



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



**SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SAC)**

**Subcommittee on Economic and Social Sciences (SCESS)**

**Report of the fourteenth session**

**Bar, Montenegro, 4–5 February 2014**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The fourteenth session of the Subcommittee on Economic and Social Sciences (SCESS) of the GFCM Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) addressed issues related to the proposal of a common methodology to carry out socio-economic analysis, the socio-economic variable and indicators contained in the GFCM Data Collection Reference Framework (DCRF) and small-scale fisheries. The SCESS agreed on the need to strengthen the contribution of socio-economic data to the management of fisheries, including through the involvement of experts in stock assessments and in the elaboration of multiannual management plans, and to follow up on the conclusions of the first Regional Symposium on Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea.

## **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 proposal<sup>1</sup>. 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 ARRANGEMENTS OF THE SCESS**

22. The fourteenth session of the Subcommittee on Economic and Social Sciences (SCESS) of the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC/GFCM) was held in Bar, Montenegro on 4–5 February 2014. The meeting was attended by experts of GFCM Members from EC, Montenegro, Morocco and Tunisia, the FAO regional projects, the GFCM Secretariat and several stakeholders. The list of participants is available as Appendix B. Concern was expressed in relation to the lack of attendance by the majority of GFCM Members.

23. The SCESS Coordinator, Mr Scander Ben Salem, opened the meeting, welcomed participants and introduced the agenda, which was adopted without changes (Appendix A). Due to the importance of the proposal for the GFCM Data Collection Reference Framework (DCRF) for the work of SCESS, and the need to provide input in relation to socio-economic data, it was decided to hold a transversal session on the socioeconomics component of the DCRF together with the subcommittee on statistics and information.

### **REVIEW OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE SCESS WORKING GROUP ON A COMMON METHODOLOGY TO CARRY OUT SOCIO-ECONOMIC ANALYSIS**

24. Mr Ben Salem recalled most salient points discussed during the “SCESS Working Group on a common methodology to carry out socio-economic analysis” (WGSEM) which was held on 3 February 2014 in Bar, Montenegro, just ahead of the SCESS. The participants reviewed the recommendations that the WGSEM had submitted to the attention of SCESS and noted that the proposed methodology would only concern those fishing vessels which have a license. In light of this, and given the need to make sure that in the future all fishing vessels in the GFCM Area could be tackled by a socio-economic analysis, it was proposed that an ad hoc methodology would have to be agreed upon in due course. Consequently, the proposed methodology, which was endorsed by SCESS, would only apply to licensed fishing vessels.

25. Several participants pointed out to the lack of information concerning the practical aspects of the proposed methodology as well as to the need to provide SAC with background and specifics so that GFCM Members can have guidance in applying the proposed common methodology. Mr Dario Pinello, from the FAO Regional Project EastMed, indicated that the finalization of a practical manual was ongoing and that this tool was conceived as a guide for national administrations willing to adopt a methodology for the collection and analysis of socio-economic data. As such manual was being prepared by the FAO Regional Projects, and in light of their vast expertise in supporting countries with the collection and analysis of socio-economic data, it was suggested to circulate the manual as soon as possible in upcoming GFCM meetings.

**ANALYSIS OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF MULTIANNUAL MANAGEMENT PLANS PROPOSED BY THE “SUB-REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON FISHERIES MANAGEMENT FOR WESTERN, CENTRAL AND EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN” (TUNIS, TUNISIA, 7-10 OCTOBER 2013)**

26. Mr Ben Salem illustrated the work being planned within the GFCM in relation to the development of several multiannual management plans at sub-regional level. He referred in particular to the aspects in these plans which were linked to socio-economic data as preliminarily discussed in Tunis in October 2013. In his view, it was of the outmost importance for the SAC to integrate socio-economic data with biological and exploitation related data while developing any sub-regional multiannual management plan.

27. In the ensuing discussions several considerations were put forth. Mr Malouli Idrissi, from INRH-Morocco, acknowledged the importance of multiannual management plans as those instruments had been tested and employed by GFCM Members already. However, he explained that at national level work could be quite advanced on multiannual management plans and that it was therefore necessary to ensure compatibility between future initiatives promoted by the GFCM at sub-regional level and existing initiatives planned and implemented at national level. There was agreement on the need to integrate more socio-economic dimensions of fishery management not only in multiannual management plans but in the annual work done by SAC. In this respect, it was noted that the status of relevant stocks validated by the subcommittee on Stock Assessment (SCSA) departed from a set of data which were also relevant for socio-economic analysis. In light of this, it was proposed to complement in the future the work of the SCSA by involving experts in socio-economic that could detail the socio-economic impacts of fisheries management on the basis of those additional data collected through the DCRF.

**TRANSVERSAL SESSION SCSI/SCCESS ON THE DCRF**

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

28. Participating experts of the joint session SCSI/SCCESS 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.

29. 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.

30. 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).

31. 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.

32. 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.

33. 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**

34. 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)***

35. 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)***

36. 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**

37. 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).

38. 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.

**DEVELOPMENTS RELATING TO SMALL SCALE FISHERIES**

39. Mr Nicola Ferri, from the GFCM Secretariat, reported on the conclusions of the first Regional Symposium on Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea (27-30 November 2013, Malta). After a careful examination of the various conclusions put forth, participants agreed on the need to continue tackling small-scale fisheries related issues on an urgent basis. To this end, they endorsed the proposal that a second regional symposium be convened in 2014. Furthermore, they agreed on the need to finalize a short concept note concerning the potential regional programme on small-scale fisheries, as proposed by the Symposium. It was suggested that all partners having participated to the organization of the Symposium should be involved in the preparation of the concept note and that a joint effort should be performed in order to collect the funding necessary for this ambitious programme.

40. Satisfaction was expressed for the positive role played by SCESS in proposing the organization of the Symposium in 2013. Participants concurred that small-scale fisheries should remain a top priority for SCESS in the years to come and that developments within the FAO on the Voluntary Guidelines for Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries should be followed with attention. In due course SCESS should provide advice as to how these guidelines could be tailored to the specificities of the GFCM competence area.

**ANY OTHER MATTER**

41. In order to ensure better coordination between SCESS and several ongoing projects currently being implemented within the GFCM competence area aimed at collecting information on socio-economic sciences in fisheries management, three informative presentations were delivered by participants.

42. Mr Fabio Grati, from the Italian ISMAR-CNR, illustrated the situation of small scale fisheries (SSF) in the Adriatic Sea. The major knowledge gaps and priorities for SSF had been identified within the framework of the Working Group on Small Scale Fisheries of the FAO AdriaMed Regional Project. Nonetheless, he reported a lack of appropriate and complete statistics as one of the main constraints for most of the Adriatic coastal countries (few countries had in place consistent monitoring programmes while others were dealing mostly with estimates). Moreover, when dealing with data requirements, the social and economic component of small scale fisheries should be better addressed in the future, with particular reference to basic data on level of employment, catch quantity and value, fleet composition, fishing season, area and, ideally, on by-catch as well. In the Adriatic context, when



dealing with shared stocks and sub-regional management processes attention should also be paid, as recalled by Mr Grati, to national management plans to tackle complex issues such as territorial access rights. The outcomes of the discussions held among Adriatic experts on small-scale fisheries thus far were provided as background for a wider exam on perspectives and sustainable development of the sector at regional level.

43. Ms Nicoletta Milone, from the FAO Regional Project AdriaMed, complemented the information provided by Mr Grati and briefed SCESS on the activities carried out by the AdriaMed Working Group on Small Scale Fisheries. During the last meeting of the group, held in November 2013, a questionnaire was circulated among the Adriatic countries to assess the source and availability of small-scale fisheries at national level. This information would constitute the basic knowledge to foresee any future joint activity on small-scale fisheries at Adriatic sub-regional level. It was recognized that the work undertaken would indeed represent a valuable contribution for the development of a common framework on small-scale fisheries in the Adriatic Sea and, more broadly speaking, in the Mediterranean region.

44. Mr Pino Lembo, from the Italian COISPA research centre, presented the SEDAF project which aimed at underpinning the establishment of appropriate management measures for sustainable fisheries on the basis of a clear knowledge of the socio-economics aspects pertaining to them. To this end, not only SEDAF aimed at improving such knowledge in the Adriatic Sea, by exploiting and combining all the different sources of socio-economic information and evaluating the knowledge gaps, but also focused on identifying main fisheries and the analyses of the status of related shared and non-shared resources which were the basis for the application of bio-economic models for simulations/forecast. Mr Lembo specified that the project would cover the different fisheries exploited along the Adriatic coasts by Italy, Slovenia, Croatia, Montenegro and Albania and indicators collected would be in line with the methodology and interpretation developed in the DCF and STECF reports for socio-economic data and in STECF reports on balance between fishing capacity and fishing opportunities. Furthermore, the indicators would be reported as annual averages by fleet segment for the economic assessment and profit/loss analysis, whilst selected variables would be taken and estimated at fishery and/or GSA level for bio-economic modeling. In order for SEDAF to fulfill its mandate 5 work packages had been developed and they were expected to be executed on a 14 months basis with the support of the FAO Regional Project AdriaMed.

45. Ms Monica Gambino introduced the SOCIOEC collaborative project, which has received funding from the European Union under the Seventh Framework Programme of Cooperation and consisted of 25 partners from 12 different countries as well as stakeholders representatives of the fishing sector and experts from ecology, economics and social sciences. Ms Gambino recalled that GFCM was included in the advisory board and participated as external reviewer for the 36 months of duration of the project. Among the main objectives, that of developing possible new management measures to be introduced in order to achieve a more profitable and efficient fishing sector was foreseen. More precisely, main objectives can be summarized as follows:

- Investigate how ecological, economic and social sustainability could be defined in a clear and overall acceptable manner to give guidance in the short term while ensuring the long-term sustainability and viability of fisheries;
- Analyse what management measures would create the right incentives to tackle the main structural failures mentioned in the Green Paper of the Reform of the Common Fisheries Policy of the EU;
- Determine the socio-economic and spatial effects of these management measures paying special attention to fishermen's behavioral responses (e.g. incentives) and to the potential links of management measures with uncertainties and externalities (e.g. oil price, interest rates, fish market prices)

46. The SOCIOEC project was structured and organized without a separation of ecology, economy and social disciplines and also considered six specific case studies that reflected the most

representatively European fisheries. Seven work packages had been created, some of which being cross-thematic as well as multidisciplinary in content.

## **GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

47. The following recommendations were drawn by SCESS:
- Submit to SAC for endorsement the common methodology to carry out the collection of socio-economic data as elaborated by the SCESS Working Group;
  - Development by SCESS of a common methodology to carry out the collection of socio-economic data that will address all fishing vessels which are currently not covered by the proposed methodology (i.e. those without a license);
  - Launch a regional programme on small-scale fisheries, as proposed by the First Regional Symposium on Sustainable Small Scale Fisheries on the Mediterranean and the Black Sea (27-30 November 2013, Malta);
  - Convene the Second Regional Symposium on Sustainable Small Scale Fisheries on the Mediterranean and the Black Sea (one of the thematic sessions of the proposed second symposium should revolve around the analysis of socio-economic data to be used for the management of small-scale fisheries);
  - Make sure that socio-economic impacts of multiannual management plans proposed by the Commission are adequately addressed and, to this end, include a small group of economists in future meetings of working groups where multiannual management plans will be examined;
48. The following recommendations were drawn by the transversal SCSi-SCESS session:
- Review the GFCM DCRF on the basis of the inputs provided by SCESS at the transversal session;
  - The periodicity to submit socio-economic data will be every two years, with the possibility of voluntarily submit those data through the DCRF on annual basis;
  - Perform an analysis of the questionnaires that were circulated in 2013 to GFCM Framework Programme focal points to draw the attention of SAC on the need for training and technical assistance on the processing and analysis of socio-economic data with a view that the SAC can propose a regional workshop to draw a roadmap on the subject.

## **PROGRAMME OF WORK**

49. The SCESS proposed the following work-plan, while referring the choice of dates and venues of meetings to the 38<sup>th</sup> session of the Commission:
- Second Regional Symposium on Sustainable Small Scale Fisheries on the Mediterranean and the Black Sea;
  - SCSi-SCESS joint working group on technical assistance on the processing and analysis of socio-economic data;
  - 15<sup>th</sup> session of SCESS.

**CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

50. The meeting was closed and the SCESS coordinator together with the GFCM Secretariat reiterated the thanks to Montenegro for the hospitality and the excellent support provided in the organization.

### Agenda

- 1. Transversal session on the review of the draft proposal for the GFCM Data Collection Reference Framework (DCRF)**
- 2. Introduction of participants and adoption of SCESS agenda**
- 3. Review of the recommendations by the SCESS Working Group on Common methodologies to carry out socio-economic analysis**
- 4. Analysis of socio-economic impacts of multiannual management plans proposed by the “Sub-Regional Workshop on Fisheries Management for Western, Central and Eastern Mediterranean” (Tunis, Tunisia, 7-10 October 2013)**
- 5. Developments relating to small scale fisheries**
  - Review of the conclusions of the “First Regional Symposium on Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Mediterranean and Black Sea” (St Julian’s, Malta, 27-30 November 2013) and identification of next steps
  - Discussions on the contents of the prospective regional programme on sustainable small-scale fisheries in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea
- 6. General conclusions and recommendations**
- 7. 2014 SCESS workplan**
- 8. Any other matter**
- 9. Date and venue of next session**
- 10. Adoption of the conclusions and closure of the meeting**

## List of participants

**Malouli IDRISSE**

Economie des pêches  
 INRH - Centre Régional de Tanger  
 BP 5268 Dradeb Tanger  
 90000 Maroc  
 Tél/Fax : 0021239325139  
 GSM : 0021261263050  
 Email : [malouliinrh@yahoo.fr](mailto:malouliinrh@yahoo.fr)

**Monica GAMBINO**

NISEA  
 Via Irno 11  
 Italy  
 Tel.: +39 089795775  
 E-mail: [gambino@nisea.eu](mailto:gambino@nisea.eu)

**Fabio GRATI**

ISMAR -CNR  
 Largo Fiera della Pesca  
 Ancona 60125, Italy  
 Tel: 0039 071207881  
 Fax: 0039 07155313  
 E-mail: [f.grati@ismar.cnr.it](mailto:f.grati@ismar.cnr.it)

**Nada LAKICEVIC**

Ministry of Agriculture and Rural  
 Development  
 Rimski trg 46, 81 000  
 Podgorica,  
 Montenegro  
 Tel.: +10038269578843  
 E-mail: [nada.lakicevic@mpr.gov.me](mailto:nada.lakicevic@mpr.gov.me)

**Giuseppe LEMBO**

COISPA Tecnologia & Ricerca  
 Via dei Trulli 18, Bari  
 Italy  
 Tel.: +39 0805433596  
 E-mail: [lembo@coispa.it](mailto:lembo@coispa.it)

**Evelina SABATELLA**

IREPA Onlus  
 Via San Leonardo,  
 trav. Migliaro,  
 84131 Salerno, Italy  
 Email: [esabatella@irepa.org](mailto:esabatella@irepa.org)

**Maria Teresa SPEDICATO**

COISPA Tecnologia & Ricerca  
 Via dei trulli 18, 70126 Bari  
 Italy  
 Tel.: +39 0805433596  
 E-mail: [spedicato@coispa.it](mailto:spedicato@coispa.it)

**FAO Regional Projects****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](mailto:matthieu.bernardon@fao.org)

**Luca CERIOLA**

FAO MedSudMed  
 Fisheries and Aquaculture Resources Use  
 and Conservation Division (FIRF)  
 Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 1  
 00153, Rome, Italy  
 E-mail: [luca.ceriola@fao.org](mailto:luca.ceriola@fao.org)

**Nicoletta MILONE**

FAO AdriaMed  
 Fisheries and Aquaculture Resources Use  
 and Conservation Division (FIRF)  
 Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 1  
 00153, Rome, Italy  
 E-mail: [nicoletta.milone@fao.org](mailto:nicoletta.milone@fao.org)

**Dario PINELLO**

FAO EastMed  
 Fisheries and Aquaculture Resources Use  
 and Conservation Division (FIRF)1, Androu  
 112 57, Greece  
 Tel.: +30 2108847960  
 E-mail: [dario.pinello@fao.org](mailto:dario.pinello@fao.org)

**SCESS Coordinator**

**Scander BEN SALEM**

INSTM - Port de pêche

2060 La Goulette

Tek.: +216 735 848

Fax: +216 732 622

E-mail: [scander.bensalem@instm.rnrt.tn](mailto:scander.bensalem@instm.rnrt.tn)

**GFCM SAC Chairman**

**Henri FARRUGIO**

IFREMER, av. Jean Monnet,

BP 171, 34203 Sète, France

Ph: +33 0499573237

E-mail: [henri.farrugio@ifremer.fr](mailto:henri.farrugio@ifremer.fr)

**GFCM Secretariat**

**Nicola FERRI**

Legal and Institutional 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 57055766

E-mail: [Nicola.Ferri@fao.org](mailto:Nicola.Ferri@fao.org)