



**GENERAL FISHERIES COMMISSION
FOR THE MEDITERRANEAN
COMMISSION GÉNÉRALE DES PÊCHES
POUR LA MÉDITERRANÉE**



SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SAC)

Sixteenth session

St Julian's, Malta, 17–20 March 2014

**Report of the fourteenth session of the Subcommittee on Statistics and
Information (SCSI)**

Bar, Montenegro, 4–5 February 2014

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The fourteenth session of the Subcommittee on Statistics and Information (SCSI) of the GFCM Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) addressed issues related to the proposal of GFCM Data Collection Reference Framework (DCRF), analyzed the status of Members' compliance regarding data and information reporting and discussed the proposed data and information dissemination services (web-based dashboards and new GFCM web site). The SCSI agreed on the need to strengthen the data reporting compliance of some members, inviting the SAC to identify priority actions related to data collection, define sampling programs at sub-regional level, consider the newly defined IMO in the GFCM-DCRF, foresee assessments at national level in each GFCM member for the improvement of data collection on small scale fisheries, and ensure continuity of the Secretariat developments in the field of cloud-based IT solutions for data and information dissemination.

OPENING OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS

1. The opening session of the SAC subcommittees, held back-to-back with the SCMEE Working Group on Marine Protected Areas (WG MPAs) and the SCESS Working Group on a common methodology to carry out socio-economic analysis in Bar, Montenegro, from 3 to 5 February 2014, was opened by Mr Abdellah Srour, GFCM Executive Secretary, who welcomed participants by recalling the latest achievements and activities of the GFCM that would be object of the subcommittees work.

2. He stressed the renewed interest in small-scale fisheries in the Mediterranean, which account for 80% of the fisheries in the region and mentioned the results obtained during the First Regional Symposium on Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries (organized in November 2013, Malta) and referred to the FAO Technical Consultations on Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries held on 3–7 February 2014. He also introduced the main issues pertaining to the process of amendment of the GFCM legal and institutional framework - foreseen to empower the GFCM and to make its decision-making process more effective to sustain tangible results in all spheres.

3. Subsequently, H.E. Petar Ivanovic, Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development of Montenegro, greeted participants and underlined the efforts undertaken by his country to contribute to sustainable fishing in the Mediterranean, particularly in the Adriatic Sea in light of recent GFCM and European Union decisions and agreements, giving special priority to the development and recovery of the small fishing fleet. He also stressed the alarming state of fishery resources in the Mediterranean as a consequence of failure to implement previous decisions.

4. In this regard, he added that fisheries development was not just a matter of legislation and procedures, but also of finding mechanisms that should allow to fish in a balanced way with the actual market demand. He finally officially opened the subcommittee sessions expressing true hope that such meetings could help find answers to questions related to mechanisms and recommendations for the sustainable use of resources.

TRANSVERSAL SESSION ON REVIEW OF THE DRAFT PROPOSAL FOR A GFCM DATA COLLECTION REFERENCE FRAMEWORK (DCRF)

5. Mr Miguel Bernal, from the GFCM Secretariat, introduced the transversal session of the SAC subcommittees on the GFCM Data Collection Reference Framework (DCRF), underlining the importance of the DCRF to achieve a more efficient data collection programme at subregional level and a better integration of data collection within the mandate of the GFCM. He highlighted that the DCRF contained GFCM data requirements included in the previous GFCM recommendations, but taking into consideration suggestions provided by the GFCM Members to simplify and clarify data requirements. He briefly recalled the preparatory steps of the document proposal, starting from the activities launched within the data collection work package (WP02) of the GFCM Framework Programme (FWP). In particular, he referred to the two assessments carried out in 2013, one internal (at Secretariat level), and the other external (at countries level through questionnaires filled by the national focal points) and mentioned the three subregional workshops on data collection (held through March and April 2013) which served as technical basis for the elaboration of the proposal.

6. Mr Paolo Carpentieri, data collection regional coordinator, delivered the presentation on the GFCM-DCRF proposal¹. After an overview of the historical background, including the GFCM performance review, the Task Force process, the Framework Programme as well as the data collection activities, he summarized the main issues in terms of gaps, difficulties and proposals which arose from the subregional workshops on data collection. The presentation went on with a summary of DCRF

¹ Proposal for the GFCM Data Collection Reference Framework (DCRF) – Draft version before editing (24 January 2014)

tasks including the type of requested data and their purposes (as reproduced on table n.2 of the proposal):

- T.I Catch (landing data, catch data per species)
- T.II Bycatch of vulnerable species
- T.III Fleet
- T.IV Effort
- T.V Socioeconomics
- T.VI Biological information (stock assessment, length data, other biological data, dolphin fish, red coral)

7. Attention was drawn to the ten annexes of the DCRF document forming integral part of the proposal. Particular focus was placed on the priority species subdivided into three proposed groups according to different criteria (frequency of assessments, fishery importance, and conservation status) following a subregional approach.

8. The presentation concluded mentioning the potential strength of the DCRF: its potential to encompass all the requested data in a single “volume” with a common structure for all the Tasks; its modular approach with scattered deadlines; the simplification of data with a better definition of data fields; the establishment of official data calls; the improvement of the submission tools and of the communications with the countries (summary report, national focal points).

9. Once the floor was opened for discussion, participants expressed general appreciation of the DCRF proposal underlining the importance of the work carried out to strengthen the data collection framework in the GFCM area. The main issues emerged during the discussion are listed below.

Language and distribution of the document

10. Clarifications were asked concerning the timing, language and the distribution list of the GFCM DCRF proposal. The Secretariat informed that the document was circulated ten days before the meeting among the national focal points of the Framework Programme (for activities on data collection and management plans), the SAC subcommittees coordinators and the FAO regional projects. The draft proposal was initially sent in English, the working language of the SAC subcommittees, but translation into French and comments received at the subcommittee meetings would be provided in time for the sixteenth session of the Scientific Advisory Committee.

Subregions and priority species

11. Some concern was expressed in relation to the subregions and the list of priority species proposed in Annex A of the DCRF proposal. With regards to the first matter, the importance of evaluating the separation of the Adriatic subregion from the central area was stressed. As for the proposed list of species, more information on criteria to classify the species into three different groups was requested. It was clarified that the proposed groups of species were based on the outputs of the three subregional workshops on data collection held in 2013. The grouping criteria took into consideration the frequency of assessments presented to the GFCM working groups (group 1), the percentage of contribution to total landing at sub-regional level (group 2) and the inclusion of the species under any recovery action plan for conservation plus non-indigenous species of greatest potential impact (group 3).

12. Furthermore, it was underlined that although all countries in a specific subregion should collect information for the identified species, some exemption rules (such as presence/absence, landing by weight per species in the country percentage contributions at the subregional level) should be considered. Moreover the identified species at subregional level should be redefined also taking into

consideration the commercial value of the species. It was recalled that the lists were not static and that they could change over time according to the identified criteria.

Fleet segmentation (effort, landing and biological variables)

13. General consensus was expressed on the “revised” fleet segmentation, composed of already existing segments (with a more detailed breakdown by length classes) with the addition of the beam trawler (Annex B of the proposal). Concerning the method of assigning a fleet segment to a vessel, it was agreed to use the dominance criteria. This would be based on the percentage of time at sea using the same fishing gear over the year.

14. It was proposed to collect effort and landing data for each identified fleet segment whereas the biological variables should be collected for the most important ones. In this respect, the introduction of a subregional threshold was considered advisable (in terms of activities or number of vessels within the segment).

Survey data biological information

15. Participants suggested to include survey data, when available, in order to provide the requested biological information in the DCRF proposal.

Data transmission (frequency, deadlines and submission tools)

16. Comments were made on the proposed data submission calendar (Annex A of the proposal) with particular respect to dolphin fish fisheries (*Coryphaena hippurus*) and red coral. It was noted that the proposed deadline for the transmission of dolphin fish data was June of each calendar year thus giving more time to the countries to prepare datasets, but posed a problem of discrepancy with current EU data call (January). Concerning red coral, although the harvesting season ends at the closure of the year, it was explained that the proposed move to June was aimed at allowing countries to better prepare their data for final transmission to GFCM.

17. The subcommittees were also informed that relevant data transmission protocols and submission tools would be provided by the Secretariat upon adoption of the DCRF.

Stock assessment

18. Clarifications were asked in relation to the issue of stock assessment forms in terms of the nature of the data (official or scientific), the national entities in charge for their transmission and the newly proposed deadline for submission (September). It was explained that data used for stock assessment should be included in the stock assessment forms and presented to the GFCM working groups on stock assessment by the experts attending the meeting, providing a clear indication of the origin (official landings, scientific surveys, etc.) and coverage of the data. Concerning the deadline for transmission, the idea was to set it shortly before the working groups, so that stock assessment-related data for reference year n-1 could be available for the meetings.

Data quality

19. The subcommittees raised the issue of data quality control on datasets transmitted to GFCM within the framework of the DCRF. In this respect, attention was drawn to the different levels of quality control: i) the national level, under the responsibility of each country before data transmission, and ii) the regional level, under the responsibility of the GFCM Secretariat once data are received. Experts were informed that some preliminary standards for quality control would be investigated upon adoption of the DCRF.

Data confidentiality and accessibility

20. Several questions were raised in relation to the confidentiality and accessibility of the collected data. In this respect, Resolution GFCM/35/2011/2, in force and defining the rules on data

confidentiality, security and access for all data, reports and messages (electronic and of other nature) transmitted and received pursuant to GFCM recommendations, was recalled. In light of the revision of GFCM data collection, these important issues should be tackled upon adoption of the proposed DCRF.

National focal points

21. Participants reiterated the importance of the role national focal points appointed for activities on data collection and management plans under the Framework Programme in 2013 and stressed the need to maintaining these functions for the coming years.

OPENING AND ARRANGEMENT OF THE SCSI

22. The fourteenth session of the Subcommittee on Statistics and Information (SCSI) of the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC/GFCM) was held in Bar, Montenegro on 4–5 February 2014. The meeting was attended by experts from four Member countries (Egypt, Montenegro, Morocco and Tunisia) as well as by representative from the European Commission (EC), the GFCM Secretariat and the FAO regional projects (AdriaMed, CopeMed II, MedSudMed, EastMed). The list of participants is reproduced in Appendix B.

23. The SCSI Coordinator, Mr Alaa Eldin El-Haweet, opened the meeting, welcomed participants and introduced the agenda. Due to the importance of the proposal for the GFCM Data Collection Reference Framework (DCRF) and considering the low attendance by national experts from most of the GFCM Members which implied the lack of presentations from participants, it was agreed to focus the discussion mainly on the GFCM DCRF. Moreover, and in coordination with the Subcommittee on Economic and Social Sciences, it was decided to hold a transversal session on the socioeconomics component of the DCRF as well as on the current status and future development of databases and information systems managed by the GFCM Secretariat. The amended agenda was adopted as reproduced in Appendix A.

GFCM DATA COLLECTION REFERENCE FRAMEWORK (DCRF)

24. Mr Federico De Rossi, from the GFCM Secretariat, opened the SCSI discussion on the GFCM DCRF, underlining the main issues already tackled at the transversal session, where the general structure of the work was presented. Before starting the discussion on the document, he recapped the procedure for the possible adoption of the proposal which implied the technical inputs at the subcommittees level, the discussion of the amended proposal at the 16th session of the SAC (March 2014) and its presentation at the Commission level (May 2014).

25. Participants experts agreed to go through each section of the proposal. The ensuing discussion among experts produced several comments for their consideration in the amended version of the GFCM-DCRF.

Introduction - Data collection activities

26. Under the section related to the outcomes of the three subregional workshops on data collection, it was agreed to suggest the following:

- Make a precise reference to the reports of the mentioned subregional workshops;
- In “Gaps”, list the requested information which are not provided to GFCM for a better picture of the identified situation;
- In “Difficulties”, specify that the human resources constrains also incorporate a low level of fishermen’s professionalism;
- In “Proposals”, indicate the data transmission tools which call for improvement.

Chapter 1 - The need for a DCRF

27. Experts agreed on the content of chapter 1 except for the type of information which should be incorporated in the proposed DCRF: under “vessel specification” (p.2) gross registered tonnage should be replaced by gross tonnage.

Chapter 2 – Task for the DCRF

28. The first sentence of the fifth paragraph (chapter 2) called for enrichment by specifying that the minimum set of information was required not only to assess the status of fisheries but the target species also. The term “block” in the sixth paragraph was not considered clear and therefore it was suggested either to replace with “task” or to rephrase the entire sentence for a better understanding.

29. The table 2 “Summary of tasks and purposes” was discussed and some clarifications were asked by participants. The GFCM Secretariat underlined that the table was conceived to summarize the whole concept of the proposed DCRF: all current requests in terms of data and information were re-organized and better defined. It was also specified that the last column “current data requirements” encompassed all GFCM decisions which represented the current legal framework for each data topic. They were not supposed to be fixed for all the time and therefore changes could occur if needed and upon decision of the Commission.

Task I Catch

30. Under the Task I Catch some concern was expressed about the table I.2.1 where landing, discard and catch were requested at the same time. It was explained that the proposal aimed at making the countries more aware of the catch composition during the data transmission process. Furthermore the importance of reporting the data properly was underlined, including the difference between the zero “0” value and not reported.

Task II By-catch

31. Some clarifications were asked by SCSJ concerning the reason for having one specific module just for bycatch within the proposed DCRF. In this respect, it was recalled that there was a widespread interest at the international level on this important aspect and that, at GFCM level, there were four different recommendations dealing with the reporting of incidental catch of seabirds, sea turtles, Mediterranean monk seal and cetaceans. Participants agreed on the proposal but expressed some concern about the difficulties in gathering this information and the need for an awareness campaign on bycatch among fishermen at local level.

Task III Fleet

32. The discussion rose on issues related to some mandatory data such as the difference between the vessel registration number and registration number, the need for event detail and the usefulness of information about the owner. The main concern was about the amount of data that should be transmitted to GFCM in case of request of each single event per vessel especially for countries with a huge fleet. Concerning the definition of the fields, it was recalled that the preparation of a methodological document was already planned aiming at providing all the details for each data fields.

33. Clarification was provided by the Secretariat about the owner details which are of particular importance for the GFCM Authorized Vessel List (GFCM-AVL), the record of fishing vessels larger than 15 meters in length overall authorized to fish in the GFCM area in line with the International Plan of Action (IPOA) to prevent, to deter and to eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing. Participants agreed to move the owner details fields to the compulsory table for vessels over 15 meters only. Furthermore, it was highlighted that, due to the importance of the subject, the AVL should be kept updated during the year and therefore the reference year for the data transmission should be “n” rather than “n-1”.

34. With regards to the fleet data, participants were informed about the informative note sent by the FAO global record as contribution to the SCSI (Appendix C) for its consideration during the discussion on the DCRF proposal. The Secretariat reminded that the Global Record of fishing vessels, refrigerated transport vessels and supply vessels aimed at being a global repository (database) designed primarily to provide reliable identification of vessels through a unique vessel identifier (UVI). FAO global record wanted to inform SCSI about the recent IMO Assembly Resolution A.1078(28) which included the fishing vessels in the scheme on the IMO ship identification numbering scheme. Taking into account the COFI 30 report which stated that the Committee “noted the necessity for RFMOs to coordinate their vessel records with the Global Record”, some RFMOs, like CCAMLR and ICCAT, had already taken measures to adopt the IMO number as a requirement in line with the mentioned decision. FAO global record invited SCSI to note these recent developments in reviewing the GFCM data collection framework for inclusion of the IMO number as defined by the mentioned resolution and for its possible use in the prototype demonstration at COFI 31.

TRANSVERSAL SESSION SCSI/SCESS ON THE DCRF

GFCM Data Collection Reference Framework (DCRF) - Task V Socio Economics

35. Participating experts of the joint session SCSI/SCESS discussed the socioeconomics component of the GFCM DCRF proposal. In particular, comments were made on the mandatory and optional data tables as well as on the frequency of submission.

36. It was agreed to replace “fuel and oil costs” in the list of mandatory variables with “fuel consumption” and “fuel price”. It was underlined how these variables were useful to assess the efficiency of fish capture defined as the relationship between fuel consumption and the value of landed catch. Furthermore, it was added that information on fuel consumption was useful also to analyze the adoption of fuel-efficient practices aimed at reducing the costs for fuel that has had a major impact on the profitability of fisheries in recent years.

37. The subcommittees noted that the proposal which was tabled for discussion only allowed the estimation of the gross cash flow, i.e. the difference between income and overall expenses (including labour cost) incurred during the production process. In this respect, it was strongly suggested to move the variables “capital costs” and “value of physical capital” from the optional data to the mandatory ones. “Capital costs” included depreciation costs (the reduction in the value of the fixed assets used in production during the accounting period) and opportunity costs (which represent the potential income resulting from an alternative investment). “Gross profit” represented the firm's real profit, i.e. actual fund availability, as being an effective indicator of the amount of cash held by the firms. On the other hand, the net profit represented a perfect financial indicator, as it is the net amount of non-cash expenses (depreciation and opportunity cost).

38. Under the mandatory table “information by species”, two different suggestions raised from participants. The first was about the importance of specifying the type of prices at first sale. The second dealt with species issue aiming at focusing on species group 1 and 2 (DCRF Annex A) only.

39. Concern was expressed by experts on the annual frequency of data submissions especially because most of the requested information derived from socio-economic surveys very difficult to be carried out on an annual basis. The subcommittees strongly suggested opting for a biannual reporting for the majority of the data.

40. The SCESS coordinator requested the GFCM Secretariat to provide to the next SCESS meetings with an analysis of the availability of socio-economic data and information on fishing effort, included in the questionnaires completed by the focal points appointed for activities relating to data collection and management plans under the GFCM Framework Programme. This was regarded as a very important exercise in order to better perceive common gaps and weaknesses across the GFCM

competence area and to propose appropriate solutions to ensure continuous collection and analysis of socio-economic data and the use of socio-economic indicators in fisheries management.

Current status and future development of databases and information systems managed by the GFCM Secretariat

41. Mr De Rossi provided participants with an overview of recent development in databases and information systems managed by the Secretariat. In particular, three different categories of web-based data representation user interface (dashboards), as part of the data dissemination cloud services being developed by the Secretariat, were presented.

GFCM capture production (FAO-GFCM database)

42. The first proposed set of dashboards aimed at providing users with interactive tools to consult the data on capture production from 1970 to 2011 in the Mediterranean and Black Sea (FAO Major Fishing Area 37) currently disseminated through the FAO Fisheries web site. It was recalled that the data source was the information transmitted by FAO members to the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture department through the FAO-GFCM Statlant37A questionnaire. The three dashboards were:

- Capture production trends (global figures with a summary table by years and regions, one chart for the Mediterranean and one for the Black Sea with filtering facility by year);
- Capture production by country and species (pivot table by years, countries, group of target species, species with filtering facility by year)
- Capture production map (pivot table by years, GFCM members and non members with filtering facility by year and interactive map)

GFCM vessel records (database on fleet register data)

43. The second set of dashboards was based on the fleet data as transmitted by GFCM Members to the Secretariat in compliance with the related GFCM decisions (mainly Rec. GFCM/33/2009/5 on fleet register and Rec. GFCM/33/2009/6 on authorized vessel list). Four different dashboards were proposed:

- Last submission by members (summary table on the latest data transmission and the type of reported information, namely entire fleet or vessels over 15 meters only, with related chart);
- Authorized vessels list (pivot table of vessels over 15 meters by authorization status, country, gear class with related chart);
- Fleet by fishing gear class (pivot table and chart of fleet by country, fishing gear class and fishing gear);
- Fleet by length classes (charts by country / length classes and vice versa).

GFCM Task 1

44. The last set of dashboards concerned the Task 1 database which was fed with the information transmitted by GFCM Members to the Secretariat in compliance with Rec. GFCM/33/2009/3 on the implementation of the GFCM Task 1 Statistical Matrix. The following examples of dashboards were given:

- GSAs and capacity (pivot table on the number of vessels and capacity by GSA and country);
- Socioeconomic data (pivot table on socioeconomic data aggregated at national level by fleet segment and country with filtering facility by year);
- Landing value (chart on landing values by country and fleet segment with filtering facility by year).

45. Participants of the two subcommittees welcomed the progress achieved by the Secretariat by flagging up how such type of solutions would surely contribute to the enhancement of data and information accessibility for web users.

OVERVIEW OF THE CURRENT SITUATION OF DATA COLLECTION AND INFORMATION SUBMISSIONS

46. Mr De Rossi reported on the current situation of data and information submitted by Members to the Secretariat in compliance with the pertaining GFCM decisions. Starting from the current GFCM data collection framework, he provided different type of overviews concerning the data submissions to the Secretariat in the last years: number of submissions per year by topic, per year by country and per topic by country (Appendix D). It was noted that these snapshots took into account cumulative numbers of distinct submissions received by the Secretariat thus implying possible double counting of some Members. From the quantitative point of view, an increase of data transmission in comparison with the previous year was underlined. The presentation went on with particular focus on the vessel records (fleet related data – Resolution GFCM/35/2011/1) and Task 1 (Recommendation GFCM/33/2009/3).

47. Participants were informed about the last date of submission of fleet data (Appendix E) and the data field coverage for the mandatory fields which still highlighted room for improvement (Appendix G). Mr De Rossi stressed the importance of reporting all the compulsory information every year. Among others, particular emphasis was given to the fishing period of vessels over 15 meters which had to be kept updated according to the Recommendation GFCM/33/2009/6 (GFCM record of vessels over 15 meters authorized to operate in the GFCM area) (Appendix F). The SCSI was informed about the following shortcomings in terms of data submission and fleet coverage:

- two countries never submitted data on fleet (Israel and Montenegro),
- five countries submitted information for vessel over 15 meters only (Algeria, Cyprus, France, Libya and Tunisia),
- seven countries needed to updated their data because the information is older than two years (Albania, Algeria, Cyprus, France, Libya, Spain, Turkey).

48. SCSI was updated on the follow-up of the periodic data transfer of data from the EU fleet register system to the GFCM vessel records information system for the common Members. The EC representative informed the Secretariat that the periodic transfer of such information based on an automatic process was not currently feasible because of systems upgrades that would be required for this sake. The subcommittee reiterated the importance of facilitating the fleet data submission from EU members to the GFCM Secretariat by looking for feasible interactions with the EU fleet register system.

49. Concerning Task 1, Mr De Rossi showed that there was a sensible increase of submissions in 2013: 14 countries had reported data for the reference year 2011, thus representing the maximum number in the recent history of Task 1. The presentation highlighted also an improvement in terms of field coverage for each of the five sub-tasks. Participants asked for clarification about the type of data analysis performed by the Secretariat including the adopted criteria for evaluating members' compliance. Mr De Rossi stated that thus far the analysis of the received national datasets was based on fields' coverage and therefore it didn't encompass any quality evaluations which, however, were envisaged in a near future (Appendix H).

DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION BY THE GFCM SECRETARIAT

50. Mr De Rossi presented the new GFCM web site by focusing on its main characteristics. The contents were completely reorganized with the aim of facilitating the web consultation as well as the

dissemination of information through the use of sharing facilities. Although the release of the new web site for GFCM was not a request arising from Members, the Secretariat took this initiative to provide users with an enhanced web experience thus facilitating the access to information. In particular, the objectives of the new release were to improve the usability, facilitate the access to meetings and reports, provide a powerful search engine, add new functionalities in terms of data and information consultation, but also increase the overall site performance and leverage a modern content management system. The proposed structure was the following: Home, About, Decisions, Framework Programme, Aquaculture, Fisheries, Data, Maps, News, Search, Glossaries, Regional cooperation, GFCM 60years, GFCM SharePoint, Links, GFCM HQ, Contacts.

51. SCSi warmly welcomed this initiative which constituted an important step forward for users in terms of usability and accessibility to the amount of information produced in the recent years. Participants raised several questions on the technology used for its development, the effective date of release on the web and the French version of the site. In addition it was also suggested, in terms of content management, to highlight the section "Data" as it was expected to be one of the most frequently accessed. The site was intended to be shortly opened to the public. However it was stressed that the time needed to transfer the "gfc.org" domain to the new site was beyond the responsibility of the Secretariat since it was directly managed by FAO. Due to sustainability constraints regarding the daily content management activities required and taking into account the human and financial resources available to the Secretariat for this sake, the overall site structure was conceived to be in English only, while it will be possible to realize specific sections in English and French as required.

MAIN OUTCOMES OF RECENT GFCM/FAO EVENTS RELEVANT TO SCSi

52. Participants were informed about the main outcomes of 2013 GFCM and/or FAO events relevant to SCSi. The conclusions derived from the official reports, when available, were briefly reported.

CoC working group on VMS and related control systems in the GFCM Area (October 2013)

53. The Working Group on VMS expressed a positive opinion on the possible establishment of a GFCM centralized VMS system and identified the six building blocks which should be the pillar of this undertaking, namely the features of the system, its tracking requirements, the web-based system, the use of data, the main implementation problems and constraints, technical assistance and capacity building. The working group consequently agreed on i) the establishment of a GFCM centralized VMS system tailored for the GFCM area of competence advised for MCS, safety, scientific research and fisheries management purposes, ii) a modular approach encompassing small-scale fisheries is needed to take into account the specificities of this sector, including the identification of case studies, iii) technical assistance and transfer of technology to be encouraged and provided, with particular reference to those GFCM Members that needed support in the establishment of their national fishing monitoring centers.

Workshop on IUU fishing in the Mediterranean Sea (October 2013)

54. Having considered the varying and multifaceted nature of IUU fishing in the Mediterranean Sea, and consistent with the same approach adopted in connection with the workshop on IUU fishing in the Black Sea (February 2013), the Workshop identified six sets of actions. Each of these were included in a roadmap to fight against IUU fishing in the Mediterranean Sea: (i) institutional aspects at regional and sub-regional level, (ii) legal aspects, (iii) scientific research aspects, (iv) technical aspects, (v) socioeconomic and education aspects and (vi) MCS related aspects.

55. The proposed roadmap should be considered as a basis for future undertakings to be launched by the GFCM which would require strong political commitment from GFCM Members. Among others, a regional plan of action to fight IUU fishing could be developed and adopted, consistent with the FAO practice.

First Regional Symposium on Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea (November 2013)

56. The First Regional Symposium on Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea² (27-30 November 2013, Malta) was attended by more than 170 participants, including policy-makers, scientists, practitioners, fishers representatives, civil society organizations, NGOs, research institutions, international organizations etc., who shared their views, opinions and experiences during the meeting. It was organized under the overall coordination of the GFCM Secretariat and with the active support of the co-organizers: FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department, FAO Regional Projects (AdriaMed, CopeMed, EastMed and MedSudMed), WWF, MedPAN and CIHEAM Bari.

57. As general conclusions, the meeting proposed to:

- Launch a regional programme in the GFCM area fostering a domain-by-domain knowledge of all the components linked to small-scale fisheries with involving all interested stakeholders.
- Establish, under the auspices of FAO–GFCM, a task force aimed at supporting Mediterranean and Black Sea countries in the implementation of the SSF Guidelines and the creation, support or extension of platforms of small-scale fishers and fishworkers;
- Foster a strategy underpinning the valorization of opportunities and products of small-scale fisheries for the benefit of local communities and stakeholders.

58. In light of the discussions during thematic session I (“Situation of small-scale fisheries in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea: strategies and methodologies for an effective analysis of the sector”), the following proposals were made:

- Bridge gaps in data and information on small-scale fisheries, their interactions with other human activities and their socio-economic aspects, with a view to developing permanent national, sub-regional and regional databases and information systems building upon the lessons learnt from case studies undertaken so far;
- Develop through the proposed programme an information monitoring system to improve knowledge on small-scale fisheries and collect relevant data and information on the activities of the fleet, including parameters and synthetic indicators of social, economic and environmental relevance;³
- Launch, within the remit of the proposed regional programme on small-scale fisheries, a survey on small-scale fisheries in Mediterranean and Black Sea countries to provide a detailed status of small-scale fisheries;
- Recognize the socio-economic specificities of small-scale fisheries as well as the seasonal and unstable features of the sector, in order to enable investments for their development, to improve the human conditions of the people involved and to eradicate poverty;
- Include small-scale fisheries in national fisheries management plans and monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) activities to deter illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing, identify fishing grounds and address aspects such as safety at sea while building capacity and raising awareness among stakeholders.

24th session of the Coordinating Working Party on Fishery Statistics – CWP (February 2013)

59. The GFCM Secretariat attended the twenty-fourth session of the Coordinating Working Party on Fishery Statistics (CWP⁴), the international body coordinated by FAO whose mission is to provide

² www.sfsymposium.org

³ Participation in the Working Group on a common methodology to carry out socio-economic analysis of the GFCM Subcommittee on Economic and Social Sciences (Budva, Montenegro, 3 February 2014) was encouraged to underpin the collection of socio-economic data and the use of socio-economic indicators in small-scale fisheries.

⁴ <http://www.fao.org/fishery/cwp>

a mechanism to coordinate fishery statistical programmes of regional fishery bodies and other inter-governmental organizations with a remit for fishery statistics. GFCM was one of the 19 participating organizations in the CWP. Within the work plan for the intersessional period a collaboration between Eurostat, FAO, GFCM and ICES was proposed to further streamline the reporting of national statistics, by harmonizing data reporting formats and enhancing information exchanges among organizations, thus reducing potentially replicated reporting.

8th FAO FIRMS Steering Committee Meeting (February 2013)

60. It was recalled that GFCM is one of the partners of Fishery Resources Monitoring System (FIRMS5), a partnership drawing together international organizations, regional fishery bodies and national scientific institutes, collaborating within a formal agreement, who are willing to report and share information on status and trends of fishery resources. In terms of developments on FIRMS marine resource fact sheets, in the period from December 2011 to January 2013, 14 new GFCM fact sheets were produced while 13 were in progress. The GFCM Secretariat was progressing for the sake of providing necessary fisheries stocks information relevant to the FIRMS dataset through the GFCM SharePoint platform, as similarly established in other RFMOs.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

61. The SCSI drew up and agreed on the following conclusions and recommendations:

- Recognizing the importance of the proposal for a GFCM Data Collection Reference Framework (DCRF), the SCSI decided that its comments to the draft would be integrated in the revised version to be presented to the SAC;
- Despite the important increase of compliance towards the data and information submission obligations, the SCSI recognized the need to strengthen the data reporting of some members – with particular reference to the fleet register (GFCM Vessel Records) and improve the national data collection;
- The SCSI agreed to compile a summary of data collection gaps and needs at national level emanating from the members replies to FWP Data Collection Questionnaires provided in 2013, to be submitted to SAC for identification of priority actions related to data collection;
- Noting the difficulties for several countries in collecting some type of data, the SCSI recommended to assist the countries in the sampling programs at the subregional level;
- In light of the already established collaboration of GFCM with the FAO Global Record, the SCSI proposed the inclusion of the IMO number, as defined by the IMO Assembly Resolution A.1078(28), in the fleet data component of the GFCM DCRF also for its possible use in the prototype demonstration at COFI 31;
- Acknowledging the promising results demonstrated so far in the fields of data/information dissemination, and noting the significant contribute that such modern technologies and instruments can provide, the SCSI advised the Secretariat to pursue further developments in the field of cloud-based IT solutions.

⁵ <http://firms.fao.org/firms>

PROGRAMME OF WORK

62. The SCSI agreed on the following proposed work plan:

- Noting the mismatching of boundaries of the GFCM Statistical Grid with some GSAs, the SCSI recommended to further assess technical implications of their harmonization;
- Acknowledging the result of the First Regional Symposium on Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea (November 2013), the SCSI advised to carry out an assessment at national level in each GFCM member for the improvement of data collection on SSF;
- In order to facilitate the fleet data submission from EU members to the GFCM Secretariat, the SCSI recommended looking for feasible interactions with the EU fleet register system.

CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

63. The conclusions and recommendations were adopted on Wednesday 5 February 2014 and the whole report was later adopted via e-mail. The SCSI coordinator together with the GFCM Secretariat reiterated their thanks to Montenegro for the hospitality and the excellent support provided in the organization of the meeting.

Appendix A

Agenda

- 1. Introduction of participants and adoption of the SCSI agenda**
- 2. GFCM Data Collection Reference Framework (DCRF) - Discussion of issues relevant to the subcommittee**
- 3. Transversal session SCSI/SCESS**
 - GFCM Data Collection Reference Framework (DCRF) - Task V Socio Economics
 - Current status and future development of databases and information systems managed by the GFCM Secretariat
- 4. Overview of the current situation of data collection and information submissions**
 - Current situation of data and information submitted by Members to the Secretariat in compliance with the pertaining GFCM decisions
- 5. Dissemination of information by the GFCM Secretariat**
 - Overview of the new GFCM web site
 - GFCM extranet on SharePoint (latest developments and services)
- 6. Report on the main outcomes of recent GFCM/FAO events relevant to the subcommittee**
 - CoC working group on VMS and related control systems in the GFCM Area (October 2013)
 - Workshops on IUU fishing in the Mediterranean Sea (October 2013)
 - First Regional Symposium on Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea (November 2013)
 - 24th session of the Coordinating Working Party on Fishery Statistics - CWP (February 2013)
 - 8th FAO FIRMS Steering Committee Meeting (February 2013)
- 7. General conclusions and recommendations**
- 8. 2014 SCSI workplan**
- 9. Any other matter**
- 10. Date and venue of next session**
- 11. Adoption of the conclusions and closure of the meeting**

Appendix B

List of participants

Mehrez BESTA

Directeur de l'Exploitation
 Direction Générale de la Pêche et de
 l'Aquaculture Ministère de l'Agriculture
 30 Rue Alain Savary 1002
 1003 Tunis, Tunisia
 E-mail: mehrezbesta@gmail.com

Essekelli DOUNIA

Centre Régional de Nador (INRH)
 13 boulevard zerkouni
 Nador, Morocco
 E-mail: douniaskali@gmail.com

Deniz FRLJUCKIC

Ministry of Agriculture and Rural
 Development
 Montenegro
 E-mail: deniz.frljuckic@mpr.gov.me

Nikolaos MITRAKIS

European Union
 European Commission
 DG-MARE
 JII-99 06/78, B-1049
 Brussels (Belgium)
 E-mail: nikolaos.mitrakis@ec.europa.eu

FAO Regional Projects**Juan Antonio CAMIÑAS**

FAO CopeMed II
 Project Coordinator
 Fisheries and Aquaculture Resources Use
 and Conservation Division (FIRF)
 Subdelegación del Gobierno en Malaga
 Paseo de Sancha 64
 29071 Malaga, Spain
 E-mail: juanantonio.caminas@fao.org

Matthieu BERNARDON

FAO CopeMed II
 Fisheries and Aquaculture Resources Use and
 Conservation Division (FIRF)
 Subdelegación del Gobierno en Malaga
 Paseo de Sancha 64
 29071 Malaga, Spain
 Ph: +34 608205873
 E-mail: matthieu.bernardon@fao.org

SCSI Coordinator**Alaa Eldin EL-HAWEET**

College of Fisheries Technology,
 Arab Accademy for Science and Technology
 Alexandria, Egypt
 E-mail: el_haweet@yahoo.com

GFCM SAC Chairman**Henri FARRUGIO**

IFREMER, av. Jean Monnet,
 BP 171, 34203 Sète, France
 Ph: +33 0499573237
 E-mail: henri.farrugio@ifremer.fr

GFCM Secretariat**Federico DE ROSSI**

Data Compliance Officer
 General Fisheries Commission for the
 Mediterranean (GFCM)
 FAO of the United Nations
 Fisheries and Aquaculture Department
 Palazzo Blumenstihl,
 Via Vittoria Colonna, 1
 00193, Rome, Italy
 Ph: +39 06 57053481
 E-mail: Federico.DeRossi@fao.org

Paolo Carpentieri

GFCM Consultant for data collection
 framework
 General Fisheries Commission for the
 Mediterranean (GFCM)
 FAO of the United Nations
 Fisheries and Aquaculture Department
 Palazzo Blumenstihl,
 Via Vittoria Colonna, 1
 00193, Rome, Italy
 E-mail: paolo.carpentieri@fao.org

Appendix C

The Unique Vessel Identifier and on-going collaboration with the FAO Global Record of Fishing Vessels, Refrigerated Transport Vessels and Supply Vessels

The FAO Global Record team would like to inform GFCM members of the preparation of a “Strategic Document on the Way Forward for the Global Record” and a “Prototype” version of the system that will be both presented at COFI 31 for its guidance. Further details on these could be provided at a later stage.

Moreover, the FAO Global Record team has been working on ensuring that a reliable Unique Vessel Identifier (UVI) will be available for fishing and non-fishing vessels and, based in numerous studies, it has proposed that the UVI could follow the IMO ship identification numbering scheme; this would be the prerequisite for a vessel to enter the Global Record.

In this line, a proposal co-sponsored by FAO to amend IMO Assembly Resolution A.600(15) on the IMO ship identification numbering scheme, in order to include fishing vessels in the scheme, was approved by the IMO Maritime Safety Committee in June 2013 and was finally adopted as resolution A.1078(28) by the IMO Assembly in December 2013 (Resolution A.1078(28)).

A proposal will be put forward to COFI 31 to endorse the use of the IMO number as the Global Record UVI.

In principle, the IMO number applies to vessels of 100 gross tonnage and above, but it does not necessarily exclude other vessels, as it has been the case so far. However, once Phase 1 (vessels of 100 gross tonnage and above) of the Global Record will be operational, adequate assessment of the way forward will be made, based on experience gained from implementing phase 1.

With all this in mind, and taking the opportunity that GFCM is currently reviewing its data collection framework, FAO Global Record team would like to encourage GFCM members to submit IMO numbers, when available, to the Secretariat (currently an optional data field for the GFCM Fleet data).

Furthermore, in the framework of the agreed collaboration with the Global Record at the 36th Session of the Commission (paragraphs 16⁶, 32⁷), the GFCM has the opportunity to participate in the prototype demonstration at COFI 31, by making this information available to FAO Global Record (only for demonstration purposes, not to be disseminated otherwise).

Attention should also be drawn to paragraph 56(d) of the last COFI report which states that the Committee “noted the necessity for RFMOs to coordinate their vessel records with the Global Record”.

Finally, also note that other RFMOs like CCAMLR and ICCAT have adopted the IMO number as the UVI (as a requirement). In this respect, we would like to encourage GFCM members to take these initiatives in consideration.

⁶ Paragraph 16: It was agreed that the collaboration proposed by FAO in relation to a global record would be accepted. It would include FAO support to GFCM for further developing the GFCM vessel records and building up the IUU vessel list with related non-compliance information. Joint efforts would be undertaken in specific activities such as capacity building and systems development.

⁷ Paragraph 32: Appreciation was expressed for the collaboration proposed by FAO in relation to a global record that will include FAO support to GFCM to further developing the GFCM vessel records and building up the IUU vessel list. Moreover, it was noted that progress in complying with the data/information requirements was made by Members although additional effort is still required in order to better meet their obligation.

Appendix D

Data submission status by topic [As at 3rd Feb 2014]

| THEME | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 | TOT |
|----------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Vessel Records | 3 | 14 | 4 | 21 |
| <i>Fleet Register</i> | | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| <i>AVL</i> | 2 | 6 | 5 | 13 |
| Task 1 | 1 | 20 | 10 | 31 |
| Red coral | | 1 | / | 1 |
| Dolphin Fish | | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Port state measures | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| TOTAL | 6 | 47 | 22 | 75 |

These figures are the cumulative number of distinct submissions received by the Secretariat (therefore members double counting can occur)

Data submission status by country [As at 3rd Feb 2014]

| GFCM Members | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 | TOT |
|-----------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Albania | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Algeria | | 1 | | 1 |
| Bulgaria | 2 | 9 | 1 | 12 |
| Croatia | | 3 | | 3 |
| Cyprus | | 1 | | 1 |
| Egypt | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| France | | 2 | | 2 |
| Greece | | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| Israel | | | | 0 |
| Italy | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| Japan | | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| Lebanon | | 4 | | 4 |
| Libya | | | | 0 |
| Malta | | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Monaco | | | | 0 |
| Montenegro | | | | 0 |
| Morocco | | 7 | 2 | 9 |
| Romania | | 1 | | 1 |
| Slovenia | 1 | | 1 | 2 |
| Spain | | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Syrian Arab Republic | | | | 0 |
| Tunisia | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| Turkey | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| TOTAL | 6 | 47 | 22 | 75 |


These figures are the cumulative number of distinct submissions received by the Secretariat (therefore members double counting can occur)

Appendix E

Fleet data (Vessel records) - Submission status by country [As at 3rd Feb 2014]

| Country | Last Submission | Fleet |
|----------------------|-----------------|-----------|
| Albania | 12/19/2011 | |
| Algeria | 1/28/2008 | >15m only |
| Bulgaria | 12/20/2013 | |
| Croatia | 7/1/2013 | |
| Cyprus | 10/22/2008 | >15m only |
| Egypt | 1/5/2014 | |
| France | 6/22/2010 | >15m only |
| Greece | 7/24/2013 | |
| Israel | No data | |
| Italy | 1/1/2013 | |
| Japan | 2/28/2013 | >15m only |
| Lebanon | 12/3/2013 | |
| Libya | 1/16/2007 | >15m only |
| Malta | 3/25/2013 | |
| Monaco | Not applicable | |
| Montenegro | No data | |
| Morocco | 1/1/2012 | |
| Romania | 12/22/2012 | |
| Slovenia | 12/20/2011 | |
| Spain | 12/30/2010 | |
| Syrian Arab Republic | 11/2/2008 | |
| Tunisia | 1/29/2014 | >15m only |
| Turkey | 5/5/2011 | |

">15 only" = only information on vessels over 15 meters have been submitted to the GFCM Secretariat




Appendix F

Authorized vessel list (>15m) - Fishing authorization status by country [As at 3rd Feb 2014]

| | Authorised | Not Authorised | Grand Total |
|----------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|
| Albania | 69 | 95 | 164 |
| Algeria | | 544 | 544 |
| Bulgaria | 1 | 58 | 59 |
| Croatia | 379 | | 379 |
| Cyprus | 14 | | 14 |
| Egypt | | 1680 | 1680 |
| France | 150 | 1 | 151 |
| Greece | 414 | 278 | 692 |
| Italy | | 1700 | 1700 |
| Japan | 278 | 54 | 332 |
| Lebanon | | 3 | 3 |
| Libya | | 270 | 270 |
| Malta | | 58 | 58 |
| Morocco | | 540 | 540 |
| Romania | | 13 | 13 |
| Slovenia | | 8 | 8 |
| Spain | | 926 | 926 |
| Syrian Arab Republic | | 31 | 31 |
| Tunisia | 381 | 496 | 877 |
| Turkey | | 1225 | 1225 |
| Grand Total | 1686 | 7980 | 9666 |

Montenegro and Israel: no data reported

Authorized = vessels which latest information submitted to the GFCM Secretariat report fishing authorization period not expired at the date of this analysis (3rd Feb 2014)



Appendix G

GFCM Vessel records (fleet data) - Data fields coverage by members [As at 3rd Feb 2014]

| | Albania | Algeria | Bulgaria | Croatia | Cyprus | Egypt | France | Greece | Israel | Italy | Japan | Lebanon | Libya | Malta | Monaco | Montenegro | Morocco | Romania | Slovenia | Spain | Syrian Arab Republic | Tunisia | Turkey | |
|--|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|------------|---------------|----------|---------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|----------------------|------------|---------------|---------------|
| TOTAL NO OF VESSELS | 511 | 544 | 2,068 | 7,770 | 14 | 2,989 | 226 | 11,500 | 0 | 12,764 | 332 | 2,627 | 271 | 1,036 | 0 | 0 | 901 | 992 | 186 | 3,218 | 55 | 892 | 17,399 | 66,295 |
| Vessel Name | 511 | 544 | 2,068 | 429 | 14 | 2,989 | 226 | 11,500 | 0 | 11,394 | 332 | 2,627 | 268 | 1,036 | 0 | 0 | 901 | 992 | 186 | 3,218 | 55 | 892 | 17,399 | 57,581 |
| Vessel Registration Number | 511 | 544 | 2,068 | 7,342 | 14 | 2,984 | 152 | 11,500 | 0 | 12,764 | 330 | 2,627 | 271 | 1,036 | 0 | 0 | 901 | 992 | 186 | 3,218 | 55 | 892 | 17,399 | 65,786 |
| GFCM Registration Number | 511 | 0 | 2,068 | 7,770 | 14 | 0 | 152 | 11,500 | 0 | 12,764 | 0 | 2,622 | 0 | 1,036 | 0 | 0 | 901 | 992 | 186 | 3,218 | 24 | 892 | 17,399 | 62,049 |
| Vessel Type | 511 | 0 | 2,068 | 7,770 | 14 | 2,988 | 149 | 10,929 | 0 | 0 | 332 | 2,622 | 271 | 1,036 | 0 | 0 | 901 | 992 | 186 | 3,218 | 55 | 891 | 0 | 34,933 |
| Operational Status | 511 | 0 | 2,068 | 7,770 | 0 | 2,989 | 0 | 10,929 | 0 | 12,764 | 0 | 2,622 | 0 | 1,036 | 0 | 0 | 901 | 992 | 186 | 3,218 | 24 | 892 | 17,399 | 64,301 |
| Port Registration | 511 | 0 | 2,068 | 7,770 | 0 | 2,989 | 0 | 11,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,547 | 0 | 1,036 | 0 | 0 | 901 | 992 | 186 | 3,218 | 24 | 892 | 17,399 | 52,033 |
| Year Entry Activity | 52 | 0 | 2,068 | 7,696 | 0 | 2,983 | 0 | 10,929 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,583 | 0 | 1,036 | 0 | 0 | 896 | 992 | 186 | 3,218 | 24 | 320 | 0 | 32,983 |
| License indicator (yes) | 155 | 0 | 1,492 | 6,851 | 0 | 2,989 | 0 | 10,920 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,021 | 0 | 0 | 901 | 183 | 140 | 3,218 | 0 | 858 | 17,399 | 46,127 |
| Fishing Period info (>15m) | 164 | 544 | 59 | 379 | 14 | 1,681 | 225 | 692 | 0 | 1,700 | 332 | 3 | 271 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 540 | 13 | 8 | 926 | 31 | 879 | 1,225 | 9,744 |
| Authorized Fishing Period (>15m) | 69 | 0 | 1 | 379 | 14 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 278 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 365 | 0 | 1,256 |
| Fishing Gear | 508 | 0 | 2,068 | 7,770 | 14 | 0 | 150 | 11,500 | 0 | 12,764 | 326 | 2,547 | 0 | 1,036 | 0 | 0 | 269 | 992 | 186 | 3,218 | 55 | 664 | 15,843 | 59,910 |
| LOA | 511 | 544 | 2,068 | 7,770 | 14 | 2,988 | 152 | 11,500 | 0 | 12,764 | 332 | 2,627 | 270 | 1,036 | 0 | 0 | 901 | 992 | 186 | 3,218 | 55 | 889 | 17,399 | 66,216 |
| GRT | 81 | 534 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,986 | 139 | 11,447 | 0 | 12,760 | 332 | 2,621 | 178 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 16,580 | 47,695 |
| GT | 511 | 0 | 2,068 | 7,657 | 14 | 2,984 | 152 | 11,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,625 | 0 | 1,036 | 0 | 0 | 592 | 992 | 186 | 3,218 | 55 | 882 | 13,901 | 48,373 |
| Construction Year | 254 | 0 | 2,068 | 7,609 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,929 | 0 | 12,764 | 0 | 2,565 | 0 | 1,036 | 0 | 0 | 883 | 992 | 186 | 3,218 | 23 | 156 | 8,219 | 50,902 |
| Hull Material | 166 | 0 | 2,068 | 7,770 | 0 | 2,989 | 0 | 10,929 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,622 | 0 | 1,036 | 0 | 0 | 898 | 992 | 184 | 3,218 | 24 | 683 | 17,390 | 50,969 |
| Powered (yes) | 501 | 0 | 1,927 | 7,709 | 0 | 2,989 | 0 | 10,765 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,351 | 0 | 1,036 | 0 | 0 | 898 | 520 | 174 | 3,127 | 24 | 857 | 0 | 32,878 |
| Engine Power Main | 500 | 0 | 1,927 | 7,705 | 0 | 2,987 | 0 | 10,765 | 0 | 10,786 | 0 | 2,346 | 0 | 1,036 | 0 | 0 | 805 | 520 | 174 | 3,127 | 24 | 856 | 17,367 | 60,925 |
| Owner Name | 511 | 477 | 2,068 | 7,770 | 14 | 2,989 | 150 | 10,929 | 0 | 12,764 | 307 | 2,627 | 34 | 1,036 | 0 | 0 | 992 | 186 | 906 | 55 | 889 | 17,399 | 62,103 | |
| Owner Address | 173 | 0 | 2,068 | 7,770 | 14 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 12,764 | 307 | 2,627 | 0 | 1,036 | 0 | 0 | 991 | 186 | 906 | 55 | 890 | 17,399 | 47,336 | |
| Operator Name | 0 | 0 | 1,714 | 7,770 | 14 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 4,663 | 307 | 516 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 992 | 186 | 3,218 | 41 | 372 | 0 | 19,943 | |
| Operator Address | 0 | 0 | 1,714 | 7,770 | 14 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 4,663 | 307 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 991 | 186 | 3,218 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 19,044 | |
| VMS indicator (yes) >15m | 125 | 0 | 39 | 291 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 | 0 | 1,687 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 540 | 11 | 7 | 926 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,797 |
| Minimum Mesh size | 0 | 0 | 0 | 788 | 0 | 1,784 | 70 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 190 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,372 | 4,275 |

Appendix H

GFCM Task 1 - Data fields coverage by members [As at 3rd Feb 2014]

| Ref. Year 2011 | MEMBERS | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 |
|-------------------|----------------------|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2013 Jan | Albania | A | C | C | D | - |
| 2013 Feb | Algeria | A | A | A | C | B |
| 2013 Jun | Bulgaria | A | B | A | B | - |
| 2013 May | Croatia | A | B | C | D | - |
| 2013 May | Cyprus | A | A | B | C | - |
| 2013 Feb | Egypt | A | C | B | - | - |
| - | EU | not applicable | | | | |
| 2013 Jul | France | A | A | B | D | - |
| - | Greece | - | - | - | - | - |
| - | Israel | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2014 Jan | Italy | A | B | A | C | B |
| - | Japan | not applicable | | | | |
| 2013 Apr | Lebanon | A | C | A | - | - |
| - | Libya | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2013 May | Malta | A | A | A | B | A |
| - | Montenegro | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2013 May | Morocco | A | A | C | C | B |
| - | Romania | - | - | - | - | - |
| - | Slovenia | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2013 May | Spain | A | A | C | B | B |
| - | Syrian Arab Republic | | | | | |
| 2013 Mar | Tunisia | A | A | A | - | - |
| 2013 May | Turkey | A | A | A | C | - |

The reported letters (A, B, C, D) depict a preliminary ranking assigned to the received national datasets in terms of fields' coverage. They don't encompass any quality evaluation.

A = All complete (100%)
 B = Mostly completed (75%)
 C = Partially completed (50%)
 D = Scarcely completed (25%)
 - = Not provided