



GROWTH AND INNOVATION IN OCEAN ECONOMY – GAPS AND PRIORITIES IN SEA BASIN OBSERVATION AND DATA

D10.3 First Panel Report (4/12/2013-03/06/2015)

Total number of pages: 20

Task:	10.4	Panel Report	
Author(s):	Nadia Pinardi	INGV	
	F.Blanc	CLS	
	G.Manzella	INGV	
	E.Moussat	Ifremer	
	G.Fabi	CNR-ISMAR	
	G.Scarcella	CNR-ISMAR	

A project funded by:

**EUROPEAN COMMISSION, DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR MARITIME AFFAIRS AND FISHERIES,
MARITIME POLICY ATLANTIC, OUTERMOST REGIONS AND ARCTIC**



Document Log

Date	Author	Changes	Version	Status
02/06/2014	N.Pinardi	First draft of report	V1	completed
07/06/2015	N.Pinardi	Added section with Dr. Bernal answers	V2	completed
07/06/2015	G.Scarcella	Answers to Dr. Bernal questions	V3	completed
18/06/2015	N.Pinardi	Last corrections	V4	completed

Executive Summary	4
Introduction	5
Panel meeting agenda and participants	5
Panel questions	8
Answers to the general questions	8
Answers to single Expert questions	10
Final Panel Report	18

Executive Summary

The first MedSea CheckPoint Panel meeting was held in Bruxelles, April 8 and 9, 2015. This report documents the participants and the discussion about the First Data Adequacy Report (DAR) of the MedSea CheckPoint project.

Panel Members asked several questions and clarification on the First DAR content which were answered by the Project participants and they are reported here. The DAR was then modified accordingly. Finally the Panel received the revised DAR and answers to the questions and commented on the consistency of the answers and corrections done.

In conclusion the revised DAR of the MedSea CheckPoint was accepted by the Panel.

Introduction

The aim of the Panel meeting was to evaluate the First Data Adequacy Report (DAR) from the MedSea CheckPoint Consortium work in the first 18 months of the Project.

1. The expert Panel for the MedSea CheckPoint is composed of:
2. Monika Peterlin -- environmental agency
3. Miguel Bernal -- regional international organization for fisheries
4. Jan Erik Hanssen – private industry
5. Alberto Lamberti – academia – coastal engineering
6. Piero Lionello – academia – climate science of the Mediterranean Sea

DGMARE suggested the additional expert Dr. Pierfrancesco Moretti from Italian CNR. Dr. Miguel Bernal could not attend the meeting and he received copy of both the draft and final revised version of the First DAR Report and he submitted a report which is inserted in the last section of the report.

Panel meeting agenda and participants

The first Panel meeting was held in Brussels at the EuroGOOS AISBL April 8 and 9, 2015.
The participants are listed in the following Table:

Participant Name	Organization
Frederique Blanc	CLS, France
Wendy Bonne	JPI Oceans, EU
Erik Buch	EuroGOOS, INT
Claudia Cesarini	CLU, Italy
Florence Coroner	JPI Oceans, EU
Anja Detant	EC-EASME
Lluís Gomez-Pujol	SOCIB, Spain
Patrick Gorringe	EuroGOOS, INT
Jan Erik Hanssen	
Alberto Lamberti	University of Bologna, Italy
Piero Lionello	University of Salento, Italy
Giuseppe Manzella	INGV and ETT, Italy
Pier Francesco Moretti	Bluemed initiative, EU
Eric Moussat	IFREMER, France
Amanda Perez Perera	EC-DGMARE
Monika Peterlin	Institute for water of the Rep. of Slovenia, Slovenia
Nadia Pinardi	INGV, Italy
Erwann Quinbert	IFREMER, France

Giuseppe Scarcella	CNR-ISMAR, Italy
Iain Shepherd	EC-DGMARE
Bernard Vanheule	International Association of Oil and Gas Producers, UK
Marco Weydert	EC- DG RTD

The agenda is reported below.

WEDNESDAY 8 April 2015

Time	Subject: EMODNET Panel meeting	Speaker
13:00-13:15	People meet	
13:15-13:30	Introduction to the EMODnet CheckPoint activities	N. Pinardi
13:30-14:00	Introduction to CheckPoint metadata and indicators	E.Moussat
14:00-14:30	Demonstration of CheckPoint Service	F.Blanc
14:30-15:00	<i>Coffee break</i>	
15:00-16:00	The 1 st Data Adequacy Report	G.Manzella
16:00-18:00	Discussion and questions from experts and stakeholders	Moderator: N. Pinardi
18:00	Meeting ends	

Evening: Project partners meeting to discuss inputs by the experts and stakeholders

THURSDAY 9 April 2015

Time	Subject: EMODnet Panel CLOSE door meeting (ONLY TO PROJECT PARTICIPANTS AND EXPERTS)	Speaker
09:00-9:30	Wrap-up of previous Day discussion and inputs from Panel	N. Pinardi
9:30-10:30	First Draft Report scheme and discussion (with Template and questions to be answered)	N. Pinardi
10:30-10:45	<i>Coffee break</i>	
10:45-12:30	Writing of Preliminary Report by Experts	Experts
12:30-13:00	Final discussion on the roadmap to a final 1 st DAR	N. Pinardi
13:00	<i>Light lunch break</i>	

At the end of the two days several questions were outlined and they are discussed in the following section.

Panel questions

A sequence of general comments were collected from the Experts at the meeting. The Consortium answered to each comment and revised the Draft MedSea CheckPoint first DAR. The answers to the general comments are reported in the following subsection.

Answers to the general questions

0) **Comment:** AV-AC-4 Choice 2 should become yellow in the future DAR and here to be commented

Answer: we introduced a new section, 5.2, explaining the Indicator evaluation scale meaning. We have also commented at the end of section 6.2 (page 29 in the revised version) that the scale of AV-AC-4 will be changed in the next DAR following the expert panel suggestions.

1) **Comment:** Describe the difference between Fitness for use and Fitness for purpose in the introduction

Answer: the Introduction has been partially re-written to accommodate for more definitions. It contains now five parts: in subsection 1.2 there is now an explanation of fitness for use and the difference with the fitness for purpose (Fig. 1.1).

2) **Comment:** Add the user/scenario Table and specify the Target users/scenarios main drivers

Answer: we added section 1.4 where the target users are now clarified.

3) **Comment:** Explain how the choice of data sources was made

Answer: a new subsection 4.1 has been added which talks about the issues of dataset identification and a comment has been introduced at page 20 that explains how choices were made.

4) **Comment:** Add a preamble about the choice of Challenge types

Answer: we added few phrases in section 1.1 to specify that Challenges are exemplary study cases for the Integrated Maritime Policy.

5) **Comment:** Add the ISO methodology definitions

Answer: We added a new subsection 1.3 which explains the ISO framework for our study and a new Annex 1 that discusses the assessment criteria on the basis of ISO standards.

6) **Comment:** classify the required characteristics on the basis of EMODnet Thematism and a section that comments “availability” of datasets from EMODnet Thematic Portals and MyOcean input data sets

Answer: We added a section 9 specifically on the availability indicator discussion for the EMODnet Portals and MyOcean and Annex 5 where each EMODnet Portal has been classified in terms of indicators and challenges.

7) **Comment :** the question to address is: are all the 298 data sets different? Discuss the duplication issue

Answer: At the moment it is not possible to clarify the issue of the duplication data sets due to incomplete information in the metadatabase. It will be done in the second DAR. Things have been clarified by mentioning that the 298 are *data set descriptions* without pretending that they are all different data sources. Section 4.1 discusses the problems of dataset identification. At page 22 it is specified that 15% is a possible estimate of the number of duplicated data sets.

8) **Comment:** After approval of the DAR, send it to the Data Providers and ask them to give feedbacks (point out to the Browser where the data can be found) and have a questionnaire ready

Answer: it will be done

9) **Comment:** Elaborate a protocol from DGMARE to give a 'blue flag' to the high 'appropriateness' and high 'availability' data sets, one for each Challenge and at least annually

Answer: it will be done

10) **Comment:** Start to think how to improve datasets for each Challenge using feasibility and benefit concepts. Feasibility of improvements should be discussed in the final DAR.

Answer: it will be done

11) **Comment:** We need to coordinate between the two CheckPoints because:

11.1) we need to give a unique answer to the data providers and to DGMARE

11.2) it is possible to harmonize in terms of common indicators and interfaces between common indicators

Answer: we will go to the Expert Panel meeting of the North Sea and we will try to exploit the meeting between all CheckPoints in october 2015.

12) **Comment:** make connections to the ECAP process in order to connect with Balkans, Middle East and North African countries and the Barcelona convention contribution

Answer: it will be done

13) **Comment:** make explicit the differences between DAR and Literature Survey results

Answer: we clarified at the end of section 3.1 that Literature survey defined only the assessment criteria while the DAR constructed the metadatabase and the indicators.

14) **Comment:** refer to the MSFD Report on Mediterranean gaps in the MSFD process (CIRCA Article 12 of the Commission)

Answer: it will be done

15) **Comment:** connect with ECOSTAT (intercalibration activity) meeting in October 2015 to show the CheckPoint activities and ask for Member States data (Iain for contact points)

Answer: it will be done

Answers to single Expert questions

1) Suggestions by Piero Lionello

Comment: Replicate section 8, which refers to challenge 3, for other challenges

Answer: At this moment, it is not possible to replicate the work done for Challenge 3 because the other Challenges have still incomplete information on all the indicators.

Comment: Could you summarize and anticipate critical issues in relation to the different challenges?

Answer: Critical issues for CheckPoints are: 1) the relatively scarce SeaDataNet vocabulary for the metadatabase (mentioned in the DAR); 2) the completeness of the metadatabase for all Challenges because the dataset identification is done by the Challenge expertise only; 3) the possibility that some Challenges will not be able to give a complete result or targeted product because input data will not be available.

While for the first it will be difficult to manage changes since of the limited duration of the project, for the second we will manage two full revisions of the metadatabase every six months (month 24 and 30 of the project) also with an independent panel of users. For the third criticality, we will try to make sure a full justification is given and gaps are well identified.

Comment: The whole exercise depends critically on the selection of datasources and monitoring systems. Considering that appropriateness has not been assessed in this 1st DAR, there is the risk of dealing with insufficient datasets in the catalog. Is there a “plan B”... ?

Answer: This is a critical issue and we answer in the comment above.

Comment: Has the comprehensiveness of the 45 characteristics been tested with external users? An independent panel of users to test the characteristics might help. eg for coastal protection I have asked some colleagues and they would need among other variables the following ones (I am not sure they are included in the catalogue)

- Temporal series of shoreline and profile sections.
- sea levels, splitting between residual and astronomical components at various scales
- current velocities in 3D.
- Long term and extreme distribution functions for those variables.

Answer: As answered two comments above, we will try to manage an external user survey. For coastal protection, it is clear that data sets are very difficult to find and data are mainly found in literature papers or reports. This case will be described in details in the second DAR and Challenge experts are working on it.

Comment: Make clear priorities and/or ranking in the selection of target users and how they are reflected in the definition of the indicators

Answer: we have now added a section 1.4 on the target users which in synthesis are the Institutional and the data providers

Comment: Some puzzling issue on indicators AV-AC-4 and AV-AC-2, as when data are restricted it is considered equivalent to unavailability of data. The three level ranking appears problematic for some indicators, where more levels would be apparently required

Answer: We have partially answered in Comment (0) above. In addition and for AV-AC-2, we believe we should leave “red” for manual order form because of the specified meaning of the color scale which is now given in section 5.2

Comment: time threshold on AV-PE-1 is quite depending on the use to be done of the data? One one week is the threshold?

Answer: Article 7 ‘Response Time’ of the Commission Regulation (EU) No 268/2010 ‘Implementing Directive 2007/2/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the access to spatial data sets and services of the Member States by Community institutions and bodies under harmonised conditions’ states: Response Times - Member States shall provide access to spatial data sets and services without delay and at the latest within 20 days after receipt of a written request, unless otherwise agreed by mutual agreement between the Member State and the institution or body of the Community.

Instead of 20 days we have chosen to put the upper limit to one week because it seemed less conservative. The other thresholds are chosen to be closer to operational users as requested from the Challenge 3 outputs.

Comment: Make clear the total number of datasets and the overlap among challenges (eventually using a Matrix)

Answer: see answer to comment (7) above.

2) Suggestions by Jan-Bart Calevart

Comment: Add a section that comments “availability” of datasets from EMODnet Thematic Portals and MyOcean input data sets and if possible any observations/recommendations that would be of interest/use for the EMODnet thematic groups to improve their services

Answer: Section 9 has been added together with Annex 5 to comment explicitly EMODnet thematic Portals and MyOcean service availability.

3) Suggestions by Jan Hanssen

General, A. Comment on the background for the “colour coding” used

Some cases of “Red” seem to be motivated by purely charging for access to data and a distinction is made between “commercial cost charge” and “distribution / collection charges”. While it would in principle always be preferable for data to be free, the approach mentioned indicates that charging for data negates their value completely and *ab initio*. Other approaches could be used/

Answer: we have answered in comment (0) above that we will change the AV-AC-4 indicator, we agree with the expert that it was not properly scaled.

General, B. Comment on the completeness of data sets

Check for completeness the availability of data sources in Annex 2 especially for cases where only 1 or 2 sources have been identified (their appropriateness can be assessed in the 2nd DAR, but availability could be confirmed now, if possible.) Particular emphasis on cases (Challenges / Parameters) where only a few data sources are identified.

Answer: we have answered this question in Comment (3) and (7) above.

General, C. Suggestion for a Group of test users

Should be external to the project team, but collaborative. Useful also in verifying availability of data sets; for now, and on both availability and appropriateness in the Final DAR (cf. the point above). A couple of ad-hoc checks with specific groups reveals a clear commitment and little time need for cases tested.

Answer: as in the answer of Piero Lionello, we will set up an external user panel to check on the completeness of the metadatabase.

4) Suggestions by Lamberti

Comment: In my opinion, the CheckPoint should be updated approximately every year by:

- including more datasets regarding the presently considered Challenges,
- including a few more Challenges, as Tourism, Navigation and Operational Forecasting for instance.

Coastal protection and climate change shall be separated.

I have the impression that the selection of the considered datasets does not reflect the objective availability, but the experience of project partners. An effort should be done to be more objective.

Answer: the reviewer is correct, many of the datasets have not been yet accessed to make the targeted Challenge products so the metadatabase (only Challenge 3 and this is why it has a dedicated section). We answered this comment in (3) and (7) above.

Comment: Indicators are in my opinion sufficient. They are however many; 8 major ones for Appropriateness and 3 for Availability. Due to the declination at a second level they become 13 and 8 respectively. The synthesis will be in any case an important part of the assessment process. The synthesis should preserve a sufficient variability of assessed values, and attention should be focused on relevant parameters. Within a 3 level assessment procedure, an indicator of secondary relevance does not have a significative influence on assessment results.

Answer: we will consider this comment while developing the indicators for the second DAR

Comment:

For some challenges the considered data sets are inappropriate. For instance: coastal protection requires a bathymetric resolution near the shoreline of the order of 1 m, that is equivalent to an altimetry resolution around 0.1 m. 100 m horizontal resolution is totally inappropriate. Erosion is most frequently assessed by displacement of the shoreline. High resolution dated satellite imagery in different years, combined with water elevation data would be sufficient. A qualitative assessment of coastal erosion at a European scale was performed by the project EuroSION. The presently considered datasets will not allow a better quantitative assessment.

Similarly precipitation and liquid discharges are measured in all the major rivers by hydrographic agencies and can be reasonably extended to ungauged basins. Measurements are regularly published. Sediment transport is far less measured but estimates can be found in literature.

Answer: the project EuroSION has been considered but the resolution is too coarse and data are qualitative. The sediment mass flux which is requested by the Challenge is not contained in the EuroSION data set. A comprehensive literature data set survey is being carried out by the project partners. The Expert anticipated the Challenge results which however will be demonstrated in the second DAR

Comment: The CheckPoint service is essentially a tool to identify appropriate data, or areas where data are insufficient. But data are never given and must be actually collected. Therefore a collection defect whose results is “data for some challenge are insufficient” whereas they exist, results in a fatal failure of the CheckPoint service.

The present structure of the service is severely conditioned by what was specified in the call text. I am not sure you can this argument without negative feedback from DG-Mare.

Assuming the service provide reliable answers, it can be used by research/service policy makers to push in some area or on some infrastructure in order to have better information for end-users where they need it.

For users the portal and metadata information is also important, giving access to data as well as information about what to do to gain access, as well as what can be obtained from accessing data.

Answer: The missing data sets, emerging from the CheckPoint activities, will not be in our opinion a fatal failure of the CheckPoint Service. In fact the identification of gaps in the basin scale monitoring system is one of the primary objectives of the CheckPoint. This assessment should be used by the relevant stakeholders to “push in some area or on some infrastructure in order to have better information for end-users where they need it”.

The CheckPoint e-service will make available the metadata and the indicators so that users will know how to gain access.

Comment: ISO approach is fine. In order to have a synthetic indicator of datasets availability and appropriateness for the specified challenges a synthesis process must be set up that accounts for logical interaction between data in the challenges solution process, as well as for uncertainty and expected correlation between indicator values.

Answer: we thank the expert for the suggestions which we will try to use for the further development of the indicators.

Comment: how often would you recommend the indicators and the service in general to be updated? It must be distinguished between correction of errors in the CheckPoint service, and reflection of real data availability and quality. Correction of errors should be done as soon as they become evident and correction is possible. Changes in the real world conditions requires some time and I doubt that updating might be necessary with frequency higher than once in 1-2 years.

Answer: well noted, the need for one CheckPoint update every 1-2 years will be put in the second DAR and in the requested document on the future of the CheckPoint service.

Comment: if MSFD assessments are due every 5 years, how do you imagine to maintain the CheckPoint tools and skills?

MSFD assessment frequency (once every 5 or 6 years?) is low when compared to service updating frequency, but within a decade (2 MSFD assessments) technology improvements will presumably force some change in the CheckPoint structure, requiring some major upgrade. From a different point of view, DG-Mare is not representative of all the stakeholders interested in the sea. If the service will be appreciated some other DGs will be also involved and challenges will be extended in future upgrades. Tools must be maintained, possibly with some support of DG-Mare, with the present structure of the service for some years, and presumably upgraded within a new project when wider interests will be focused on the service.

Answer: well noted, in the document about the future of the CheckPoint a new list of require Challenges will be done

Comment: In my opinion the DAR suffers because time was short.

Answer: we agree with this, making the metadatabase is still ongoing and the first DAR is limited in scope due to the lack of time.

Comment: Some words could be more appropriately selected (Territory: the non literal interpretation “**3 an area of knowledge, activity, or experience: the contentious territory of clinical standards | the way she felt now—she was in unknown territory.**” Maintains some connection with the literal interpretation that is not present in the logical definition applied in DAR.).

Answer: Our territory refers to a *domain of assessment* and we believe it might express well the subdivision of the assessment criteria into the two categories of appropriateness and availability. We added a definition in the Annex 6 nomenclature.

Comment: In some other cases the definitions should be transferred more clearly in the text (Data providers/sources-126-, source descriptors -298-; descriptors apparently refer to the combination of data-source and challenge; providers refers literally to institutions that provide data, whereas in fact it seems to be used as a synonymous of data-source or data-set ; somewhere else data-sets add up to 298, i.e. to the number of combination), the reader becomes confused.

Answer: we have now described the 298 as the data set descriptors in the metadatabase and changed everywhere accordingly. We have also added a section where now we define the “providers” in section 3, page 18. In the first DAR providers is a data originator, distributor and/or custodian all together and this might cause duplication of data sets in the metadatabase.

Comment:

In some cases some more information, that maybe is lacking as a consequence of subjective reasons, reverts a “not available” into a “partially (not easily) available”, i.e. the boundary between Red and Yellow is fuzzy; in any case most indicators of availability do not combine according to a severe logic (AND), since “not easy” does not means “impossible” and since researchers do frequently solve difficult problems, with one remarkable exception.

If we consider the example of Challenge 3, showing among challenges the greatest number of data-sets, most data are accessible by online downloading (Green) but under “moratorium” conditions (Yellow); the combined image seems to represents a rather easy availability, but in fact data are available to some users and unavailable to some others. Online availability is irrelevant if you are not allowed to have access to data. Data policy must be severely combined (AND) with the synthesis of all other indicators of availability. So that the synthesis of the apparently positive availability conditions presented in the table at page 38 is actually, in my opinion, “Yellow”: data are available under moratorium conditions.

Answer: we do agree with the Expert that the synthesis should weight the AV-AC-3 indicator (Data Policy) more than the others but in the first DAR we did not define yet the algorithm to give a synthesis score. As suggested by the reviewer we will have to weight differently the indicator values in the final synthesis indicator and/or use logical combination.

5) suggestions by Peterlin

Comment: Missing data sources:

- data in WISE (Water Information System of Europe, including Water framework directive WFD, Bathing water directive data and other).
- Barcelona Convention Data (MEDPOL I-IV)
- Plan Bleu?

Answer: we will consider these data sets in the future upgrades of the metadatabase even if the targeted Challenge products in this first project might not require inputs from the listed data sets.

Comment: The grading of the (example AV-AC-2 on page 23) Delivery mechanism seems a bit too stringent in terms of payable services since it should be considered normal that preparation of data is payable. It is recommended to only use red colour for ‘No information available’, Commercial costs is recommended to be yellow and Distribution costs – green.

Answer: we thank the expert for the input, as written in the answers to comment (0) and to Lionello’s comment, we will consider to change the AV-AC-4 color score (Cost basis) but not the AV-AC-2 (delivery mechanism) because in our opinion the order form/invoice delivery mechanism is really a red light. We hope the costing is now clearer since we have added section 4.2 on the definition of indicator evaluation scale.

Comment: It is advised that results (assessment results) of current challenge on Eutrophication be present to eutrophication experts in the Ecostat (intercalibration) group, to discuss with them consistency of results with the views of national experts, which has the next meeting in (in the week 20-23th) October 2015. Member states experts could also be asked at the meeting for non aggregated data on nutrients and Chl a to be included in the database and assessed together with

other data in order to improve the overall assessment of eutrophication and revise boundary values. (Contact should be done by Ian S. with Wouter Van-de-Bund (email: wouter.van-de-bund@jrc.ec.europa.eu)

Answer: we thank the expert for the suggestion and we will make an effort to go the Ecostat group meeting.

Comment: the approach and results should be discussed with the Barcelona convention secretariat with a view on how the Emodnet work could support ECAP (Ecosystem approach to the management of human activities) process. (Contact: Tatjana Hema) It would be very valuable if the discussion would start on how the Environmental objectives, stemming from ECAP/BC process can be supported by the MedSea CheckPoint approach in the future.

Answer: well noted, we will go to discuss the ECAP/BC Challenges to propose for the next phase

Comment: In the climate change challenge salinity should be also included as relevant variable;

Answer: well noted, this will be added to the document to be written about the future of the CheckPoints

6) suggestions by Bernal

Dr. Bernal was not capable to come to the meeting and he sent his comment reading the DAR manuscript.

Comment: Overall I do not have much comments on the assessment included in the DAR.

Comment: In relation to fisheries I have some questions and comments. First of all, I did not fully understand the way to assess the status of the fisheries challenge; it is clear to me that the information commonly used for fisheries management is somehow short in variables but rich in coverage (species, areas, etc.). I am unsure if this balance is well included in the assessment; for example that in Annex 3 there is a large number of parameters but the Fisheries challenge only has a few ticks.

Answer: The number of input data sets depends on the specific targeted product that is requested for this first exercise. In the case of the Fishery Challenge the specific targeted products are:

1) The first final product will be a set of Excel spreadsheets reporting values of mass and catches by species and year as well as the corresponding confidence limits (if adequate and possible). This will be made accessible on a specific page on the portal.

2) The second final products will be GIS maps (displayed on a specific page of the MedSea CheckPoint Portal) and digital data layers showing the level of disturbance by bottom trawling in the various Mediterranean areas and the changes in levels of disturbance. These maps will include data on the sedimentological features of the seabed, the bathymetry and the occurrence of particular habitats in order to highlight any disturbance produced by trawling in sensitive habitats.

Our experts have indicated that the data sets required to produce these two products are what is reported in the DAR, i.e.:

- 1) fish catch statistics;
- 2) fishery of by-catch;
- 3) horizontal platform movement (VMS data, we are searching for AIS data at the moment).

This nomenclature was fitting our chosen vocabulary which is given by the SeaDataNet Parameter Discovery Vocabulary (P02) as shown in Annex 3 of the Data Adequacy Report. A total of 26 data providers were listed and inserted in the database which you can browse from the webpage. Thus the limited number of parameters is due to the specific targeted product requested by the Project and that in the future could be modified.

Comment: This is in my mind normal and should not be negatively affecting the assessment of the fisheries challenge. On the other hand, an assessment of the coverage (in terms of number of species, spatial coverage, percentage of the landings for which data for assessment exist, etc.) is very relevant for this challenge. We have some estimates of the coverage of stock assessment at Mediterranean level (around 40 % of the landings, I can give you a more precise number if you consider this important).

Answer: The project asks to make available on an excel spreadsheet the fish catch by species and year and this will produce the coverage map as you say which will be given in terms of a GIS layer.

Comment: Also, I am unsure what are the sources of data that you are assessing.

Answer: There are several sources of data depending on the geographical area and they are inserted in the CheckPoint metadatabase (accessible from the web portal under Services and Browser). EU countries can provide data from the Data Collection Framework established in 2002. Other sources of data are coming from the FAO-FISHSTAT database, ICCAT database, GFCM Task 1, etc.

Comment: For example when you mention that fisheries data is not readily available (takes some days) I am unsure what is the source you refer to. Fisheries data from FAO (landings, some economic related variables) is readily available directly on the webpage (up to the reference year available, usually 1.5 years old). The GFCM also publish all information on stock assessment for those stocks being assessed once it is validated by the Scientific Advisory Committee. I also know that the EU STECF publish stock assessment forms once they are validated, although they are included as pdf files and it is somehow cumbersome to extract the info you need.

Answer: In this case we were referring mainly to DCF data. Data available from the Portal are not complete. The request of the full dataset needs to be approved by each MS and this process can take some days/weeks. Unfortunately the information coming from the stock assessment forms does not cover all the species we need for the Challenge targeted products. Our indicator documents this “low” accessibility process.

Final Panel Report

Panel experts were asked to state the acceptance of the revisions and answers. Their answers were as follows:

From ALBERTO LAMBERTI on 24 May 2015

Dear Nadia,

Thanks for the revised version of the report.

I confirm that my comments were accurately reported and considered.

I appreciate how comments of the experts were integrated in the text as well as your commitment to complete answers in the second DAR.

I just represent that editing should be improved, by checking spelling and avoiding casual cutting of tables between pages.

Your sincerely

Alberto

Prof. Alberto Lamberti

DICAM Idraulica, Università di Bologna

Viale Risorgimento, 2; 40136 Bologna BO; Italy

Phone: +39-0512093749, Fax: +39-0512093263

From JAN ERIC HANSSEN on 25 May 2015

Dear Professor Pinardi:

I confirm that you have taken into account fully all the comments that I had made to the first draft DAR in the revised document (version 09). As far as I can assess, also the comments of other Reviewers and the general outcome of our discussions at the meeting are fully incorporated.

I thank you for the thorough and in-depth review at the meeting, and look forward to the next occasion to follow this highly relevant and important effort.

Kind regards,

Jan Hanssen

From PIERO LIONELLO on 20 may 2015

Dear Nadia:

Thanks for the revised version of the report. I confirm that my comments were accurately reported and considered. I also appreciate how the report was modified taking into account the comments of the experts and your commitment to answer in the second DAR to those comments that were not possible to include in this first DAR.

Best regards,
Piero

From PIERFRANCESCO MORETTI on 18 May 2015

Dear Chiara,
apologize for not answering you all from the very beginning: mainly because I gave a very little contribution for the revision (mainly the comment number 10, which I do suggest to proceed with) and I think the report is well done.
all my best
pier

From MONIKA PETERLIN on 01/06/2015

Dear Nadia,

I hereby confirm that the revised Dar report summarises my opinion accurately.

With best wishes,
Monika

--

dr. Monika Peterlin
Inštitut za vode Republike Slovenije
Institute for Water of the Republic of Slovenia
Hajdrihova 28 c, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija
t: + 386 (0)1 47 75 337 f: + 386 (0)1 47 75 343 mobitel: +386 (0)41 527 385
www.izvrs.si

From MIGUEL BERNAL on 04/06/2015

Dear Chiara dear Nadia,

As has been often the case in this project, my apologies for lack of responsiveness, last week we had our yearly commission, in which preparation the whole GFCM Secretariat is involved for a period of about a month. As you have suffer it is very difficult for me to keep up with other initiatives during this period.

I must also confess that as I have not been able to attend the different meetings I am a bit lost on the methodology of work used. Also, I find some difficulties in understanding my role in the project, as when I tried to suggest a substitute from the GFCM to attend the meetings I was informed that only me can interact with the project. Maybe this is related to the fact that I am selected as an individual expert, but please bear in mind that in my current position as a FAO-GFCM officer, it is difficult to me to escape the priorities imposed by the GFCM Members and the GFCM workplan on the GFCM Secretariat.

In any case please find below some comments which I hope could be useful.

Overall I do not have much comments on the assessment included in the DAR. In relation to fisheries I have some questions and comments. First of all, I did not fully understand the way to

assess the status of the fisheries challenge; it is clear to me that the information commonly used for fisheries management is somehow short in variables but rich in coverage (species, areas, etc.). I am unsure if this balance is well included in the assessment; for example that in Annex 3 there is a large number of parameters but the Fisheries challenge only has a few ticks. This is in my mind normal and should not be negatively affecting the assessment of the fisheries challenge. On the other hand, an assessment of the coverage (in terms of number of species, spatial coverage, percentage of the landings for which data for assessment exist, etc.) is very relevant for this challenge. We have some estimates of the coverage of stock assessment at Mediterranean level (around 40 % of the landings, I can give you a more precise number if you consider this important). Also, I am unsure what are the sources of data that you are assessing. For example when you mention that fisheries data is not readily available (takes some days) I am unsure what is the source you refer to. Fisheries data from FAO (landings, some economic related variables) is readily available directly on the webpage (up to the reference year available, usually 1.5 years old). The GFCM also publish all information on stock assessment for those stocks being assessed once it is validated by the Scientific Advisory Committee. I also know that the EU STECF publish stock assessment forms once they are validated, although they are included as pdf files and it is somehow cumbersome to extract the info you need.

As I previously told you, we are also aiming to be able to provide some fisheries related products online towards the end of this year, once this is revised appropriately.

I know it is late in the process and therefore I do not know if you will be able to incorporate this comments, in case you find them useful. Once again apologies for the delay and my best regards,
Miguel Bernal

Fishery Resources Officer
General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM)
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
Palazzo Blumenstihl, Via Vittoria Colonna 1, 00193, Rome
Tel: +39 06 57056537
Fax: +39 06 57055827
E-mail: miguel.bernal@fao.org
Website: www.gfcmonline.org
http://twitter.com/UN_FAO_GFCM