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**Purpose of the Guidance**

The Guidance for the submission of Annual Reports (AR) under the framework Council Regulation (EC) 199/2008, and implementing Commission Regulation (EC) 665/2008 and Commission Decision 2010/93/EU (the 'Data Collection Framework' or DCF), is intended to help Member States (MS) in producing Annual Reports that contain all the necessary information for evaluation by the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) and the European Commission (EC).

**Years of application and periodical revision of the Guidance**

The present document contains the 2016 version of the Guidance, based on a review of the Guidance by the STECF EWG 15-15 (Hamburg, November 2015) and ad-hoc contract work, taking into account the recommendations and suggestions of the EWG 15-10 (Gdynia, June 2015). This Guidance is designed to assist MS’s in reporting their achievements in the ARs for the years 2015-2016.

The present revision of the guidance (January 2016) replaces the text and standard tables of the previous version of these documents (26 February 2015).

Tables of the National Programmes (NP) can be maintained as in the original formats because suggested revisions only relate to information that should be given in the AR and not in NP.

**Circulation of the Guidance**

The Guidance will be circulated by the EC to the MS through their National Correspondents (NC). This will be done well in advance of the AR submission deadlines, so that MS are always provided in time with the most recent version of the Guidance.

The Guidance will also be available on JRC's data collection web pages:

[https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu](https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/) (National Programmes and Annual Reports > [most recent year] > Guidance)

**Deadline for the submission of Annual Report**

Following the provisions of the DCF, the deadline for the submission of the AR is **31 May** of the year following the sampling year (Reg. 665/2008 Article 5.1). MS are urged to scrupulously respect this deadline. Delays in submission will lead to reductions in the financial assistance, based on provisions under the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF, Regulation (EU) No 508/2014).

**Evaluation of the Annual Report**

Every year, subsequently to the submission of the AR, an STECF Expert Working Group (EWG) shall evaluate their conformity and the scientific relevance of the data to be covered and also the quality of the proposed methods and procedures (Article 6 of Reg. 199/2008).

With regard to the outcomes, STECF shall evaluate the execution of the NPs approved by the EC and the quality of the data collected by the MS (Article 7 of Reg. 199/2008).

The EWG's conclusions and recommendations will be laid down in its summer meeting report, for subsequent endorsement by STECF Plenary and further consideration by the EC.

It was stressed that regarding the submission the ARs, Article 2 and 5 of Commission Regulation 665/2008 clearly stipulate that MSs have the obligation to use the guidance and templates established by STECF.

**Scope of the Annual Report**

The primary aim of the AR is to allow STECF to evaluate:

* What has been achieved by MS in fulfilment of the requirements of the DCF.
* The reasons for any deviation from the plan (methodology, objectives, …).
* The non-conformity in the AR with the provisions of the DCF.

The AR should particularly address the above aspects of the data collection programmes, in a **brief but sufficiently comprehensive** way. The AR text should address general aspects of NP implementation and deviations from the NP, while details on deviations from planned numbers of samples etc. should be addressed briefly in the AR tables in the corresponding lines (rows) under the ‘Comments’ column. The aim is to make the tables as informative as possible and to reduce explaining text to a minimum, but allowing a full STECF evaluation of MS compliance.

**Format of the Annual Report files**

The AR should be provided in three physical documents, one file containing the report text in a Microsoft Word (or compatible) file (a PDF file of the word document should also accompany the submission) and one file containing the standard tables in an Excel (compatible) file (also see section ‘Standard tables’ below). Annexes (if any) should be physically part of the main report, not in separate files.

Plain text should be formatted in Times New Roman, font size 11 or 12.

Coloured graphs and charts should be avoided unless their complexity is such that the use of grey scales only makes reading difficult.

The AR file for the main body of the report should be named as follows:

* Country\_Annual\_Report\_Reference-year\_Text\_Submission-date.docx

Example: Belgium\_Annual\_Report\_2015\_Text\_31-May-2016.docx.

The AR file containing the standard tables should be named as follows

* Country\_Annual\_Report\_Reference-year\_Tables\_Submission-date.xlsx

Example: Belgium\_Annual\_Report\_2015\_Tables\_31-May-2016.xlsx

It may be that the AR documents will be revised after STECF evaluation. Only the latest version should be available on the JRC's Data Collection web site.

**Language**

MS are encouraged to submit their AR in English, in order to avoid delays in the evaluation process. STECF is aware that the EC cannot oblige MS to submit their AR in English, but stresses that doing so is in the MS's own interest: (a) it helps to speed up the evaluation process, and (b) it prevents translation errors and hence misinterpretation by the evaluators.

**General section layout**

The AR should have the following sections and sub-sections, referring to the structure of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU.

I.General framework
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III.C.2 Data quality issues

III.C.3 Actions to avoid deviations
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III.E.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal
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III.F.2.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal
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The layout of the AR and the numbering of the sections should strictly be adhered to.

Details on the expected contents of each section and sub-section of the AR are given in sections I-XI of the Guidance

**Standard tables**

The Guidance comes with a unique set of standard tables. The standard tables should be submitted as a separate file, and in an Excel compatible format, avoiding the use of pdf or other non-compatible formats. No cells should be deleted from the tables (apart from the example rows) and no columns should be added.

Comments should be inserted into the relevant column, at the end of the table or explained in the AR text. The aim of this column is to substitute the footnotes in every cell and make the tables more workable. This column should also be used to provide short explanations (up to approx. 200 characters) for deviations from the NP, while longer and complex explanations should be inserted in the AR text.

For those Member States having moved towards a “Statistically Sound Sampling Scheme” (4S) and incorporating the principles of randomised sampling, the Guidance for the AR2014-2016 has been revised as such that the Tables are also useful as reporting template. Under the “roll-over” system of the current DCF, these Member States will not have planned targets linked to their new sampling frames in the National Programme, however they can report the achieved number of trips per selected stratum, e.g number of port visits etc.

Details of achieved sampling can be uploaded to Regional Databases each year, on the basis of data calls for assessment working groups, and sampling data can also be uploaded centrally in response to RCM data calls on an annual basis.

Reporting of information requested according to the AR standard tables could be done using Regional Data Bases. The variables should be given in the same order as given in the standard tables. There are no special requirements for specific fonts or font sizes. Fonts without serifs (sans-serif) such as Arial, however, are preferred in terms of readability.

Details on which tables go with which Modules and sections of the DCF and on the types of data that should be included in the tables (and their formatting) are given in Sections I-XI of the Guidance. When filling in the tables, MS should closely follow the instructions and not to leave cells blank when they should have a "No". An empty space in a cell that should have a "No" is very confusing, as it may mean both a "No" or a forgotten entry.

Cell Descriptions:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| White Cells | Copy directly from the NP |
| Grey Cells | Fill in with achievements |
| Yellow cells | Contain calculations and will update automatically |

Do not include any empty lines (e.g. meant to mark sections in long tables), as this makes the evaluation process difficult.

Unhide any hidden cells and remove any filters before submitting the AR tables!

**Revised versions of Annual Reports**

Revisions of AR text and/or standard tables before their evaluation by STECF (e.g. because omissions or errors were discovered after the original had been sent to the Commission) are sometimes authorised by the Commission under certain conditions.

Should a revision be necessary and agreed by the Commission, MS shall submit a revised version of the entire AR with all modified paragraphs (not single figures, words or sentences), table entries and graph titles highlighted in red font, to allow easy identification of the sections that were changed. Revised versions of the AR should be named following the same rules as for the initial versions (see section ‘Format’ above).

Only the latest version of the AR and standard tables should be available on the JRC Data Collection website.

**Consistent naming and codification, compliance with conventions**

In order to allow full comparability within and between MS reports, **consistent naming and codification** of gears, species, metiers, fishing grounds etc. – according to the DCF and other international conventions including those established at Regional Co-ordination Meetings (RCMs) – has to be applied throughout the text and tables of the reports.

"Other regions" should be presented in one regional chapter per section and not separately by CECAF, ICCAT etc.. Regional (Fisheries Management) Organisations (RFMO) should be specified within these chapters. The same division is to be followed in the standard tables, i.e. columns "Region" and "RFMO/RFO/IO" (i.e. Regional Fisheries Management Organisation/Regional Fisheries Organisation/International organisation).

**“Good practice” examples for AR modules**

As guidance for “good practice” in annual reporting, the STECF EWGs conducting the evaluation of the ARs have listed examples of MS performing well. For the ARs 2014, the EWG 15-10 considered the following MS reports as good examples, by module: However it should be noted that these are best examples for the year stated and that there maybe substantial changes to the table for the current year.

[https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu](https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/) (National Programmes and Annual Reports > [most recent year]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Module** | **MS** |
| I | Malta |
| II | Germany |
| III.A | Portugal |
| III.B | Finland, Germany, Slovenia, Poland |
| III.C | Finland, Spain, Sweden, Poland, Ireland, Latvia, UK |
| III.D | Poland, Spain, UK |
| III.E | Denmark, Finland, Greece, Latvia |
| III.F | Poland |
| III.G | Poland, Spain, UK |
| IV.A | Finland, Germany, Slovenia, Poland |
| IV.B | Finland, Germany, Slovenia, Poland |
| V | Poland, Spain, UK |
| VI | Italy |

**AR sections**

# General framework

Outline the general framework of the achieved national data collection programme in relation to the relevant version(s) of the DCF. Also mention which year of activities is covered by the Annual Report and whether there have been major methodological changes in approach compared to the year(s) before. MS should indicate in which section(s) these changes appear.

In Table I.A.1, MS should provide a comprehensive and updated list of all their derogations, including previously approved derogations that are still valid, and requests that were rejected, as well as those added during the reference year. MS should clearly state what provisions in Commission Decision 2010/93/EU the derogation is based on (e.g. exemption rule of a specific module) or which regional/bilateral/multi-lateral agreement is made reference to.

Description of the fields in Table I.A.1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| MS | Member State shall be given as ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code |
| Short title of derogation | Give a brief description of the derogation |
| NP proposal section | State the section of NP proposal the derogation is related to |
| Type of data - Variables | State the variables the derogation is asked for. Variables should be in accordance with the ones mentioned in commission Decision 93/2010. |
| Region | Region shall be given according to the labelling of regions in Table III.A.1 e.g. “Baltic”, “North Sea and Eastern Arctic”, etc |
| Derogation approved or rejected | State if derogation is approved or rejected. |
| Year of approval or rejection | If derogation is approved or rejected state the year of approval or rejection. |
| Reason / Justification for derogation | Describe the justification for asking the derogation. |

In Table I.A.2, MS should provide a comprehensive and updated list of all their bilateral and multilateral agreements regarding data collection that are currently valid. Copies of the bilateral and multilateral agreements should be provided in an annex to the Annual Report text. When the annexes contain scans of bilateral or multilateral agreements, please ensure that the quality is sufficient for these documents, including pictures/graphics/maps, to be readable.

Description of the fields in Table I.A.2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| MS | Member State shall be given as ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code |
| content | Give a brief description of the aim of the agreement |
| coordination | Describe briefly how the coordination is done and by whom |
| description of sampling / sampling protocol / sampling intensity | Briefly describe the sampling to be carried out under the agreement |
| data transmission | State who is responsible for submitting which data |
| costs | Describe here who will be undertaking the cost of the agreed sampling if any |
| access to vessels | State if the agreement implies access to other partners’ vessels. |
| validity | Mention the year when the agreement expires or the year when the agreement was signed if it rolls over annually |

# National data collection organisation

## II.A National correspondent and participating institutes

Give name and contact details of the national correspondent (postal address, phone and fax number, e-mail). Give full name, acronym and contact details of all institutes that will contribute to the NP (postal address, phone and fax number, website – if any).

Information on a national DCF website (ref. Commission Regulation 665/2008 article 8(2)) should be given, including the hyperlink (URL) to the website.

Provide the minutes of the national co-ordination meetings that have been held, in accordance with Reg. 665/2008 Article 3.3.

## II.B Regional and International coordination

### II.B.1 Attendance of international meetings

Use Table II.B.1. to list all recommended and/or relevant (https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/recommended-meetings) meetings from NP and indicate which meetings have been attended by MS. Relevant meetings are, e.g., the RCMs for the regions the MS has fishing activities in, ICES, GFCM and other RFMO/RFO/IO meetings for the stocks or planning groups for surveys for the stocks where the MS is fishing on, PGECON meetings, National Correspondents meetings and relevant workshops. Provide a justification for non-attendance of relevant meetings.

The number of attendees should be given.

Description of the fields in Table II.B.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| MS | Member State shall be given as ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code |
| Acronym | Give the official acronym of the meeting attended |
| Name of the meeting | Give the full official name of the meeting attended |
| RFMO/RFO/IO | Enter the acronym of the competent Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (RFMO), Regional Fisheries Organisation (RFO) or International Organisations (IO) for providing management/advice on the species/stock.  e.g. RFMO: ICCAT, …  e.g. RFO: NAFO,…  e.g. IO: ICES, …  If no RFMO, RFO or IO is applicable, NA (not applicable) is used. |
| No. of attendees by MS | State the number of participants that attended the meeting |
| Comments | Relevant comments: provide short explanations (up to approx. 200 characters) for deviations from the NP, while longer and complex explanations should be inserted in the AR text. |

### II.B.2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations and agreements

Use Table II.B.2 to list the recommendations and the agreements from the RCMs/RCGs, Liaison Meeting, STECF and survey planning groups, relevant to the AR year and the MS. Give a brief description of the responsive actions taken, in Table II.B.2. There is no need to also list recommendations and agreements that do not apply to MS (e.g. on the terms of reference of ICES expert groups, or actions to be taken by the EC, etc.).

*Description of the fields in Table II.B.2:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| MS | Member State shall be given as ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code |
| Region | Region shall be given according to the labelling of regions in Table III.A.1, e.g. “Baltic”, “North Sea and Eastern Arctic”, etc. If recommendation applies to all regions, insert “all regions” |
| Source | Source should be given with the acronym of the relevant RCM/RCG, LM, STECF, e.g. “LM 2014”, “STECF EWG 14-07” |
| Section | Refers to the AR section, e.g. “III.C”, “III.F”, “VII”, etc. If recommendation applies to several modules, insert the relevant modules. If recommendation applies to all modules, insert “all” |
| Topic | Refers to the topic to which recommendation applies, e.g. “Metier-related variables”, “Data quality”, “Surveys” |
| Recommendation Number | Refers to the number assigned to an individual recommendation, where numbers exist. |
| Recommendation/ Agreement | Refers to the relevant recommendations to the AR year and to the MS. There is no need to list recommendations and agreements that do not apply to MS (e.g. on the terms of reference of ICES expert groups, on actions to be taken by the EC, etc.) |
| Follow-up action | Give a brief description on the responsive actions taken |
| Comments | Relevant comments: provide short explanations (up to approx. 200 characters) for deviations from the NP, while longer and complex explanations should be inserted in the AR text. |

# Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector

## III.A General Description of the fishing sector

Indicate the major changes in the fishing sector which had an impact on the implementation of the National Programme, if any.

*Description of the fields in Table III.A.1.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| MS | Member State shall be given as ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code |
| Region | Pre Filled |
| Sub-area | Pre Filled |
| Target assemblages or species assemblages | Enter X if the MS has fisheries targeting the assemblages given in the columns D to I. |

## III.B Economic variables

*[Insert here supra-region header, according to Appendix II of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU. For each supra region, sections III.B.1-4 should be given. If the same methodology is applied in all supra-regions then insert one common text for all supra-regions under a heading that states “All Supra-Regions.*

### III.B.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Fill Tables III.B.1 and III.B.2 with the information collected during the sampling year.

*Description of fields in Table III.B.1: Population segments for collection of economic data*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| MS | Member State shall be given as ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code |
| Supra-region | Refer to the naming convention used in the Comm. Dec 2010/93/EU Appendix II |
| Fishing technique | Refer to the naming convention used in Comm. Dec. 2010/93/EU Appendix III, 2nd column. Put an asterisk in the case the segment has been clustered with other segment(s) |
| Vessel length class |
| Reference year | The year to which the data collected actually refer. For fleet economic data, this is the year preceding the AR year. |
| Target population no. | Total population nos.' should be those of the official fleet register on the 1st of January |
| Frame population no. | The frame population is the set of population units which can be actually accessed and the survey data then refer to this population. |
| Planned sample no. | Number of vessels comprised in the sampling plan for each of the fleet segments. |
| Planned sample rate | Planned sampling rate for each of the segments. Filled in automatically. |
| Type of data collection scheme | Enter the code of the data collection scheme, as follows: A - Census; B - Probability Sample Survey; C - Non-Probability Sample Survey |
| Achieved Sample no. | Achieved sample no. should refer to the no. of respondents (and not for instance to the number of questionnaires actually sent)  The no. of respondents should refer to the survey (unit response rate) and not to the variables (item response rate) |
| Achieved Sample rate | Achieved sample no./frame population no  Filled in automatically. |
| Achieved Sample no. / Planned sampled no. | Automatic filling with the figures achieved vs. planned |
| National name of the survey | The name which identifies the survey (not mandatory) |

**Table III.B.1 should be filled in separately for each individual data source/survey performed. Insert separate lines for each sampling scheme per segment. Inactive vessels have to be reported in Table III.B.1 by vessel length class.**

*Description of fields in Table III.B.2: Economic Clustering of fleet segments*

| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| --- | --- |
| MS | Member State shall be given as ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code |
| Supra region | Refer to the naming convention used in the Comm. Dec 2010/93/EU Appendix II |
| Reference year | Give the year to which the data collected actually refer. For fleet economic data, this is the year preceding the AR year. |
| Name of the clustered fleet segments | Provide an entry for all the segments marked with an asterisk in table III.B.1  Name the cluster after the biggest segment |
| Total number of vessels in the cluster by the 1st of January of the sampling year | Total number of vessels in each of the clusters. |
| Fleet segments which have been clustered | Refer to the naming convention used in Comm. Dec. 2010/93/EU Appendix III |
| Number of vessels in the segment by the 1st of January of the sampling year | Total number of vessels in each of the fleet segments. |
| Classification of segments which have been clustered | Enter the code of classification of segments, as follows: [I]mportant segments with distinct characteristics; [S]egments similar to other segments; [N]on-important segments with distinct characteristics |

Tables III.B.1 and III.B.3 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.

List the deviations (if any) in the achieved data collection compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the deviations. Explain any deviation from the sampling intensity proposed, the methods used for collecting data and for estimating the parameters.

MS should follow NP proposal. In the case of changes in the methodology during the year, MS should provide information regarding the changes in the AR.

MS are reminded of the fact that the DCF has no provisions for the exclusion of any part of the vessel population from data collection (by means of thresholds for, e.g., fishing effort, quantities landed, revenues, etc.). If, none­theless, part of the fleet was excluded from data collection, the reasons for this should be thoroughly explained and justified.

Clustering should be described and information should be given on the segments that are clustered, as required by the DCF and following STECF recommendations. MS should distinguish between segments considered for clustering as follows:

1. Important segments with distinct characteristics;

2. Segments similar to other segments;

3. Non-important segments with distinct characteristics.

Importance of fleet segments should be assessed in terms of landings (value and volume) and/or effort. Similarity should be demonstrated using expert knowledge on fishing patterns or on available data on landings and/or effort.

For each of the cases described, MS should apply the following approaches for clustering according to the different characteristics of fleet segments:

*1. Important segments with distinct characteristics*

Such segments should not be clustered unless strictly necessary in data reporting for confidentiality reasons. Data should be separately collected for these segments and included in national totals (unless separate identification is then made possible as a consequence).

*2. Segments similar to other segments*

Such segments can be clustered for sampling purposes, as well as for confidentiality reasons. The segments merged should be selected according to criteria that should be fully explained and justified by the MS. In particular, the approach to determine similarity should be clearly described by the MS.

*3. Non-important segments with distinct characteristics*

Such segments can be clustered for sampling purposes, as well as for confidentiality reasons. These segments can be merged with other non-important segments. Clustering of these segments with other important segments should be avoided. MS should explain how the lower importance had been determined and for which reasons the clustered segments have been selected. Table III.B.2 should report the segments that have been clustered. Clusters should be named after the biggest segment in terms of number of vessels or economic significance.

A specific section should include a description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs. This section should answer to the following questions:

1. Which are the reference values taken into account for the estimation of the Price per Capacity Unit, PCU (e.g. book value, second hand market, etc…)?
2. Which estimation methods and/or models have been used to estimate the PCU?
3. If a net value has been used, what is the method used to calculate the gross value? (e.g. formula, figures from the balance sheets, etc..)?
4. What type of index price series have been used (e.g. heavy machinery index, etc..)?
5. What depreciation rates? From where do they come (e.g. national legislation, general scheme excel spreadsheet, etc…)?
6. Which age schedule (service life time) has been used?
7. What is the share of each asset on the total value of the capital?

### III.B.2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Report in Table III.B.3 the values of the accuracy indicators.

*Description of fields Table III.B.3: Economic Data collection strategy*

| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| --- | --- |
| MS | Member State shall be given as ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code |
| Supra region | Refer to the naming convention used in the Comm. Dec 2010/93/EU Appendix II |
| Variable group | Refer to the naming convention used in the Comm. Dec 2010/93/EU Appendix VI |
| Variables | Refer to the naming convention used in the Comm. Dec 2010/93/EU Appendix VI |
| Reference year | Give the year to which the data collected actually refer. For fleet economic data, this is the year preceding the AR year. |
| Data sources | Enter the data sources used (logbook, sales notes, accounts, etc.) |
| Fishing technique | Refer to the naming convention used in **Comm. Dec. 2010/93/EU Appendix III.** Put an asterisk in the case the segment has been clustered with other segment(s)  Fleet segments can be reported as "all" where the sampling strategy is the same for all segments; otherwise MS should specify the segments for which a specific sampling strategy has been used. |
| Length class |
| Type of data collection scheme | Enter the code of the data collection scheme, as follows: A - Census; B - Probability Sample Survey; C - Non-Probability Sample Survey |
| Achieved sample rate | **Provide the value of the indicator as defined in the following table “Indicators of accuracy”** |
| Response rate |

The capital value (apart from the value of quota and other fishing rights), capital costs and transversal variables should not be reported in Table III.B.3. Information regarding transversal data should only be presented in Table III.F.1.

Accuracy indicators have to be reported for each fleet segment and for each variable.

In case that a variable is not applicable in a MS (e.g. income from fishing rights), it should not be left blank, but marked as "NA" in Table III.B.3.

***Definition of the “Indicators of accuracy” to be presented by MS in the AR***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of data collection** | **Accuracy indicators** | **Definition and *presentation*** |
| A: Census | Response rate | achieved no.(1)/ frame population no.  *Present as %* |
| Coverage rate | total value of production of the respondent units/total value of production of the frame population  *Presented as %* |
| B: Probability Sample survey  C: Non-Probability Sample survey | Achieved sampling rate | achieved sample no.(2)/frame population no.  *Presented as %* |
| Coverage rate | total value of production of the respondent units/total value of production of the frame population  *Presented as %* |
| Response rate | achieved sample no.(2)/ planned sample no. (3)  *Presented as %* |

(1) **Achieved no.** is the number of respondents who supplied data in response to the census

(2) **Achieved sample no.** is the number of respondents that supply data (and not, for instance, the number of questionnaires sent out, or number of companies contacted)

(3) **Planned sample no.** is the number of units to be contacted for the survey (even though you may not expect all of them to respond and supply data)

MS have to provide qualitative description regarding the assessment of quality of data collected.

In case of derived indicators, such as FTE, MS should provide the information about calculation procedures and accuracy indicators of based data collected. The data collected for this purpose should be stated in the report and accuracy indicators should be presented in the AR text.

List the deviations (if any) in the achieved accuracy compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the deviations.

### III.B.3 Actions to avoid deviations

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid the deviations in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no deviations, then this section can be skipped.

## III.C Metier-related variables

*[Insert here region header, according to Appendix II of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU. For each region, sections III.C.1-4 should be given.]*

### III.C.1 Achievements, Results and deviation from NP proposal

In the AR text the MS should describe if there are any deviations from the sampling strategies as outlined by the MS in its NP.

There are currently two acceptable sampling strategies within the DCF. These are a ‘Métier Based’ sampling strategy, or a ‘Statistically Sound’ sampling scheme. The Statistically Sound sampling scheme approach, will, from here on be referred to as ‘4S’.

General reasons for deviations from the NP in terms of the planned vs. sampled number of trips should be summarised in this section, while detailed comments on particular sampling frames or metiers should be included in the Comments column in Table III.C.3 (see below).

Table III.C.1 – List of identified métiers

Label the métiers at level 6 as follows:

Gear type \_ Target assemblage\_Mesh size (range) \_ Selective device \_ Mesh size (range) in the selective device

For regions covered by a RCM, the fishing grounds and métiers naming convention agreed by the RCMs have to be used. Refer to the most recent RCM reports for the exact definitions to use.

All métiers for which fishing activity has been recorded during the reference period should be given in table III.C.1. MS shall give a short description how the information used for ranking the métiers was obtained (logbooks, sales notes, vessel register data, census, etc.).

MS who implement the métier-based approach should update all columns.

In relevant cases, it may be justified to merge metiers provided evidence is brought regarding their homogeneity. This may include merging of metiers identified by the ranking system, and/or merging of identified metiers with metiers that have not been identified by the ranking system. Describe the rationale behind the decision to merge the specific metiers

For a MS following the Statically Sound Sampling Scheme (‘4S’), the columns J-P should **not** be filled.

*Description of the fields in Table III.C.1: List of identified métiers*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| MS | Member State shall be given as ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code |
| Reference period | **Métier-based sampling Scheme**: According to the Commission Decision 2010/93/EU, MS should use the average values of the previous 2 years. There may be a justifiable reason, however, to use the values from the latest year only. In this case, the justification should be clearly outlined in the AR text. Give the reference year/years e.g. “2013-2014”.  **Statistically Sound Sampling Scheme (‘4S’):** MS should use the sampling year as reference year, being year n, e.g. 2015 |
| Region | Region shall be given according to the labelling of regions in Table III.A.1 e.g. “Baltic”, “North Sea and Eastern Arctic”, etc. |
| RFMO/RFO/IO | Enter the acronym of the competent Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (RFMO), Regional Fisheries Organisation (RFO) or International Organisations (IO) for providing management/advice on the species/stock.  e.g RFMO: ICCAT, …  e.g. RFO: NAFO,…  e.g. IO: ICES, …  If no RFMO, RFO or IO is applicable, NA (not applicable) should be used. |
| Fishing ground | The fishing ground: as defined by the relevant RCMs. |
| Metier LVL6 | Metier level 6 as defined in Commission Decision 2010/93/EU Appendix IV (1-5) metier level 6, and agreed by the relevant RCM. |
| Effort Days | Total days at sea for the metier as defined in Commission Decision 2010/93/EU. |
| Total Landings | Total volume in live weight of the landings for the metier given in tonnes. |
| Total Value | Total value of the landings for the metier given in € Euro |
| Identified Effort | Metier identified according to the ranking system based on the effort variable. Enter “YES” or “NO”. |
| Identified Landings | Metier identified according to the ranking system based on the landings variable. Enter “YES” or “NO”. |
| Identified Value | Metier identified according to the ranking system based on the value variable. Enter “YES” or “NO”. |
| Identified Other | Metier identified for other reasons that selected from the ranking system. Enter “YES” or “NO”. Explain in the text the reasons of the choice. |
| Identified Discards | Metier identified according to the provisions of the Commission Decision 2010/93/EU (more than 10% discard of the total volume in weight of catches). Enter “YES” or “NO”. |
| Is metier merged with other metiers for sampling | Indicate with Y if the metier will be merged with other metiers for sampling purposes |
| Name of the metier to sample | State the name of the new metier. |
| Comments | Relevant comments: provide short explanations (up to approx. 200 characters) for deviations from the NP, while longer and complex explanations should be inserted in the AR text. |

Table III.C.2 - Merging and disaggregation of metiers (re-arrangement)

**Table III.C.2 is not required from the 2014 Annual Report onwards.**

Table III.C.4: Sampling Strategy

Table III.C.4 provides details on what is planned, for both sampling strategies, i.e. the Métier based sampling strategy and the Statistically Sound Sampling Scheme ‘4S’.

*Description of fields in Table III.C.4:*

| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| --- | --- |
| MS | Member State shall be given as ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code |
| MS participating in sampling | If the metier is sampled according to a regionally co-ordinated programme, all participating Member States shall be given. If the metier is sampled unilaterally, the single participating Member State shall be given. |
| Sampling year | Year for planned sampling. |
| Region | Region shall be given according to the labelling of regions in Table III.A.1 e.g. “Baltic”, “North Sea and Eastern Arctic”, etc. |
| RFMO/RFO/IO | Enter the acronym of the competent Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (RFMO), Regional Fisheries Organisation (RFO) or International Organisations (IO) for providing management/advice on the species/stock.  e.g RFMO: ICCAT, …  e;g. RFO: NAFO,…  e.g. IO: ICES, …  If no RFMO, RFO or IO is applicable, NA (not applicable) is used. |
| Sampling frame code | Give coding, codes and lines used should match in Table III.C.3 and III.C.4 |
| Sampling frame (fishing activities) | Description of the sampling frame in term of fishing activities. |
| Sampling frame (geographical location) | Description of the sampling frame in term of geographical locations. |
| Sampling frame (seasonality) | Description of the sampling frame in term of temporal stratification. |
| Sampling strategy | As defined in Commission Decision 2010/93/EU Chapter III.B.B1.3 (f) (g) (i) |
| Sampling scheme | As defined in Commission Decision 2010/93/EU Chapter III.B.B1.3 (g) |
| Type of data collection scheme | Enter the code of the data collection scheme, as referred to in subsection (c) of the Guidance for NP Proposals. Three different types of data collection schemes can be used for data collection:  A) Census, which attempts to collect data from all members of a population. This would include exhaustive monitoring of all fishing trips.  B) Probability Sample Survey, in which data are collected from randomly selected units of a population  C) Non-Probability Sample Survey, in which data are collected from non-randomly selected units of population. |
| Time stratification | Indicate if the time stratification is yearly (Y), quarterly (Q) or monthly (M) |
| Planned no. trips to be sampled at sea by MS | Give the number. If no trips planned, fill in 0 |
| Planned no. trips to be sampled on shore by MS | Give the number. If no trips planned, fill in 0 |
| Planned total no. trips to be sampled by MS (N+O) | Give the number, should be the sum of the two previous columns |
| Comments | Relevant comments: provide short explanations (up to approx. 200 characters) for deviations from the NP, while longer and complex explanations should be inserted in the AR text. |

Table III.C.3 – Sampled trips by métier

*Description of fields in Table III.C.3:*

| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| --- | --- |
| MS | Member State shall be given as ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code |
| MS participating in sampling | If the metier is sampled according to a regionally co-ordinated programme, all participating Member States shall be given. If the metier is sampled unilaterally, the single participating Member State shall be given. |
| Sampling year | Year for planned sampling. |
| Region | Region shall be given according to the labelling of regions in Table III.A.1 e.g. “Baltic”, “North Sea and Eastern Arctic”, etc. |
| RFMO/RFO/IO | Enter the acronym of the competent Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (RFMO), Regional Fisheries Organisation (RFO) or International Organisations (IO) for providing management/advice on the species/stock.  e.g RFMO: ICCAT, …  e.g. RFO: NAFO,…  e.g. IO: ICES, …  If no RFMO, RFO or IO is applicable, NA (not applicable) is used. |
| Fishing ground | The fishing ground as defined by the relevant RCMs. |
| Metier\_LVL6 | Metier level 6 as defined in Commission Decision 2010/93/EU Appendix IV (1-5) metier level 6, and agreed by the relevant RCM, or codes redefined after merging / split in Table III.C.1. |
| Sampling frame codes | Each line should contain only one single sampling frame code. This can result that for 1 métier, several lines are filled. Sampling frame code must be consistent with Table III.C.4, Colum F |
| Total No. of fishing trips during the Sampling year | Provide the total number of fishing trips carried out by each metier (whether sampled or not) during the sampling year. |
| Achieved number of sampled fishing trips at sea | Provide the number of achieved number of trips sampled at sea during the sampling year. If no achievement, fill in 0 |
| Achieved number of sampled fishing trips on shore | Provide the number of achieved number of trips sampled on shore during the sampling year. If no achievement, fill in 0 |
| Total achieved number of sampled fishing trips (J+K) | This field is the sum of the two previous columns, i.e. The Total Number of achieved trips that were sampled during the sampling year. |
| Comments | Use this field also to provide brief explanations for deviations from the planned number of trips, related to the particular sampling frame or metier. |

Table III.C.5 Sampling intensity for length composition (all métiers combined)

**Table III.C.5 is not required from the 2014 Annual Report onwards**

Table III.C.6 Achieved length sampling of catches, landings and discards by metier and species

*Description of fields in Table III.C.6:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| MS | Member State shall be given as ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code |
| MS participating in sampling | If the metier is sampled according to a regionally co-ordinated programme, give the names of all participating Member States. If the metier is sampled unilaterally, give the name of the single participating Member State. |
| Multi-lateral agreement | Indicate by ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ whether there is a bilateral or multi-lateral agreement or not. |
| Sampling year | Year for achieved sampling. Information contained in this table should cover all years separately. |
| Region | Region shall be given according to the labelling of regions in Table III.A.1 e.g. “Baltic”, “North Sea and Eastern Arctic”, etc. |
| RFMO/RFO/IO | Enter the acronym of the competent Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (RFMO), Regional Fisheries Organisation (RFO) or International Organisations (IO) for providing management/advice on the species/stock.  e.g RFMO: ICCAT, …  e.g. RFO: NAFO,…  e.g. IO: ICES, …  If no RFMO, RFO or IO is applicable, NA (not applicable) is used. |
| Fishing ground | As defined in the relevant Regional Coordination Meetings. |
| Species | Use Latin name |
| Species Group | Group 1, 2 or 3 as defined in Commission Decision 2010/93/EU Appendix VII. |
| Metier level 6 | Metier level 6 as defined in Commission Decision 2010/93/EU Appendix IV (1-5) metier level 6, and agreed by the relevant RCM. |
| Achieved length sampling from the unsorted catches | Number of fish measured during the year for the given species, fishing ground and metier. Use this field only if the sampling is done at-sea without indication whether the fish is discarded or retained. If no sampling was done, fill in 0 “zero” |
| Achieved length sampling from the retained catches and/or landings | Number of fish measured during the year for the given species, fishing ground and metier. Use this field for the measurement done on the retained and landed fraction, i.e. combining information at-sea and on shore If no sampling was done, fill in 0 “zero” |
| Achieved length sampling from the discards | Number of fish measured during the year for the given species, fishing ground and metier. Use this field for the measurement of the discarded fraction coming from at-sea observations. If no sampling was done, fill in 0 “zero” |
| Achieved number of fish measured at a national level by metier. | Number of fish measured during the year for the given species, fishing ground and metier. This field is the sum of the number of fish measured over all catch fractions and sampling source. |
| Comments | Relevant comments: provide short explanations (up to approx. 200 characters) for deviations from the NP, while longer and complex explanations should be inserted in the AR text. |

### III.C.2 Data quality issues

List the deviations (if any) in the achieved quality compared to what was described in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the deviations. Within this section, MS should provide details of the sampling scheme (or make reference to the relevant general section, e.g. section I or as introduction to section III.C).

Within this section, Member States should include information on how concurrent sampling onshore and at sea is being applied (or make reference to the relevant general section, e.g. section I or as introduction to section III.E).

Explain the reasons for any deviation from the sampling intensity proposed, the methods used for collecting data etc.

### III.C.3 Actions to avoid deviations

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid deviations in the future and when these actions are expected to produce the desired effect. If there are no deviations, then this section can be skipped.

## III.D Recreational fisheries

*[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.]*

*Description of fields Table III.D.1*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| MS | Member State shall be given as ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code |
| Year | Year for achieved sampling. Information contained in this table should cover all years separately |
| Region | Region shall be given according to the labelling of regions in Table III.A.1 e.g. “Baltic”, “North Sea and Eastern Arctic”, etc. |
| RFMO/RFO/IO | Enter the acronym of the competent Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (RFMO), Regional Fisheries Organisation or scientific body (e.g. ICES) for providing management/advice on the species/stock.  e.g RFMO: ICCAT, …  e.g. RFO: NAFO,…  e.g. IO: ICES, …  If no RFMO, RFO or IO is applicable, NA (not applicable) is used. |
| Species | MS should report on species for which recreational fisheries sampling is mandatory according to the requirements of Appendix IV of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU. |
| Applicable (Species present in the region?) | MS should indicate with YES or NO if the species are present in their current data collection of recreational fisheries |
| Approved Derogation | If the species is applicable in a MS, but not collected, MS should indicate with YES or NO if they received an official derogation for not sampling this species |
| Quarterly weight of Catch? Y/N | If country has estimated Quarterly weight of the catch then indicate with Yes or No |
| Type of survey | MS should indicate what type of survey has been used for collecting the relevant information, e.g. census, questionnaires, etc… |
| Comments | Relevant comments: provide short explanations (up to approx. 200 characters) for deviations from the NP, while longer and complex explanations should be inserted in the AR text. Use this column for any additional comments on other estimated variables. |

### III.D.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Briefly describe which data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained (census, questionnaires, etc.).

**Use the Table III.D.1 to report approved derogations, if any.**

List the deviations (if any) in the achieved data collection compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the deviations. Explain any deviation from the sampling intensity proposed, the methods used for collecting data and for estimating the parameters.

### III.D.2 Data quality issues

List the deviations (if any) in the achieved quality compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the deviations.

### III.D.3 Actions to avoid deviations

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid the deviations in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no deviations, then this section can be skipped.

## III.E Stock-related variables

*[Insert here region header, according to Appendix II of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU. For each region, sections III.E.1-4 should be given.]*

### III.E.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

*Description of fields in Table III.E.1: List of required stocks*

| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| --- | --- |
| MS | Member State shall be given as ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code |
| Species | Use scientific name. |
| Region | Region shall be given according to the labelling of regions in Table III.A.1 e.g. “Baltic”, “North Sea and Eastern Arctic”, etc. |
| RFMO/RFO/IO | Enter the acronym of the competent Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (RFMO), Regional Fisheries Organisation (RFO) or International Organisations (IO) for providing management/advice on the species/stock.  e.g RFMO: ICCAT, …  e.g. RFO: NAFO,…  e.g. IO: ICES, …  If no RFMO, RFO or IO is applicable, NA (not applicable) is used. |
| Area / Stock | All species and stocks for which biological variables sampling is mandatory according to the requirements of the Appendix VII of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU, for all areas where the MS's fishing fleet is operating regardless as to whether the MS has ever reported landings of these species from these areas or not. In many cases, this will result in an extensive list of species and stocks, many of which with zero landings. |
| Species Group | 1, 2 or 3 following the grouping specified in Commission Decision 2010/93/EU, Chapter III, section B.B1.3(1)(f). |
| Average landings | Average landings for each species and stock over the reference period (used in the most recent NP). Enter the reference period in the header of the table, next to the cell which says “Reference period”. While entering the landings data, take into account the following conventions:  If the species is not landed at all, then enter 'None'.  If the average landings are less than 200 t, then do not enter the average landings figure, but enter '< 200' instead.  If the average landings exceed 200 t, then enter the average landings figure for the most recent 3-years reference period. Average landings figures may be rounded to the nearest 5 or 10 t. |
| Share in EU TAC | Only applies to stocks that are subject to TAC and quota-regulations. In this column:  • Enter “None”, if the MS has no share in the EU TAC of the stock concerned.  • Enter the exact share if the MS's share in the EU TAC of the stock concerned.  Share in EU landings applies to (i) all stocks in the Mediterranean, and (ii) all stocks outside the Mediterranean for which no TACs have been defined yet. In this column:  • Enter “None”, if the MS has no landings of the stock concerned.  • Enter the exact share, if the MS's has landings of the stock concerned |
| Share in EU landings | Applies to all stocks. In this column:  Enter 'None', if the species is not landed at all.  Enter “< 10”, if the MS's landings is less than 10% of the total EU landings from this stock.  Enter “> 10”, if the MS's average landings from the stock represent more than 10% of the total EU landings from this stock. There is no need however to give the exact share. |
| Selected for sampling | Indicate by ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ whether the species/stock has been selected for sampling. |
| Comments | Relevant comments: provide short explanations (up to approx. 200 characters) for deviations from the NP, while longer and complex explanations should be inserted in the AR text. |

Use Table III.E.3 to give an overview of the achieved sampling for the variables age, weight, sex ratio, maturity and fecundity (if applicable) in the NP years.

Details of achieved stock related sampling are also uploaded to the RDB each year, on foot of data calls for assessment working groups, and of sampling data also uploaded centrally in response to RCM data calls on an annual basis. It can be an option for a MS to derive the information for the AR from the RDB.

*Description of fields in Table III.E.2: Long-term planning of sampling for stock-based variables*

| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| --- | --- |
| MS | Member State shall be given as ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code |
| Species | Use scientific name. |
| Region | Region shall be given according to the labelling of regions in Table III.A.1 e.g. “Baltic”, “North Sea and Eastern Arctic”, etc. |
| RFMO/RFO/IO | Enter the acronym of the competent Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (RFMO), Regional Fisheries Organisation (RFO) or International Organisations (IO) for providing management/advice on the species/stock.  e.g RFMO: ICCAT, …  e.g. RFO: NAFO,…  e.g. IO: ICES, …  If no RFMO, RFO or IO is applicable, NA (not applicable) is used. |
| Area/stock | According to Commission Decision 2010/93/EU Appendix VII. |
| Species group | G1/G2/G3 as defined in Commission Decision 2010/93/EU Appendix VII. |
| Age | MS should indicate the year in which age data are collected |
| Weight | MS should indicate the year in which weight data are collected |
| Sex ratio | MS should indicate the year in which sex ratio data are collected |
| Sexual maturity | MS should indicate the year in which sexual maturity data are collected |
| Fecundity | MS should indicate the year in which fecundity data are collected |
| Comments | Relevant comments: provide short explanations (up to approx. 200 characters) for deviations from the NP, while longer and complex explanations should be inserted in the AR text. |

*Description of fields in* ***T****able III.E.3: Sampling intensity for stock-based variables*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| Region | Region shall be given according to the labelling of regions in Table III.A.1 e.g. “Baltic”, “North Sea and Eastern Arctic”, etc. |
| RFMO/RFO/IO | Enter the acronym of the competent Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (RFMO), Regional Fisheries Organisation (RFO) or International Organisations (IO) for providing management/advice on the species/stock.  e.g RFMO: ICCAT, …  e.g. RFO: NAFO,…  e.g. IO: ICES, …  If no RFMO, RFO or IO is applicable, NA (not applicable) is used. |
| Area/stock | According to Commission Decision 2010/93/EU Appendix VII. |
| Variable | MS should indicate the variable for which the data are collected: length, weight, age, sex, maturity, fecundity. |
| Data Sources | MS should indicate the source of data collection, e.g. commercial at sea, commercial onshore, survey |
| Planned minimum number of individuals to be measured at the national level | State the planned minimum number of fish to be measured at the national level. |
| Achieved No of individuals at a national level | Number of individuals measured at a national level. |
| % achievement (100\*M/L) | Automatic filling with the figures achieved vs planned. |
| Comments | Use this field also to provide brief explanations for deviations from the planned number of individuals, related to the particular species or stock. Longer and complex explanations should be inserted in the AR text. |

List the deviations (if any) in the achieved data collection compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the deviations. Explain any deviation from the sampling intensity proposed, the methods used for collecting data and for estimating the parameters.

General reasons for deviations from the NP in terms of planned vs. achieved number of individuals should be summarised in this section, while detailed comments on particular species/stocks should be included in the Comments column in Table III.E.3 (see above).

With respect to achieved sampling for variables related to age, the numbers in the table should refer to the numbers of fish collected, not to the number of age readings actually performed. Otoliths or any other calcified structures may have been collected, but the age readings may not have been performed yet, pending e.g. the outcome of an age-reading workshop, the purchase of new age-reading equipment, etc. Nevertheless, the mere fact that the samples were taken is considered to be part of the MS's achievements and therefore, they should be included in the table.

### III.E.2 Data quality issues

List the deviations (if any) and explain the reasons for the deviations. Within this section, Member States should include information on how concurrent sampling onshore and at sea is being applied (or make reference to the relevant general section, e.g. section I or as introduction to section III.E).

### III.E.3 Actions to avoid deviations

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid the deviations in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no deviations, then this section can be skipped.

## III.F Transversal variables

MS should provide a brief description of the sources of transversal data in the text.

Transversal data which have been collected under the Control Regulation (1224/2009) should not be provided in Table III.F.1.

### III.F.1 Capacity

#### III.F.1.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Report in Table III.F.1 capacity information collected during the sampling year.

*Description of fields in* ***T****able III.F.1: Transversal Variables Data collection strategy*

| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| --- | --- |
| MS | Member State shall be given as ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code |
| Region | Region shall be given according to the labelling of regions in table III.A.1 e.g. “Baltic”, “North Sea and Eastern Arctic”, etc. |
| Variable group | Refer to Commission Decision 2010/93/EU Appendix VIII |
| Variables | Refer to Commission Decision 2010/93/EU Appendix VIII under column ‘Variable’. |
| Data sources | Indicate the name(s) of the sources used for collecting the data and detailed in section III.F.2.1 of the NP proposal. |
| Fleet Segments | Refer to the naming convention used in Comm. Dec. 2010/93/EU Appendix III. Put an asterisk in the case the segment has been clustered with other segment(s) |
| Type of data collection scheme | Enter ‘A’ for a census, ‘B’ for a probability based survey and/or C for a non-probability based survey. |
| Reference year | Give the year to which the data collected actually refer. For transversal data, this should be the AR year. |
| Achieved sample rate | Provide the value of the indicator as defined in the table “Indicators of accuracy” reported in section III.B.2 |
| Response rate |

List the deviations (if any) in the achieved data collection compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the deviations.

MS are reminded of the fact that the DCF has no provisions for the exclusion of any part of the vessel population from data collection (by means of thresholds for, e.g., fishing effort, quantities landed, revenues, etc.). If, nonetheless, part of the fleet was excluded from sampling, the reasons for this should be thoroughly explained and justified.

#### III.F.1.2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Report accuracy indicator values in Table III.F.1.

List the deviations (if any) in the achieved accuracy compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the deviations.

#### III.F.1.3 Actions to avoid deviations

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid the deviations in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no deviations, then this section can be skipped.

### III.F.2 Effort

#### III.F.2.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Report Effort data collected during the sampling year in Table III.F.1

List the deviations (if any) in the achieved data collection compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the deviations.

MS are reminded of the fact that the DCF has no provisions for the exclusion of any part of the vessel population from data collection (by means of thresholds for, e.g., fishing effort, quantities landed, revenues, etc.). If, nonetheless, part of the fleet was excluded from sampling, the reasons for this should be thoroughly explained and justified.

#### III.F.2.2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Report accuracy indicator values in Table III.F.1. DCF data quality achievements for data collected under different EU legislation (e.g. Reg. 26/2004 and 1224/2009) do not have to be reported in Table III.F.1.

List the deviations (if any) in the achieved accuracy compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the deviations.

Precision estimates should be calculated following the provisions of the DCF (Commission Decision 2010/93/EU section B.B2.4).

#### III.F.2.3: Actions to avoid deviations

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered/have been taken to avoid the deviations in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no deviations, then this section can be skipped.

### III.F.3 Landings

#### III.F.3.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Report in Table III.F.1 the information collected during the sampling year.

List the deviations (if any) in the achieved data collection compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the deviations.

MS are reminded of the fact that the DCF has no provisions for the exclusion of any part of the vessel population from data collection (by means of thresholds for, e.g., fishing effort, quantities landed, revenues, etc.). If, nonetheless, part of the fleet was excluded from sampling, the reasons for this should be thoroughly explained and justified.

#### III.F.3.2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Report accuracy indicator values in standard table III.F.1.

List the deviations (if any) in the achieved accuracy compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the deviations.

Precision estimates should be calculated following the provisions of the DCF (Commission Decision 2010/93/EU section B.B2.4).

#### III.F.3.3 Actions to avoid deviations

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid the deviations in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no deviations, then this section can be skipped.

## III.G Research surveys at sea

### III.G.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Update Table III.G.1 with the information collected during the sampling year.

*Description of fields in* ***T****able III.G.1: List of surveys*

| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| --- | --- |
| MS | Member State shall be given as ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code |
| Name of survey | Use the name of the survey(s) as spelled in the Commission Regulation 2010/93/EU appendix IX. |
| Aim of survey | Enter the main aims of the survey (target species, target data). |
| Area(s) covered | Enter the codes of the areas visited (ICES divisions, GFCM subareas etc..) |
| Period (Month) | Enter the period, by months, when the survey will be operating. Note that this period should match the information given in Commission Decision 2010/93/EU Appendix IX. |
| 2014-2016 | Enter ‘X’ for specifying the years when the survey occurs. |
| Days at sea planned according to NP | Give the number of days at sea planned for the survey(s). |
| Max. days eligible | Give the maximum days eligible for the survey(s) as stated in Commission Decision 2010/93/EU Appendix IX |
| Type of Sampling activities | Use the following convention :   1. Enter 'Echo Nm', if the target is to perform a pre-set distance (in nautical miles) of echo sounding, regardless of the sampling strategy used. 2. Enter 'TV Tracks', if the target is to perform a pre-set number of underwater TV tracks, regardless of the sampling strategy used (simple random, stratified random or fixed stations). 3. Enter 'Fish Hauls', if the target is to perform a pre-set number of fishing hauls, regardless of the sampling strategy used (simple random, stratified random or fixed stations). 4. Enter 'Plankton Hauls', if the target is to perform a pre-set number of plankton hauls for fish eggs and/or larvae, regardless of the sampling strategy used (simple random, stratified random or fixed stations). 5. If different methods will be deployed during the same survey, then use more than one line and specify the targets for each method separately (see highlighted rows in Table III.G.1 for examples). |
| Planned target according to NP | Give the numerical value of the planned target for the sampling activities named in previous column |
| Ecosystem indicators collected | Enter the code specification of the ecosystem indicators collected (Commission Decision 2010/93/EU Appendix XIII. |
| Map | Indicate the reference to map(s) given in the text of the NP proposal. |
| Relevant international planning group | Indicate the acronym of the international planning group coordinating the survey(s). |
| Upload in international database | Indicate the acronym of the database if the data are uploaded in an international database or not. If not, indicate with a “NO” |
| Achieved days at sea | Number of days at sea actually achieved. |
| Achieved target | Value of target related to the column ‘Type of sampling activities’, actually achieved. |
| % achievement no of days (A/P %) | Automatic filling with the figures achieved vs. planned |
| % achievement target (A/P %) | Automatic filling with the figures achieved vs. planned |
| Comments | Relevant comments: provide short explanations (up to approx. 200 characters) for deviations from the NP, while longer and complex explanations should be inserted in the AR text. |

List the deviations (if any) in the achieved data collection compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the deviations. Explain any deviation from the number of days at sea and the target objectives of the surveys. Deviations of less than 10 % from the target are considered to be an acceptable operational margin for sea-going surveys and need not be justified.

If a survey had covered more than one type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activity.

A map with achieved sampling activities is to be included in the main body of the Annual Report (references to the column ‘map’ given in standard table III.G.1).

### III.G.2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

List any point that would likely impair the quality of the indices (if any), such as change in settings of the gear, imperfect geographical coverage, etc…and explain the reasons for the deviations.

### III.G.3 Actions to avoid deviations

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid the deviations in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no deviations, then this section can be skipped.

# Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry

## IV.A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture

### IV.A.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Table IV.A.1 gives an overview of a MS aquaculture sector and shall be updated with every new AR with information from the reference year. Table IV.A.1 requires entries for each cell, either with “Yes”, “No” or “Yes (N.S.)”, the latter indicating the existence of a segment in national aquaculture sector but no sampling activities (either not mandatory or not executed for other reasons). Cells marked with a cross do not have to be filled in.

Report information collected during the sampling year in Table IV.A.2.

*Description of fields in table IV.A.2: Population segments for collection of aquaculture data*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| MS | Member State shall be given as ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code |
| Segment | Refer to the naming convention used in Comm. Dec. 2010/93/EU Appendix XI. |
| Reference year | Give the year to which the data collected will refer |
| Total population no | Number of enterprises comprised in each of the segments. |
| Frame population no | Number of enterprises accessible for sampling in each of the segments. |
| Planned sample no. | Number of enterprises comprised in the sampling plan for each of the segments. |
| Planned sample rate | Planned sampling rate for each of the segments.  Filled in automatically |
| Type of data collection scheme | Enter the code of the data collection scheme, as follows: A - Census; B - Probability Sample Survey; C - Non-Probability Sample Survey |
| Achieved Sample no. | Achieved sample no. should refer to the no. of respondents (and not for instance to the number of questionnaires actually sent)  The no. of respondents should refer to the survey (unit response rate) and not to the variables (item response rate) |
| Achieved Sample rate | Achieved sample no./frame population no  The no. of respondents should refer to the survey (unit response rate) and not to the variables (item response rate). Filled in automatically. |
| Achieved sample rate / planned sample rate | Automatic filling with the figures achieved vs. planned  Filled in automatically. |
| National name of the survey | Report the name which identifies the survey (optional) |
| Comments | Relevant comments: provide short explanations (up to approx. 200 characters) for deviations from the NP, while longer and complex explanations should be inserted in the AR text. |

List the deviations (if any) in the achieved data collection compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the deviations. Explain any deviation from the sampling intensity proposed, the methods used for collecting data and for estimating the parameters.

MS are reminded of the fact that the DCF has no provisions for the exclusion of any part of the population from data collection (by means of thresholds for, e.g., number of employees, quantities produced, revenues, etc.). If, none-the less, part of the aquaculture sector was excluded from sampling, the reasons for this should be thoroughly explained and justified.

### IV.A.2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Report in Table IV.A.3 the values of the accuracy indicators (for definition of indicators see Table “Indicators of accuracy” under section III.B.2. of guidance).

*Description of fields in Table IV.A.3: Sampling strategy – Aquaculture sector*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| MS | Member State shall be given as ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code |
| Variables (as listed in Appendix X) | Enter the name of the variables as listed in Commission Decision 2010/93/EU Appendix X. |
| Reference year | Give the year to which the data collected will refer |
| Data sources | Indicate the name(s) of the sources used for collecting the data and detailed in section IV.A.2.(e) of the NP proposal. |
| Type of data collection scheme | Indicate the code of the data collection scheme |
| Achieved sample rate | Provide the value of the indicator as defined in the table “Indicators of accuracy” reported in section III.B.2. |
| Response rate |
| Segments | Provide the segments for which the data collection scheme applies |
| Comments | Relevant comments: provide short explanations (up to approx. 200 characters) for deviations from the NP, while longer and complex explanations should be inserted in the AR text. |

List the deviations (if any) in the achieved accuracy compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the deviations.

### IV.A.3 Actions to avoid deviations

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid the deviations in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no deviations, then this section can be skipped.

## IV.B Collection of data concerning the processing industry

### IV.B.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Report information collected during the sampling year in Table IV.B.1.

*Description of fields in Table IV.B.1: Processing industry -Population segments for collection of economic data*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| MS | Member State shall be given as ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code |
| Segment | If applied, refer to the segmentation by number of employees as used in SBS. Otherwise indicate “all the population” |
| Reference year | Give the year to which the data collected will refer |
| Total population no | Number of enterprises comprised (in each of the segments, if segmentation is used). |
| Frame population no | Number of enterprises accessible for sampling (in each of the segments, if segmentation is used). |
| Planned sample no. | Number of enterprises comprised in the sampling plan (for each of the segments, if segmentation is used). |
| Planned sample rate | Planned sampling rate for each of the segments.  Filled in automatically. |
| Type of data collection scheme | Indicate the code of the planned data collection scheme as follows: A - Census; B - Probability Sample Survey; C - Non-Probability Sample Survey |
| Achieved Sample no. | Achieved sample no. should refer to the no. of respondents (and not for instance to the number of questionnaires actually sent)  the no. of respondents should refer to the survey (unit response rate) and not to the variables (item response rate) |
| Achieved Sample rate | Achieved sample no./frame population no  should refer to the survey (unit response rate) and not to the variables (item response rate). Filled in automatically. |
| Achieved sample rate / planned sample rate | Automatic filling with the figures achieved vs planned  Filled in automatically. |
| National name of the survey | Report the name which identifies the survey (optional) |
| Comments | Relevant comments: provide short explanations (up to approx. 200 characters) for deviations from the NP, while longer and complex explanations should be inserted in the AR text. |

List the deviations (if any) in the achieved data collection compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the deviations. Explain any deviation from the sampling intensity proposed, the methods used for collecting data and for estimating the parameters.

MS are reminded of the fact that the DCF has no provisions for the exclusion of any part of the population from data collection (by means of thresholds for, e.g., number of employees, quantities produced, revenues, etc.). If, nonetheless, part of the processing industry was excluded from sampling, the reasons for this should be thoroughly explained and justified.

### IV.B.2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Report the values of the accuracy indicators (for definition of indicators see Table “Indicators of accuracy” under section III.B.2.) in Table IV.B.2.

*Description of fields in Table IV.B.2: Sampling strategy – Processing Industry*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| MS | Member State shall be given as ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code |
| Variables (as listed in Appendix XII) | Enter the name of the variables as listed in Commission Decision 2010/93/EU Appendix XII. |
| Reference year | Give the year to which the data collected will refer |
| Data sources | Indicate the name(s) of the sources used for collecting the data and detailed in section IV.B.1.(d) of the NP proposal. |
| Type of data collection scheme | Indicate the code of the data collection scheme as follows: A - Census; B - Probability Sample Survey; C - Non-Probability Sample Survey |
| Achieved sample rate | Provide the value of the indicator as defined in the table “Indicators of accuracy” reported in section III.B.2. |
| Response rate |
| Segments | If applied, refer to the segmentation by number of employees as used in SBS. Otherwise indicate “all the population” |
| Comments | Relevant comments: provide short explanations (up to approx. 200 characters) for deviations from the NP, while longer and complex explanations should be inserted in the AR text. |

List the deviations (if any) in the achieved accuracy compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the deviations.

### IV.B.3 Actions to avoid deviations

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid the deviations in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no deviations, then this section can be skipped.

# Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem

### V.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Update Table V.1 with the information collected during the sampling year.

*Description of fields in* ***T****able V.1: Indicators to measure the effects of fisheries on the marine ecosystem*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |
| MS | Member State shall be given as three letter code e.g. “GER” |
| Region | Region shall be given according to the labelling of regions in table III.A.1, e.g. “Baltic”, “North Sea and Eastern Arctic”, etc. |
| Code specification | Enter the code specification of the ecosystem indicators collected as specified in the Commission Decision 2008/949/EC Appendix XIII. |
| Indicator | Enter the name of the ecosystem indicators collected as specified in Commission Decision 2010/93/EU, Appendix XIII. |
| Data required | Enter the data requirement of the ecosystem indicators collected as specified in the Commission Decision 2010/93/EU, Appendix XIII. |
| Data collection | Indicate by ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ whether the relevant data will be collected or not. |
| Effective time lag for availability | Indicate the time lag for availability of the collected information. |
| Time interval for position reports | Indicate the time interval for position reports, for the indicators necessitating the VMS information. |
| Comments | Relevant comments: provide short explanations (up to approx. 200 characters) for deviations from the NP, while longer and complex explanations should be inserted in the AR text. |

List the deviations (if any) in the achieved data collection compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the deviations. Explain any deviation from the sampling intensity proposed, the methods used for collecting data and for estimating the parameters

### V.2 Actions to avoid deviations

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid the deviations in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no deviations, then this section can be skipped.

# Module for management and use of the data

### VI.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Table VI.1 describes the data transmission to end-users. This table is an addition to the data transmission failures reported by the end-users. In Table VI **all** data transmissions to end-users should be listed, on the request level.

The table should refer to the end-user requests sent to the MS in the AR year.

*Description of fields in Table VI.1:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Fields** | **Description/definition of the fields** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MS | Member State shall be given as ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code |
| End-user | End-user receiving data. Standard options: DG MARE, GFCM, IATTC, ICCAT, ICES, IOC, JRC, RCM, WCPFC. Other options should be allowed (e.g. universities, other institutes) |
| Expert group, data call or Project | Data calls from DCF website, project data requests, routine data deliveries for end-users (e.g. RDB) |
| Achievement rate | To which extent did the MS respond to the end-user?   * F (fully addressed and in time for deadline); * A (addressed, but not all data delivered -explanation is mandatory); * N (not addressed at all -data call received, but no response sent, explanation is mandatory); * T (timeliness issue; data delivered after deadline -explanation is mandatory) |
| Comments | Short explanation why data transmission was not or not fully achieved. If explanation is given in AR text refer to relevant paragraph. If explanation is given in IT platform on data transmission, refer to it. |
|

*Example:*

Data call ICES WKNSEA 2015 on dab and saithe in North Sea: MS delivered all relevant information on dab, but no information on saithe as that was not collected by MS. Data call name and end-user can be provided from DCF website, achievement rate is ‘A’, in the comment is added why no saithe data have been collected by MS (no obligation, derogation, other issues). If MS already provided comments in JRC IT platform on Data Transmission, MS can refer to that.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MS** | **End-user** | **Expert group, data call or project** | **Achievement rate** | **Comments** |
| NLD | WKNSEA | Data call on dab and saithe | A | All data values for dab delivered but MS has a derogation from length and age sampling for saithe |
|  |  |  |  |  |

#### VI.1.1 Management of data

List the deviations (if any) in the achieved actions compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the deviations. Explain any deviation from the planned development of the databases and the planned processing, analysing and estimating of the parameters.

Provide details on progress in national database management, including a description of quality assurance, data availability and back-up systems available.

#### VI.1.2 Data transmission

List the deviations and /or issues in data provision to Expert Group or Project etc

### VI.2 Actions to avoid deviations

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid the deviations in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no deviations, then this section can be skipped.

# List of acronyms and abbreviations

Provide a full list, in alphabetical order, of all acronyms and abbreviations used in the main body of the AR, together with their meaning in plain language.

# Comments, suggestions and reflections

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.

Note that this section is used for compiling MS suggestions for changes of the AR guidelines and templates.

# References

Provide a full list of bibliographic references used in the main body of the AR and in the standard tables, in alphabetical order.

# Annexes

Use this section to add methodological overviews, working papers, etc., that are essential to the understanding and evaluation of the AR. Annexes related to Pilot Studies should be concise and have the general structure and layout of a scientific paper.