues. No issues have been noted for other data calls so far.

3. Current National Programme ~ 2016 (All)

- Biological sampling: Inaugural year for the 4S sampling, carried out for demersal port sampling, but not for pelagics or *Nephrops*. Working well for the port sampling scheme with new ports and sampling locations added.

- Sampling at sea is problematic and only 50% of the sampling targets have been met for demersal and *Nephrops* directed trips. Reasons are being investigated, but are believed to be a combination of the effects of the landing's obligation, the penalty point system and a limited pool of contractors. From next year refusal rates have to be recorded as well, which could further inhibit access to vessels. Sampling of pelagic trips are at 100% of targets to date.
- Sentential vessel data is good.
- Surveys at sea are on target with no vessel issues to date.
- Socio-economic aquaculture data: New variables are required. Information sources based on voluntary surveys are working satisfactory at the moment, but there are concerns that the additional data requirements will reduce response rates. Alternative sources should be investigated to reduce burden on voluntary sources. Some variables are sensitive and could alienate survey participants, e.g. education level. Should be seen in the context of the sector only.
 - ★ Action point: *HD* to liaise with other sections within BIM and other agencies to see if this data is already collected and available.
- Socio economic fisheries data: Data collection is linked to grant aids, which has improved the return rates of survey questionnaires. Self-declaration of economic data is possible for under 10s. Quality of data is poor and has high variability. For vessels over 10 meters permission to contact their accountants directly for the next 5 years is tied into EMFF funding for POs, this improves the data quality and data access. Overall the return rates have improved from 10% to 15%.
- Socio-economic data for processing sector: No issues to report. Data is still being made available.
- Data Calls: MI staff resource issues are currently being resolved, the new data manager team leader will work with DAFM/SFPA to improve access to data. Currently BIM are receiving the landings data from the SFPA and the effort data from the MI. For capacity reporting it has been agreed to use the EU Fleet register on the 31st of December.

4. DCF/DC MAP 2017 + New implementing decisions

- ★ Action point: LOD to circulate the presentation on new DCF legislations.
- Socioeconomics- main changes: Calculation of income is problematic, units are not defined. As a general issue, there is a problem with the renaming and definition of socio economic variables in the new EUMAP/Workplan template. Need to have a compendium of definitions

and “metrics” which explain how the variables are calculated to ensure clarity and consistency between member states. This was strongly recommended by PGECON and needs to be circulated ASAP before the national workplan is drafted. Units need to be explained and definition of categories, e.g. age classes, education level etc. need to be provided to have a unified approach among MS.

- Detail Aquaculture: Environmental data for aquaculture table 8: Mortalities are not a problem, but the data source for introduction of chemicals/medicines needs to be identified.
- ★ Action point: Check with MI- Fiona Geoghegan / Dave Jackson on availability of environmental aquaculture variables (*LOD/HD*).
- Recreational fisheries: With regard to the requirements in the new regulation for recreational fisheries there is currently only data collection programmes for salmon. National agencies will have to work together to address this gap and there could be serious funding issues as the DCF budget was fixed before the new legislations EUMAP and DCF work plan templates were published.

5. Clarification from the Commission on DCF/DC MAP 2017 + - Summary of teleconference:

Question Ireland: In terms of the processing we would like confirmation that the voluntary nature of this part of the data collection would still be eligible for funding under the programme and that the data ‘required’ would be table 11 which was removed from the more recent Annex document.

Answer Commission: Yes, eligible under Article 77 of the EMFF regulation.

Question Ireland: In terms of the new social variables for fisheries and aquaculture we still hold the opinion that some of these are not relevant. This is not likely to change, but we do need specific definitions regarding the meaning behind these variables and their unit of measure, which, as they stand are ambiguous. Variable definitions have been worked on through ad hoc contracts and at PGECON so we would like confirmation that these will be provided.

Answer Commission: The ad hoc contract on the methodology/definitions was completed and will be published on the DCF website. Any queries for clarification should be sent to the Commission (Bas and Venetia) who will pass this onto the inhouse experts dealing with the socioeconomic aspects of the DCF.

Question Ireland: In terms of recreational fisheries, Ireland has pre – approved derogations for recreational fisheries (table provided to the Commission). Does Ireland need to re – establish these derogations (re – do pilot surveys etc.) or can they be rolled over into the new programme?

Answer Commission: If the derogations have been approved on the basis of high survivability and/or low mortality on the stock (ie low levels/proportion of recreational catches in relation to commercial fisheries) these can carry on until the DCF recast is adopted as they are still valid under the current DCF. The basis for the derogation should be included in the NWP. In the future EUMAP, the basis for derogations will be the thresholds and it needs to be checked if current derogations are still valid. Some recreational fisheries have no agreed thresholds so they must be collected. International agreements supersede EU agreements and need to be covered.

Question Ireland: Previous derogation for Biological sampling, eg seed mussel derogation?

Answer Commission: need to check what basis was used for the derogations and if this is still holds under the new EUMAP.

Question Ireland: In terms of EMFF indicators, how is the indicator “% of data calls fulfilled” calculated and how do the timelines of the evaluation process fit in with the requirements of the EMFF annual implementation report due in May?

Answer Commission: This is still being developed by the EMFF expert group.

Question Ireland: In terms of WP deadlines, the email from the Commission (18.7.2016) stated that the NP should be submitted before the legal deadline in order to facilitate evaluation by STECF, can you elaborate?

Answer Commission: The legal deadline is the 31st of October, but STECF is meeting on the 7th of November. The commission needs to pre-screen the workplans. Hence the commission urges MS to have the NWP submitted at least two weeks before the STECF meeting. The commission is putting together a repository for common questions and queries to circulate to the RCMs. MS should provide any comments/problems to the Commission and to the appropriate RCM chair for consideration by the RCMs.

Question Ireland: Where can we access the final reports of the studies funded under regional grants 'MARE/2014/19'?

Answer Commission: Final reports are currently being reviewed and will be available on the DCF website shortly.

Question Ireland: EM Map Annex Table 1A: will it be sufficient to list the stocks for which the MS has either landings or a TAC share?

Answer Commission: Prefers to have all the stocks listed but only for the geographical regions applicable to MS. This will allow easy comparison to other MS.

Question Ireland: Table 1B: 'Frequency' this is likely to be different for different parameters (e.g length: quarterly, maturity: annual)

Answer Commission: Agrees, proposes a frequency code. Asks for all issues that need to be communicated to the RCMs to be sent to the Commission in advance of the RCMs.

Question Ireland: Table 4D: How is this table informative; there is no way to split the landings to match the sampling programme, e.g. demersal/pelagic/shellfish.

Answer Commission: Allows MS to have a description of the populations and or sampling units within their sampling scheme. The rationale behind these table columns is explained in the fish pie project and will be disseminated as final report on the DCF website.

Question Ireland: Table 4D: Fishing grounds to be agreed at marine regional level on the basis of existing areas defined by RFMO or scientific bodies. What needs to go in here?

Answer Commission: Table is very flexible, fishing ground can be added if available.

Question Ireland: Table 5A: 'Is the sampling design documented' what about documents that are not available online?

Answer Commission: Add link or explain that document is not online. The aim is to have the methodology/design fully documented and available.

Question Ireland: Table 6A: is the year of implementation not the same as the year the data are collected?

Answer Commission: Mostly, but for economic variables it may be the previous year.

Question Ireland: IMPLEMENTING DECISION- work plan template- Table 1A: is there a difference between two stocks that are given on separate lines (e.g. Conger in X and Conger in all areas excluding X) and stocks that are separated by a dash (e.g. Herring n VIa/VIaN/VIaS etc)?

Answer Commission: Stock break down in table 1 A should be reviewed by RCMs and endusers (not Commission), as not consistent. Multiple stock entries in single rows could have been entered to reduce size of table in legal document. The table can be improved for the next legal version.

Question Ireland: Quality assurance 5a & 5b

STECF plenary made reference to recommendations 16/08.

Question Ireland: Will there be a more detailed structure of the work plan and guidelines for the submission?

Answer Commission: Yes these will be published on the DCF website.

★ **Action Point for all:** Document any issues when filling in the tables to report back to the commission and appropriate RCM chair before the RCMs. It is hoped there will be a RCM repository to address common questions and queries.

6. DCF 2017 National Programme – planning ahead (All)

★ **Action points:**

- Compile document listing the agencies responsible for the different data required under the DCF, ie MI, BIM, SFPA, DAFM (EJ/LOD).
- Ensure DAFM are fully aware of data sets used for data calls. Issues around who is responsible for data quality, SFPA collect it, MI and BIM report on it. Similar issue for recreational data collected by DAFM, IFI & MI. Needs to be agreements (MOU's) put in place.
- Subgroup under 10m – possible in October/November depending on PGECON workshop. To include SFPA?
- Sentinel Programme- the utility is being queried: Meeting with EJ and OT to discuss sentinel programme. A goal is to disseminate data back to the fishermen. Should be a discussion point under the NIFs and RIFs (EJ to discuss with IL & MK-BIM).
- All – to start filling out the tables and noting any issues arising between now and end of August. Phone conference between all 2 weeks before RCM to go through progress and issues. Provisional target of 21st of October to submit Irelands new national workplan.