

ICES SCICOM REPORT 2008

ICES SCIENCE COMMITTEE

REF. BUREAU

Report of the Science Committee (SCICOM)

18–20 May 2009

European Environment Agency (EEA),
Copenhagen, Denmark



ICES

International Council for
the Exploration of the Sea

CIEM

Conseil International pour
l'Exploration de la Mer

International Council for the Exploration of the Sea Conseil International pour l'Exploration de la Mer

H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44–46
DK-1553 Copenhagen V
Denmark
Telephone (+45) 33 38 67 00
Telefax (+45) 33 93 42 15
www.ices.dk
info@ices.dk

Recommended format for purposes of citation:

ICES. 2009. Report of the Science Committee (SCICOM), 18-20 May 2009, European Environment Agency (EEA), Copenhagen, Denmark . 25 pp.

For permission to reproduce material from this publication, please apply to the General Secretary.

The document is a report of an Expert Group under the auspices of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea and does not necessarily represent the views of the Council.

© 2009 International Council for the Exploration of the Sea

Contents

1	Opening.....	1
2	Follow up on actions from SCICOM (6–8 January 2009) and Bureau (10-11 February 2009) meetings	1
3	New structure of SCICOM.....	1
3.1	SCICOM decisions.....	3
4	Chairs of Steering and Administrative Groups	4
4.1	SCICOM decisions.....	5
5	2009 ASC business meetings	6
5.1	SCICOM decisions.....	7
6	Theme Sessions for 2010 ASC	7
7	Strategic initiatives.....	7
7.1	ESSAS	8
7.2	BASIN.....	9
7.3	Breakout groups.....	9
8	Reporting and presentations	11
8.1	Report of the Steering (now Planning) Group on Climate Change (PGCC)	11
8.2	Presentation on ICES Data Management Program	11
8.3	Report of the Working Group on Information and Data Management (WGDIM).....	12
8.4	Report of the Transition Group on ICES Publication (TGIP).....	12
8.5	Report of the ICES Training Committee (now Group).....	13
8.6	Report of the SCICOM Working Group on Science Cooperation (SWGSC)	14
9	Report of the HoS on meetings with other organizations.....	14
10	Housekeeping.....	15
10.1	ASC 2009–2012	15
10.2	Symposia 2010–2012	15
10.3	Communication with Delegates	16
10.4	Coordination of resolutions	16
10.5	SCICOM/ACOM linkages	17
10.6	ICES-FAO WGFTFB venue, Thailand, 2010	17
11	Next Meeting.....	18

Annex 1: List of participants.....19
Annex 2: Three breakout groups on strategic initiatives23

1 Opening

The Chair welcomed participants (see Annex 1) and thanked all who contributed to the report of the SCICOM Working Group on Science Leadership (SWGSL). He stressed the importance of this report and in particular how it provides a solid base for the discussion on the implementation of the new Science structure. At this meeting, we have to agree on the new SCICOM structure and appoint chairs for the key committees in order to move forward with the implementation before ASC. Another important subject for this meeting will be our discussion on the implementation of Strategic Initiatives. The Chair outlined key agenda items and objectives for the meeting. The agenda was approved without any addition.

2 Follow up on actions from SCICOM (6–8 January 2009) and Bureau (10–11 February 2009) meetings

Actions were taken on all decisions made by SCICOM at its 6–8 January 2009 meeting. As part of the follow-up, many subjects are on the agenda of this SCICOM meeting. The minutes of the 6–8 January 2009 meeting were approved without modification.

The Chair briefly reported on the 10–11 February 2009 Bureau meeting at which he presented the decisions and resolutions taken at the January SCICOM meeting. The report was well received by the Bureau. The SCICOM resolution for establishing a C4 post in the Science Program in the Secretariat for three years was approved and will be funded 50/50 by the Secretariat and the Strategic Investment Fund (SIF). As part of the discussion on the SIF, the Bureau asked SCICOM to deal with two specific issues:

- Take the ownership of the Climate Change project currently under the leadership of the Steering Group on Climate Change (SGCC) and comes back to the Bureau at its June meeting with a proposal for continuation.
- Assess the relevance and priority for ICES in participating to the continuation of the Census of Marine Life project, which is currently being funded until the end of 2010.

These two issues were dealt with under the agenda items on Strategic Investment Fund and Science Cooperation.

3 New structure of SCICOM

The Chair of the SCICOM Working Group on Science Leadership (SWGSL), Niall Ó'Maoiléidigh presented the report of the working group. Key recommendations of the report are:

- Setting up a Steering Committee (SC) structure under SCICOM. It would be formed by five (5) SCs, of which three (3) would be aligned with the Science Plan Themes and two (2) would be horizontal integrative programs:
 - Theme 1 – Ecosystem Functions
 - Theme 2 – Human Interactions on Ecosystems
 - Theme 3 – Sustainable use of Ecosystems
 - Regional Sea Program
 - Ecosystem Surveys Science and Technology
- Allocation of each of the 69 Science EG to one of the 5 SGs. SGs could set ToRs for any EG – Matrix Approach
- Setting up four (4) committees to deal with core responsibilities of SCICOM:
 - Data
 - Publications
 - Training
 - Awards
- Setting up one external advisory committee to review the implementation of the Science Plan
- Nurturing (mentoring) each EG would be the responsibility of a pair of SCICOM delegates. Each pair would oversee 5–6 EGs.

In preparation for the discussion at SCICOM, the report of SWGSL was distributed to the EGs Chairs in late April. Comments received on the proposed science structure were overall positive and it was viewed as being more responsive to emerging science. Most concerns raised were questions of clarification. For instance, ensuring interaction between science and advice; dealing with workload issues; keeping a balance between a top-down and a bottom-up approach; participation of EG Chairs in the Steering Committees; and the need to set clear objectives.

In the following discussion, SCICOM agreed that the report from SWGSL provided a strong basis to move forward. There was a general agreement that the key 5 Steering Committees proposed by SCICOM were an appropriate structure for the management of ICES scientific activities. Furthermore, members expressed strong support for the Regional Sea Program committee, which would provide a good forum for the integration of disciplines and the development of ecosystem science. There was also a strong support for setting the Ecosystem Surveys Science and Technology committee, which would match well with priorities of the Advice Strategy. Although it was mentioned that Climate Change could have its own committee given its importance worldwide, SCICOM felt this priority would be adequately addressed by the SC on Ecosystem Functions (Theme 1).

SCICOM had a general discussion on the role and responsibilities of these five SCs and the need to create a work plan as soon as possible to engage the Expert Groups. Operational aspects, such as how often and when SCs would meet (face-to-face and web-conferences); coordination of the work among the SCs; how to organize EGs reporting; and linkage with the advisory side were discussed. These issues will have to be addressed as the ToRs and the work plan of these Steering Committees are developed. The Committee discussed the idea of setting up a SCICOM executive subcommittee to coordinate activities, but no consensus was reached.

The Committee then discussed the four committees proposed by SWGSL to deal with administrative responsibilities of SCICOM (e.g. Data, Publications, Training and Awards). It was recognized that these 'administrative' committees were quite different from the 5 major SCs (described above) and should not be on the organization chart describing the science structure. SCICOM agreed that Awards was a responsibility of the Bureau and Council rather than one of SCICOM. The need to set up a committee to deal with the theme sessions of ASC was also discussed and it was felt that the Chairs of the 5 SCs (which manage the science activities) and the host countries should form that committee (including the Secretariat). Concerning Data, it was stressed that the Data Centre provides services to both Science and Advice and that an integrated plan should serve the needs of both SCICOM and ACOM. Both Training and Publications committees also support Science and Advice and as such these committees need to develop their plans in consultation with SCICOM and ACOM. The Committee also had a discussion on the evolving role of the former Publication Committee, which will likely encompass communication at some point in the future. In that context SCICOM agreed to set up a Publication/Communication Group and abolish the Transition Group on ICES Publications (TGIP).

Mixed views were expressed on the need to set up an External Advisory Committee to review the progress in implementing the Science Plan. It was felt that more thought should be given on the role and responsibilities of such a group and that it was not urgent to make a decision given the early stage in implementing the Science Plan. This will be back on the agenda of SCICOM when the new science structure is fully operational.

In its report, SWGSL recommended that each EG be nurtured (mentored) by a pair of SCICOM delegates (each pair would oversee 5–6 EGs). Given that each EG has been allocated to one of the 5 SCs, SCICOM agreed that the nurturing role could easily be assumed by the SCICOM delegates who will be sitting on the 5 SCs.

The General Secretary informed SCICOM that the terminology used in the SWGSL report created problems. According to the ICES Rules of Procedure, committees report to the Councils and instituting new committees requires changes in the Rules of Procedure and approval by the Council. However, SCICOM has the authority to create subcommittees, which should be formed by a subset of members of SCICOM.

The 5 Steering Committees proposed by SWGSL will include non-SCICOM delegates (e.g. EG Chairs) and consequently could not be named subcommittees. To avoid any confusion and lengthy procedures in having the ICES Rules modified, SCICOM agreed to use the word 'GROUP' rather than 'COMMITTEE' to describe its reporting bodies. Hence the Steering Committees will be called STEERING GROUPS and other committees will be called GROUPS. The nomenclature of various groups reporting to SCICOM or its Steering Groups will be reviewed and approved by SCICOM.

3.1 SCICOM decisions

- The Steering Committee structure was approved, but to avoid changing the ICES rules and regulations these will be named Steering Groups (SG)
- There will be 5 SGs along the lines proposed by SWGSL.
- To avoid confusion and dual reporting, the Steering Group on Climate Change (SGCC) will be renamed Planning Group on Climate Change (PGCC) and report to SG – Ecosystem Functions (Theme 1).

- Action: The Chair of PGCC, Luis Valdes, will be notified.
- SCICOM agreed to set up 3 of the 4 'Administrative' Groups proposed by SWGSL:
 - Publication / Communication Group. Note: TGIP is abolished
 - DATA Group (currently WGDIM)
 - Training Group
- Another 'Administrative' Group will be set up to review and recommend to SCICOM the ASC Theme Sessions. It will be formed by the chairs of the 5 SGs, the Host Country and the Head of Science (HoS).
 - Action: Chairs of the SG and Delegate of France to review and recommend to SCICOM ASC Themes sessions for 2010.
- The Awards Committee will remain under the responsibility of the Council.
- The External Advisory Group proposed by SWGSL will not be established at the present time. It will be reconsidered when the new science structure is fully operational.
 - Action: Put on the agenda of SCICOM in spring 2010
- Nurturing (mentoring) of EGs will be done by the delegates of SCICOM sitting on the 5 Steering Groups as each EG has been allocated to one of the SG.

4 Chairs of Steering and Administrative Groups

SCICOM had a discussion on the membership of the Steering Groups and supported the approach proposed by SWGSL. It was agreed that the chair might not be a delegate of SCICOM, but need be to a dedicated scientist from the ICES scientific community. The committee also agreed that membership of the SG needs to include delegates of SCICOM (at least 2) as well as EG Chairs (number to be determined). Some delegates of SCICOM suggested that all EG Chairs should be invited to be member of the SGs.

SCICOM discussed the pros and cons of appointing chairs of SGs and 'Administrative' Groups on an interim basis during the transition (e.g. 1 year appointment). There was a consensus that creating stability in the Science organization was of the utmost importance and consequently we should proceed immediately with longer term appointments. It was also felt that staggering appointments (some for a 3 year period and some for 2) would be beneficial. SCICOM agreed to appoint the Chairs with mixed terms of office. Terms will begin on 1 January, which means that 3 years term will be end on 31 December 2011 and 2 years term on 31 December 2010.

Then the Committee discussed how Chairs of the SGs and Administrative Groups reporting to SCICOM should be appointed. It was agreed that SCICOM would not delegate its authority to appoint chairs to subsidiary groups. However SGs and EGs will be encouraged to make recommendations on potential candidates for SGs.

At its October 2008 meeting, the Council approved the structure of SCICOM, which includes one Chair, one delegate of each of the 20 ICES member countries and up to five (5) additional members to be decided by SCICOM. Given the Council decision, it was agreed that SG Chairs or 'Administrative' Chairs appointed by SCICOM would be also appointed as member of SCICOM for the duration of their term if they are not

delegates on SCICOM. If there is a requirement to appoint more than five additional members to SCICOM, the Committee will bring the matter to the Bureau.

4.1 SCICOM decisions

- Steering Group Chairs appointed:
 - Ecosystem Functions (SGEF): Pierre Petitgas (France) – May 2009–December 2011. Additional member on SCICOM.
 - Human Interactions on Ecosystems (SGHIE): Tom Noji (USA) – interim until ASC 2009 (candidates will be sought for a 2 year term ending Dec. 2010). Potentially additional member on SCICOM
 - Action: T. Noji to work with the Secretariat to identify candidates and make recommendation for the approval of SCICOM.
 - Sustainable Use of Ecosystems (SGSUE): Mark Dickey-Collas (The Netherlands). May 2009–December 2010. Already member of SCICOM
 - Regional Sea Programs (SGRSP): Yvonne Walther (Sweden). May 2009–December 2011. Additional member on SCICOM
 - Ecosystem Surveys Science and Technology (SGESST): Bill Karp (USA). May 2009–December 2011. Additional member on SCICOM
- SG Chairs will develop ToRs for their Steering Group using the generic ToRs proposed in the report of SWGSL.
 - Action: The ToRs will be reviewed and approved by correspondence by SCICOM.
- SG Chairs will make a recommendation to SCICOM on the membership of their groups along the lines proposed in the report of SWGSL.
 - Action: Membership will be approved by SCICOM at ASC in September 2009.
- At least 2 SCICOM delegates will be member of each SG. The following delegates have expressed interest to be member of these SGs:
 - SGEF: Daniel Duplisea (Canada); Antonio Bode (Spain); Eisner Svendsen (Norway); Olafur Assthorsen (Iceland); Markku Viitasalo (Finland); Einar Eeg Nielsen (Denmark); Niall Ó Maoiléidigh (Ireland)
 - SGHIE: Carlos Vale (Portugal); Maurice Heral (France); Kris Cooreman (Belgium); Dick Vethaak (Netherlands - alternate)
 - SGSUE: Mike Sissenwine (ACOM Chair); Gerd Kraus (Germany); Mårten Åström (Sweden); Einar Svendsen (Norway)
 - SGRSP: Georg Kornilovs (Latvia); Dariusz Fey (Poland); Tom Noji (former chair MHC)
 - SGESST: D.V. Holliday (USA); Robin Cook (UK); and Oleg Lapshin (Russian Federation)
- SGs will meet by correspondence or web conference to prepare their business meeting that will be at ASC on 23 September 2009
 - Action: SG Chairs to develop agenda and prepare for the business meeting.
- Administrative Group Chairs appointed:
 - Publication / Communication: Pierre Pepin (Canada) – May 2009 – December 2011. Additional member on SCICOM.

- Training – Gerd Kraus (Germany) – May 2009 – December 2011. Already member of SCICOM. Note: Olafur Assthorsen was appointed on the group to replace Mark Dickey-Collas.
- ASC Theme Sessions – SG Chairs and Host Country – permanent membership.
- SCICOM Working Group on Data and Information Management (WGDIM): Ayers – Helge Sagen (Norway) and Richard Ayers (UK) – Not members of SCICOM.
 - Action: ToRs to be reviewed by Secretariat and approved by SCICOM.
- PubCom Chair will develop draft ToRs for the Group and make recommendation on the membership to SCICOM
 - Action: ToRs and membership will be approved by SCICOM at ASC in September 2009

5 2009 ASC business meetings

HoS presented a proposal for the business meetings at ASC in Berlin (doc. 9). The Committee had a general discussion on how to manage the business of SCICOM at ASC. Concerns were raised with regard to the total duration of ASC and the business meetings, which totals 10 days in the proposed agenda. The majority of SCICOM delegates felt that business meetings should be streamlined and the total duration of these meetings be reduced to 9 days (e.g. ending on Sunday September 27). At the same time, the Committee agreed that sufficient and quality time is needed at ASC to discuss cross-cutting issues and harmonize the work among Steering Groups.

Before the ASC, it was proposed that each SG do preparatory work by web conference, including reviewing the results of the work accomplished by EGs and assessing how to move forward with the implementation of the Science Plan (e.g. new 3 years ToRs for EGs; rationalization of work such as combining, abolishing and creating groups). In that context, it was noted that we need a standard template that could be used by EGs to report on their accomplishments.

During the business meetings, immediately following ASC, it was suggested that breakout sessions of the SGs could be useful to develop draft resolutions; identify areas of overlaps or common issues with other SGs and develop a plan for finalizing resolutions after ASC. Plenary sessions could be better used to discuss strategic issues; oversee the processes and control quality; provide guidance to the SGs and develop an overall action plan for finalizing and approving resolutions. Web conferencing would be used after ASC to finalize and approve all the resolutions. In that context, it was felt that web conference training may be required to facilitate the work.

Finally, the Committee discussed the purpose of each SCICOM business meeting at the ASC. The following was generally agreed:

- Saturday, 19 September: Regular full-day meeting of SCICOM focusing on the preparation of ASC
- Monday AM, 21 September: Open session with the scientific community
- Monday AM, 21 September: Steering Group meetings
- Wednesday PM, 23 September: Steering Group meetings

- Friday PM, 25 September: SCICOM meeting.
- Saturday AM, 26 September: Joint SCICOM–ACOM meeting
- Sunday, 27 September: Regular meeting of SCICOM focusing on strategic issues and the action plan

5.1 SCICOM decisions

- Each SG will meet by web conference during the summer to review the results of the work accomplished by EGs and assess how to move forward with the implementation the Science Plan
 - Action: Secretariat to develop a standard template that will be used by EGs to report on their accomplishments.
 - Action: SG Chairs to prepare for ASC by web conference
 - Action: Secretariat to plan a test web conference, set up a procedure and provide training to individual participants if required.
- Develop the agenda for the SCICOM business meeting at ASC based on the comments from SCICOM
 - Action: SCICOM Chair with the Secretariat.

6 Theme Sessions for 2010 ASC

The purpose of this agenda item was to set an approach on how to structure theme sessions at ASC with a view to address the 16 priorities of the Science Plan. Although the Committee generally agreed that SCICOM has to provide leadership in setting a multiyear approach that will align the ASC theme sessions with the Science Plan, it was recognized that in order for ASC to be successful, you need to have groups of scientists who are interested and willing to foster theme sessions. Involving EGs and attracting scientists from academia and other organizations should also be part of the strategy.

SCICOM also had a discussion about setting a deadline (such as the end of July) for proposing theme sessions at ASC. The Committee generally agreed that such an approach would be beneficial, but given that suggestions for theme sessions are generated during the ASC, SCICOM should remain receptive to these late proposals. It was also noted that if SCICOM decides to implement a deadline, it should be well publicized on the ICES website.

Finally, the Committee discussed approaches to review and agree on theme sessions at ASC. It was agreed to set up a group to deal with the theme sessions of ASC. The group will include the chairs of the 5 SGs (which manage the science activities), the host countries and the HoS.

- Action: Chairs of the SG and Delegate of host country and HoS to review and recommend to SCICOM ASC Themes sessions.

7 Strategic initiatives

The Chair had circulated a call for strategic initiatives to SCICOM delegates before the meeting. The ICES Science Plan specifically calls for making progress on cross-cutting issues *such as climate change impacts, and spatial planning/MPAs*. In that context, a discussion on strategic initiatives was on the agenda in order to identify 3 to 5 priority issues (e.g. areas where to put emphasis) with a view to develop scientific initia-

tives to be supported by the ICES Strategic Investment Fund (SIF). These initiatives, which could be 2–3 years in duration, would advance the ICES Science Plan by focusing on cross-cutting issues important to member countries and integrating scientific knowledge and disciplines. The end products would be ICES authoritative reports, such as ‘unsolicited scientific advice’, that would make a significant contribution to marine science, support the development of marine policies, and position ICES as a leader.

Before engaging in the discussion aiming at identifying priorities issues, the Committee discussed two international research initiatives:

- ESSAS – Ecosystem Study of Subarctic Seas
- BASIN – Basin-scale Analysis, Synthesis and Integration

7.1 ESSAS

HoS presented the ESSAS project. The invitation by ESSAS to ICES to participate to a number of workshops was brought to the attention of the Consultative Committee (ConC) in Halifax in September 2008 and it was agreed that the final decision should be left with the new SCICOM. The proposal is asking for more ICES involvement in the ESSAS workshops via Expert Groups and is asking for SIF funding. ESSAS is one of the regional programmes under GLOBEC with the goal “to compare, quantify and predict the impact of climate variability and global change on the productivity and sustainability of Sub-Arctic marine ecosystems”. The project is planned to go to 2014/15. ESSAS has funding for five years.

The best scientific reason for ICES to be more involved is captured in a message received from the Arctic Science Summit Week in Bergen in March 2009: *‘It is impossible to understand the changes in the Arctic without understanding the subarctic processes, and this is probably true vice-versa’*. With a relatively small investment ICES could gain a lot. Strategically it would also link ICES and PICES Arctic activities. Such a cooperation also fits with the concept of SCICOM being proactive getting involved with projects on the ground level There are a number of good reasons to be involved:

Advantages to ICES

- Closer ties to PICES and Pacific scientific community at working scientists level
- Early access to ESSAS science including fish and fisheries model development
- Can influence what ESSAS will do (ESSAS may be willing to help or undertake requests by ICES)

Advantages to ESSAS

- Broaden scientific community
- Increased support for scientific activities

Several delegates and the ACOM Chair supported the initiative. SCICOM did not support the request for funding from the SIF and participation of scientist will be at national expense.

SCICOM decision:

- SCICOM will encourage member states to send their scientists at their expense to ESSAS workshops

7.2 BASIN

HoS introduced BASIN. BASIN is an initiative to develop a joint EU / North American research programme in the field of ocean ecosystems in support of the Global Earth Observation System of Systems (GEOSS) initiative - a transatlantic endeavour. After years of preparatory work, there will be a call for proposals of the EC under "Theme 6 Environment (including climate change)": ENV.2010.2.2.1.1. North Atlantic Ocean and associated shelf-seas protection and management options – collaboration with US & Canada, to be launched before the summer break. The aim of BASIN is "to understand and simulate the impact of climate variability and change on key species of plankton and fish, as well as community structure as a whole, of the North Atlantic and to examine the consequences for the cycling of carbon and nutrients in the ocean and thereby contribute to ocean management". The EC funding will be complemented by funding from the US and perhaps from Canada. The Secretariat is aware of a major consortium with core ICES membership (AZTI, Cefas, IMR Norway, IMR Iceland, the Irish Marine Institute, Marine Scotland-Science, DTU-Aqua, IFREMER, MIR Gdynia). This consortium would consider hosting the IPO at ICES or using the ICES Data Centre while the EC DG RTD might consider involving ICES in the future transatlantic coordination efforts starting 2010/11. The Secretariat had also been contacted by a further, perhaps less advanced consortium.

It was commented that BASIN is very large scale project, involving a lot of institutes, and it is well within the geographical and scientific scope of ICES. This is exactly the kind of objective and work that should involve ICES. If ICES does not participate, it means that science will be carried outside ICES, scientists will go to EU project meetings instead and have their theme session at the end of the project. The goals of BASIN fit well under the priorities of the ICES Science Plan and it would be advantageous to participate.

SCICOM decision:

- ICES will offer services and support to any consortium asking for it. However, the final decision on which consortium to support should be made by SCICOM. A letter will be sent to BASIN to declare and explain this.

7.3 Breakout groups

Three breakout groups were established along the themes of the Science Plan with a view to identify 2-3 potential major issues that could be considered in the context of strategic initiatives. The outcome of the three breakout sessions are summarized in Annex 2.

During the plenary following the breakouts, several topics were discussed.

Indicators: ICES is currently funded by the EC to develop indicators of good environmental status for the purposes of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) assessments. So there is an option for science here and the goal of improving existing sets of indicators in various contexts is welcomed by the advisory side. It also links well with the general coastal zone issues raised here. Top predators were mentioned as potential indicators for fishing pressure.

Climate change: was seen as a cross-cutting issue through all research themes and receives a lot of attention in the work of ICES Expert Groups, ASC Theme Sessions and ICES co-sponsored symposia. There is a group explicitly dealing with the coordination of work in ICES. Laboratory studies on climate change and ocean acidification were discussed. Using "natural labs" in areas with volcanic activities (acidic

seeps) to study effects are one option already being used.

Socio-economics: there is a firm commitment in the science plan to address this priority, although individual institutes may have decided differentially. Many management decisions are based on socio-economical rather than biological consideration, so the question is how to integrate ecological and economic. The mariculture industry demand that both biology and economic be considered in decision making and this might be an area to initiate constructive work. ICES of tomorrow: strong points were made that strategic initiatives should consider how to engage the next generation of young ICES scientists and the academia.

Coastal issues and spatial planning: many themes can be integrated under the umbrella of coastal research issues, cutting across a number of disciplines. The coastal zone could well be a target area for ICES activities and an opportunity for several ICES Expert Groups to focus their work.. There is national funding available to bring under the ICES coordination and there is a great deal of involvement by universities. Marine spatial planning (MSP) is an important element and there is a demand for developing new facilities which would embrace specialized databases, old and new models and an agreement of the research needed to feed into management. MSP extends well beyond the coastal and EEZ zones and becomes an important research area for instance on the Mid-Atlantic ridge.

A common focus of almost all proposals was the coastal area. Another cross-cutting or integrating issue was Marine Spatial Planning (MSP). ICES must be proactive and position itself as leader. The wider political frameworks for these are NATURA 2000 and the MSFD, and we have the UNGA resolution on the high seas. There are obvious customers as recipients of the research to be launched by ICES.

Mariculture was discussed as a very good case for linking up with coastal environmental issues but also with socio-economic and ecological research. For mariculture, science can be directly put into practice. Marine spatial planning activities would integrate other industrial activities, e.g. wind farming and capture fisheries. There is broad scope for producing advice and there is a demand. Strategically, advisory issues of tomorrow can be addressed which is an important selection criteria for where to go.

Further beyond EEZ's MSP is important in the context of conservation and resource exploitation. The UNGA resolution and the RFMO's as clients have set the stage. ICES has the chance here too to position itself in the forefront.

Another strategic goal to be considered in our context is to produce advice for science, for instance for the EC DGRTD with a view on making ICES the first port of call for them. We don't currently have a dialogue with them, but hopefully in the long term this would be a success story of SCICOM.

SCICOM concluded that a more strategic approach, more time, and the involvement of the new structures (SGs and EGs) were needed to further develop these ideas. It was also agreed that funding from the SIF might be requested at a later date when proposal are fully developed. It was also agreed to move forward with the development of a strategy to increase the profile of ICES on coastal issues. SCICOM decision:

- A SCICOM Working Group on Strategic Initiatives (SWGSI) is set up to develop a short strategic paper on how to increase the profile of ICES on specific areas of marine science such as coastal issue.
 - Action: The group will propose a set of ToRs that will be approved by SCICOM by correspondence.

- Membership of SWGSI:
 - Ted Potter - UK (Chair)
 - Daniel Duplisea – Canada
 - Niall Ó Maoiléidigh – Ireland
 - Einar Eeg Nielsen – Denmark
 - Adi Kellerman - Secretariat

8 Reporting and presentations

8.1 Report of the Steering (now Planning) Group on Climate Change (PGCC)

The SGCC was established by ConC in 2007 with a view to raise the profile of ICES in the field of climate change related research. ICES is doing a lot of work on climate and ocean change, but is hardly acknowledged. There was also a need for better co-ordination of the work. SGCC produced a work plan at its first meeting 2008, which was adopted. SGCC is supported by the SIF

The final product of PGCC will be a White Paper (or Position Paper) outlining where ICES strengths in this field are and where it can best contribute, as well as a perspective where ICES should go in the future. PGCC has produced an outline of the table of contents of the White Paper anticipated for 2010 which can be seen in the 2008 report. PGCC will meet on 3 June at ICES HQ.

The target audience was discussed for the White Paper. The report should go beyond the ICES community and should also be a useful document for managers and policy makers. Summarizing the state-of-the-art it should, for instance, tackle management implications such as reference points in a changing environment.

In response to the Bureau request to make a proposal in the context of the continuation of this initiative, PGCC has been asked to provide a detailed plan (including activities and costs) that will cover the initiative until it ends in 2010.

Given the new responsibilities of the current chair of PWCC Luis Valdes, SCICOM recommends that the group elects a co-Chair. (Note: Juergen Alheit (Germany) has been appointed Co-Chair) Action: Secretariat to follow up with the PGCC Chair.

8.2 Presentation on ICES Data Management Program

Neil Holdsworth made a presentation on the ICES Data Centre (DC). The DC works in close cooperation with Expert Groups on various issues well beyond survey data like in the past. The DC today is a modern and dynamic facility and is set up in a responsive and service-oriented way. It should, however, be a bilateral communication in that the more feedback from EGs, the better data the DC can provide.

Questions were answered. It was noted that there were competing resources when extracting large amounts of data. The DC capacity in terms of hardware and software has increased, now embedded and upgraded into the SQL server, however, the web server environment may still slow down processes. DC has tried to introduce a unique token ID, which allows downloading, alternatively it can be sent via FTP. Data should be available without delay and the DC keeps improving.

The DC is part of SeaDataNet which is a distributed system, but even though it is up and running they are only able to respond to about 2% of requests. Our customers know that the ICES datasets are quality assured, fast, etc. Delivery problems of na-

tional data are still a problem and DC will have to develop a plan of how to make that better. This will also involve discussions with HELCOM. There is a broader issue in the context of spatial planning. There is lack of access to high resolution data, which presumably exist, but it is extremely difficult to get appropriate hold of those.

DC strategy is that once we have ecosystem data, which will combine physical with biological data, the next stage will be how to act as a funnel, the net, the shopping basket, a “one stop shop” approach.

Data for Baltic countries will be found under ecosystem data and it may be difficult to find them right now due to reconstruction of the DC site. WGDIM will advise us from the users point of view, and DC need this feedback.

8.3 Report of the Working Group on Information and Data Management (WGDIM)

Neil Holdsworth presented the update on WGDIM. The group has strong links into the DC and also has an advisory role. It ensures that the ICES data policy complies with EC regulations and national policies. On request from ACOM, WGDIM has been tasked to look into VMS data, identifying the main players, the experts, and what are the barriers and regulations. On request from the ICES DC, WGDIM is looking into Meta Data Standards within open sources GIS.

As it is the “Year of the (Fish) Stomach Database”, experts from ICES will be asked for input on quality control before putting the processed data online.

SCICOM discussed the role and responsibilities of WGDIM and those of the Data Centre. It was stressed that the Data Centre provides services to both Science and Advice and that an integrated plan should serve the needs of both SCICOM and ACOM. The management of data is a core function for ICES and WGDIM should perform an advisory role. In the new Science structure, an Administrative Group on Data will be established. WGDIM could become this group once its role and responsibilities have been reviewed and approved by SCICOM and ACOM.

- Action: The ToRs will be reviewed and approved at the SCICOM meeting in September 2009.

8.4 Report of the Transition Group on ICES Publication (TGIP)

TGIP Chair, Pierre Pepin, introduced Doc 15a and 15b. TGIP had been tasked to complete the development of a Communication Strategy by October 2009. There was good feedback from ACOM on issues to be addressed and similar input is expected from SCICOM which was asked to provide constructive input. The Chair of TGIP will synthesise and finalise the document in time for the next joint SCICOM/ACOM at the ASC.

- Action: SCICOM Chair urged SCICOM members to read Doc 15b, Developing a Communications Strategy for ICES, and provide feedback.

A model for an extension of the current honorarium of the CRR Editor as a consequence of the increased number of CRRs was endorsed earlier by correspondence between the Chair and the GS and HoS. The extension can be accommodated under the budget line for CRRs.

TGIP Chair developed a remit for a redesign of the ICES website, which is not ideal right now. Web presence is an important element which puts a face and a shop window on an organisation. With the help of the secretariat, Executive Editor and Head

of DC a plan will be developed to revamp the ICES website. The DC has expertise in building websites. Content management system would eliminate half of our problems. Hiring a consultant was abandoned mostly due to the current nature of the current set-up which serve multiple purposes and which has developed into a high level of complexity in response to the various needs of the science, advisory and data centre programmes. There are too many details that are not fully accessible to an outside technical expert.

In addition, a web portal for MARCOM+ is an activity under one ICES led work package of the project. That portal will be built using the ICES web page, certainly not to be started before the fall.

Given that the work is done in-house, SCICOM and ACOM were asked for support to carry out an analysis of the web trends and implement a voluntary survey on the web page asking ICES and "external" scientists to tell what they seek, and any comments they have. SCICOM and ACOM and EG Chairs will be asked to fill it out and provide us as much information as possible. Such feedback would provide important input on redesigning the website.

As mentioned previously in the report, TPIG has been abolished and it is now replace the the Publication / Communication Group.

- Action: The Chair of the Publication / Communication Group, Pierre Pepin, was asked to forward a note to the SCICOM Chair to be distributed, strongly encouraging ACOM, SCICOM, EG Chairs to participate.

8.5 Report of the ICES Training Committee (now Group)

Chair of the TrainingGroup, Gerd Kraus, presented Doc 16, Update from SCICOM Training Committee. The feedback from SCICOM focused on the following points:

- More interaction with and input from the grass roots will be needed on the long term. The Training Group did consider this at the ASC 2008 and gave former Science Committees the opportunity to provide feedback.
- Fee and cost recovery. The fee will cover the direct cost for instructors, course material, etc., but not cover the salary of the ICES Project Coordinator. As preparation would decrease over time, a reduced fee should be considered. In future, the Training Group should look towards a model that is self-financing. General Secretary pointed out that there is no continuous funding from SIF.
- Suggestion for course on survey technology. WGFTFB is thinking about how to assure training courses. Survey Technology is a candidate for the next round for new courses.
- Who will be the potential participants? The programme was primarily set up to raise the capability of ICES people to do the work in Expert Groups, like raising the capability of people participating in the advisory process. Selection procedures applied previously (e.g., WKAFAT) was based on national share of seats and other criteria, and is well applicable at present.
- A system based purely on preference given to delegates' nomination may well reinforce the impression that ICES is a top down governmental organization, so we should market the training programme and introduce topics beyond purely ICES geared qualifications.
- Suggestions for courses felt needed by the ICES community should be sent to the Project Coordinator, Søren Anker Pedersen.

SCICOM decision:

- In light of his new commitment as Chair of Sustainable use of the Steering Committee on Sustainable use of Ecosystems, Mark Dickey-Collas, The Netherlands, stepped down as member of the Training Committee and was replaced Olafur Astthorsson.

8.6 Report of the SCICOM Working Group on Science Cooperation (SWGSC)

Markku Viitasalo presented Doc 25. In January SCICOM decided to carry out a more structured mapping of the Science Cooperation through SWGSC with a view of evaluating the functionality of cooperation. The group has set up criteria for evaluation: relevance to Science Plan, specificity, scope, continuity, breadth of participation, funding). Views of SCICOM were invited.

The main comments were:

- SWGSC should take into account a Council report on review of MoUs which was provided by the GS. Some MoUs involve resources, some don't.
- Partners should be categorized before evaluation criteria are applied because cooperation is also governed by their specific rules of procedures. For some we are interested in just having our name affiliated, while if funding is expected it will be a different type of cooperation.
- Functionality and outcome of cooperation is the key criterion (joint meetings, reports, working groups, other publications). Evaluating effectiveness of our cooperation is an important aspect.
- Scientific excellence of the partner - if applicable - is another important criterion.

General Secretary felt that this should be a Bureau/Secretariat job. SCICOM should deal with the contents, but the formalities could be left with the Bureau and Secretariat. SWGSC was asked to consult with the Secretariat during this process.

The Bureau has asked SCICOM to assess the relevance and priority for ICES in participating to the continuation of the Census of Marine Life project, which is currently being funded until the end of 2010. There was concern that CoML concludes in 2010 with little flexibility and scope until details may be disclosed about how the Census will continue. SCICOM decided that it was premature to make a recommendation to the Bureau and the collaboration with CoML will be evaluated by SWGSC in the context of their study.

9 Report of the HoS on meetings with other organizations

HoS presented Documents 17–21 which were seen to report from the practical side of cooperation with a view to complement the previous report. The following events were covered:

- Arctic Science Summit Week (IASC) in Bergen, Norway,
- Events within the framework of the European Strategy for Marine and Maritime Research,
- An FAO workshop on the impacts of climate change on global fisheries and aquaculture,
- Third SCOR Summit of International Marine Research Projects, Newark, Delaware,

- The ICES co-sponsored “2009 International Nutrients Scale System (INSS) International Workshop held from 10–12 February 2009, at the UNESCO Headquarters in Paris, France”, resulting in a proposal for a joint IOC/ICES Study Group to Develop International Standards for Nutrients.

Full descriptions of these events are given in the Documents 17-21.

SCOR has asked for an ICES contribution to their General Assembly in fall 2009, reporting on relevant main activities. The Secretariat had drafted a document, which has been posted on the SCICOM May 2009 SharePoint site at <http://groupnet.ices.dk/SCICOMMAY2009/default.aspx>, see Doc 28 “ICES Report on International Activities”. Moreover, SCOR had asked for proposals for new SCOR Working Groups at <http://www.scor-int.org/2009EC/2009EC.htm>.

- Action: Proposals are welcomed before 15 September as well expressions of interest in co-funding proposals.

The PICES Science Board has suggested a joint ICES/PICES Group on Strategic Planning for Scientific Cooperation in Northern Hemisphere Marine Science. This should be a direct joint activity of the two (ICES/PICES) Science Committees. Membership would be open, potentially members of SCICOM and some PICES board members.

- Action: SCICOM will respond to PICES that we are supportive and Secretariats will be asked to develop the details.

10 Housekeeping

10.1 ASC 2009–2012

Meeting & Conference Coordinator, Görel Kjeldsen, presented Doc 22a, 22b (Programme), 22c (Submitted abstracts), and 22d (Notice to conveners of Theme Sessions).

HoS presented the programme and explained that the programme is always agreed by SCICOM first and then sent to conveners. This year there are 19 theme sessions due to the request made by WGPBI to include session T which is a schedule part of their work plan. All sessions were to be accommodated within the available time.

- Action: SCICOM was asked to provide their feedback to the programme at their earliest convenience and no later than 27 May. The Secretariat will finalize the details.

All SCICOM members were reminded that with the setup for the coming ASC agreed, it would be wise to book their hotels as soon as possible.

10.2 Symposia 2010–2012

HoS presented the list of symposia and updated the committee on the progress of ICES cosponsored symposia.

- 3rd International Symposium on Research and Management of Eutrophication in Coastal Ecosystem (Eutro 2010). Still missing an ICES member in the SSC so
 - Action: SCICOM was urged for nominations.
- The same is still the case for the ICES co-sponsored 26th Lowell Wakefield Symposium on “Ecosystems 2010: Global Progress on Ecosystem-based Fisheries Management” to be held in Anchorage, USA, in 2010.

- Action: SCICOM was urged for nominations.
- HoS informed SCICOM of the preliminary plans for the next Early Career Scientists Conference to be held in 2012. The best cycle for these symposia, not losing a generation, was agreed to be a five-year cycle for both sides of the Atlantic. ICES Secretariat will start the process, and start searching for young and promising scientists from national labs to join the scientific steering committee under the guidance of senior scientists.
- The Symposium on “Carrying Capacity what does it mean in a changing Ocean?” had been transferred into 2011.

Comments were received:

On the “Symposium on hydrobiological and ecosystem variability in ICES area during the first decade of the XXI century” – the ACOM Chair informed the committee that ACOM aims at producing an advice strategy on ecosystems in the ICES area. The symposium is expected to deliver the basis for such an assessment as it was the case with the first symposium in 2000.

- Action: HoS will draft a letter to the conveners pointing this out.

Under the interim period it had been agreed to provide JMS support for the “ICES/PICES/FAO Symposium on Forecasting Climate Change Impacts on Fish and Fisheries”. The Chair of TGIP informed SCICOM that if this is well attended, perhaps SCICOM should consider approaching the organisers to fund a larger issue than the usual 250 pages.

10.3 Communication with Delegates

Council will be informed about the resolutions approved by SICOM. The Chair urged SCICOM members to debrief their national delegates of the decisions and questions brought up in SCICOM. In discussions on strategic initiatives, the view of the country should be represented by each national SCICOM member. In the same way, good communication from SCICOM to national delegates would facilitate the implementation of the Structure.

- Action: Chair asked for suggestions for better ways to communicate with our home countries.

10.4 Coordination of resolutions

Draft resolutions will be finalized during the ASC with the aim of having a final, near completion set available for SCICOM approval. Many of the groups have generic ToRs but there will also be specific ones. Normally, the ASC is the place to incorporate and coordinate the ToRs from ACOM. Such short term ToRs could be decided by individual EG Chairs. The whole procedure will be a learning process because the new system will be set up in parallel. Chairs of the new groups will be trained in getting much of their business done by using Webex conferences in preparation of the ASC.

- Action: The Secretariat was asked to set up facilities for WebEx conferences. The ACOM Chair pointed out that half the people in SCICOM have colleagues in ACOM who could assist in the training process. There is a cost to use the system. The Secretariat will need to address that.

10.5 SCICOM/ACOM linkages

SCICOM will work on the resolutions for their own groups and address the overlapping/crosscutting issues. This will need exchange with ACOM on specific requirements for advice. At the joint ACOM / SCICOM ASC meeting, we should have a view of the needs. The ACOM Chair expects this to work out reasonably well. ACOM Vice-Chairs could participate in relevant web conferences when finalising the resolutions. Most input from ACOM would be known by the time of ASC. One needs to decide what the protocol will be.

The Chair mentioned that the Advisory Strategy is now complete and available on the SharePoint site together with benchmark background documents.

Between ACOM and SCICOM many activities are linked already. The newly agreed Ecosystem Surveys Science and Technology SG will support many ACOM needs. SG Chairs and ACOM Vice-Chairs will collaborate in developing ToRs of EGs. Many EGs are interested to collaborate on Benchmark Workshops.

10.6 ICES-FAO WGFTFB venue, Thailand, 2010

The ICES Working Group for Fisheries Technology and Fish Behaviour (WGFTFB) which is co-sponsored by FAO, has been invited to meet in Thailand in 2010. ConC had drafted guidelines for holding Expert Group meeting outside ICES member countries and the majority if not all comply. The unknown for the Thailand case is what are the benefits for ICES science to meet there? There was an earlier case with a meeting in Hobart, Australia which saw tremendous opportunities. If the same is the case here, that would be interesting.

Such circumstances tend to happen when groups are co-sponsored by other international organisations. ICES cannot really limit venue to ICES countries only as it has made a commitment to cooperate with these organisations. Holding the meeting there may raise ICES profile globally.

SCICOM had a lengthy discussion on the scientific benefits of having a meeting of WGFTFB co-sponsored by ICES and FAO. It was acknowledged that the scientific work done by FTFB is of high quality and valuable to ICES. It was also recognized that international cooperation is important and there is also the intangible benefit of capacity building in developing countries. Justification for meeting outside of the ICES area, such as a location that would bring more expertise to address a priority issue for ICES was also discussed.

There was concern that a meeting that distant from Europe would see low ICES participation. If member countries will not support attendance, it will not be a great collaboration.

SCICOM agreed to decline the invitation unless there was a compelling reason to meet in Bangkok we did not know about. The Chair will contact Bill Karp to ensure that SCICOM has considered all the facts in taking its decision. (Note: The Chair sought further advice from the ICES Bureau which took note of the issue, and left it to SCICOM to decide).

- Action: Chair to respond to Francis Chopin.

11 Next Meeting

The next meeting of SCICOM will be held in Berlin from 19–27 September 2009.

Key agenda items to be discussed:

- Annual Science Conference
- Finalizing the details of new committee structure
- Agree on the SGs work plans for 2010
- Discussed and rationalize Resolutions
- Develop the SCICOM action plan for 2010
- Chair of SCICOM

Annex 1: List of participants

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX/EMAIL
Chair:		
Serge Labonté	1601 - 445 Laurier Avenue West K1R 0A2 Ottawa, Ontario ON Canada	sergemplabonte@gmail.com
Former ConC Members:		
Tom Noji, former Chair of Marine Habitat Committee (MHC)	National Marine Fisheries Services Northeast Fisheries Science Center 74 Magruder Road Sandy Hook Highlands NJ 07732 United States	Phone +1 732 872 3025 / 24 Fax +1 732 872 3068 Email thomas.noji@noaa.gov
Pierre Pepin, former Chair of Publications Committe	Fisheries and Oceans Canada Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Center P.O. Box 5667 St John s NL A1C 5X1 Canada	Phone +1 709 772 2081 Fax +1 709 772 4105 Email pierre.pepin@dfo- mpo.gc.ca
Pierre Petitgas, former Chair of Living Resources Committee (LRC)	IFREMER Nantes Centre P.O. Box 21105 F-44311 Nantes Cédex 03 France	Phone +33 240 37 40 00 Fax +33 240 37 40 75 Email pierre.petitgas@ifremer.fr
Ted Potter, former Chair of Diadromous Fish Committee (DFC)	Centre for Environment, Fisheries & Aquaculture Science Lowestoft Laboratory Pakefield Road NR33 0HT Lowestoft Suffolk United Kingdom	Phone +44 1502 562244 Fax +44 1502 513865 Email ted.potter@cefas.co.uk
Yvonne Walther, former Chair of Baltic Committee (BCC)	Swedish Board of Fisheries Institute of Marine Research Utövägen5 SE-371 37 Karlskrona Sweden	Phone +46 455 362 852 Email yvonne.walther@fiskeriverket.se

Ex officio:

Mike Sissenwine, Chair of the Adviory Committee (ACOM)	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution - PO Box 2228 Teaticket MA 07536 United States	Phone +1 508 566 3144 Email m.sissenwine@ices.dk
---	--	---

National members and alternates

Kris Cooreman (Belgium)	Institute for Agricultural and Fisheries Research Ankerstraat 1 B-8400 Oostende Belgium	Phone +32 59569820 Fax +32 59330629 Email kris.cooreman@ilvo.vlaanderen.be
Daniel Duplisea (Canada)	Fisheries and Oceans Canada Institut Maurice- Lamontagne, Mont-Joli, QC, Canada G5H 3Z4	tel: (418) 775 0881 fax: (418) 775 0740 daniel.duplisea@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Einar E. Nielsen (Denmark)	The National Institute of Aquatic Resources Department of Inland Fisheries Vejløsvej 39 DK-8600 Silkeborg Denmark	Phone 33 96 31 15 Email een@dfu.min.dk
Toomas Saat (Estonia)	Estonian Marine Institute 10a Mäealuse Street EE-126 18 Tallinn Estonia	Phone +372 671 8901 Fax. +372 671 8900 Email toomas.saat@ut.ee
Markku Viitasalo (Finland)	Finnish Environment Institute – Marine Center P.O. Box 2 FI-00561 Helsinki Finland	Phone +358-40-5034848 Email markku.viitasalo@fimr.fi
Maurice Héral (France)	IFREMER 155 rue Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Technopolis 40 F-92138 Issy-les- Moulineaux France	Email mheral@ifremer.fr
Gerd Kraus (Germany)	Johann Heinrich von Thünen-Institute, Palmaille 9 D-22767 Hamburg Germany	Phone +49 Fax +49 Email gerd.kraus@vti.bund.de
Ólafur S. Astthórsson (Iceland)	Marine Research Institute Skúlagata 4 IS-121 Reykjavík Iceland	Phone +354 5520240 Fax 3545623790 Email osa@hafro.is

Niall Ó Maoiléidigh (Ireland)	Marine Institute Farran laboratory Newport Co. Mayo Ireland	Phone +353 98 423 00 Fax +353 98 423 40 Email niall.omaoleidigh@marine.ie
Georgs Kornilovs (Latvia)	Head of Research Department LATFRA Daugavgrivas str. 8 Riga LV-1048 Latvia	Phone: +371 67676027 Fax: +371 67616946 E-mail: Georgs.Kornilovs@lzra.gov.lv
Sarunas Toliulis (Lithuania)	Lithuanian State Pisciculture and Fisheries Research Centre Fisheries Research Laboratory P.O. Box 108 LT-91001 Klaipeda Lithuania	Phone +370 46 391122 Fax +370 46 391104 Email sarunast@gmail.com
Mark Dickey-Collas (The Netherlands and former Chair of RMC)	Wageningen IMARES P.O. Box 68 NL-1970 AB IJmuiden Netherlands	Phone +31 255 56 46 85 Fax +31 255 56 46 44 Email mark.dickeycollas@wur.nl
Einar Svendsen (Norway)	Institute of Marine Research P.O. Box 1870 N-5817 Bergen Norway	Phone +47 55 238458 Fax +47 55 238687 Email einar.svendsen@imr.no
Dariusz Fey (Poland)	Sea Fisheries Institute in Gdynia ul. Kollataja 1 PL-81-332 Gdynia Poland	Phone +48 58 735 61 30 Email dfey@mir.gdynia.pl
Carlos Vale (Portugal)	Carlos Vale IPIMAR Avenida de Brasilia PT-1449-006 Lisbon Portugal	Email cvale@ipimar.pt tel 351 213027070 or 213027140 fax 351 213015948
Oleg M. Lapshin (Russia)	Russian Federal Research Institute of Fisheries & Oceanography 17 Verkhne Krasnoselskaya RU-107140 Moscow Russian Federation	Phone +7 4992649721 Mobile +7 495 722 3436 Email lapshin@vniro.ru
Antonio Bode (Spain)	Instituto Español de Oceanografía Centro Oceanográfico de A Coruña Muelle de las Animas, s/n P.O. Box 130 E-15001 A Coruña Spain	Phone +34 981 205362 Fax +34 981 229077 Email antonio.bode@co.ieo.es

Mårten Åström (Sweden)	Department of Research and Development, Swedish Board of Fisheries, Box 423, SE-401 26 Göteborg, Sweden	Phone (mobile): +46-(0)70-799 54 15 Email: marten.astrom@fiskeriverket.se
Robin Cook (UK)	Fisheries Research Services FRS Marine Laboratory P.O. Box 101 AB11 9DB Aberdeen United Kingdom	Phone +44 1224 295423 Fax +44 1224 295511 Email cookrm@marlab.ac.uk
D.V. Holliday (US)	University of Massachusetts University of Rhode Island 5034 Roscrea Ave San Diego CA 92117 United States	Phone +1 858-279-5369 Cell +858-449-0005 Email vholliday@umassd.edu
ICES Staff		
Neil Holdsworth, Head of Data Centre	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	neil@ices.dk
Gerd Hubold, General Secretary	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	gerd@ices.dk
Adi Kellermann, Head of Science Programme	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	adi@ices.dk
Görel Kjeldsen, Meeting & Conference Coordinator	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	gorel@ices.dk
Søren Anker Pedersen, Project Coordinator	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	sorenap@ices.dk
Vivian Piil, Departmental Secretary, Science Programme	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	vivian@ices.dk

Annex 2: Three breakout groups on strategic initiatives

Theme 1: Ecosystem Functions

The group identified three priority areas, recognizing that the one on Climate Change is already being addressed by the Planning Group on Climate Change (PGCC).

Climate change processes and predictions of impacts

- Laboratory studies of ecosystem responses to climate change, including ocean acidification
- Modelling the ecosystem responses to selected climate (physical oceanographic) scenarios, including data access for understanding the past (hind-casting).
- Suggest to PGCC a Workshop on comparison/validation of models and needed complexity for predicting effects of climate change

The role of coastal zone habitat in population dynamics of commercially exploited species

- There is a need for acquiring more data (including collating data from academia)
- Quantify environmental effects on fish in the coastal zone
- Fine scale modeling, including the spatial dimensions
- Organize a workshop to do review the state-of-the-art to prepare this work

Biodiversity and the health of marine ecosystem

- How should we measure, quantify and understand the role of biodiversity and its variability, and put it into a management framework?
- Involve academia to interact with ICES
- Organize a workshop to do review the state-of-the-art to prepare this work

Theme 2 Human impacts on ecosystems

The group suggested four priority areas under theme 2, but no specific plan was proposed for Invasive Species.

Evaluation of indicators, best practices for development, and application as indicators of ecosystem stress and health in the context of marine spatial planning (MSP)

- critical evaluation of indicators over a series of workshops to determine which indicators are the most useful for assessing the impacts of fishing, eutrophication, mariculture impacts, contaminants on marine ecosystem/community state to feed into a marine spatial planning exercise.
- applying indicators in case studies for coastal zone management advice with a view to develop a set of practices that can help us with spatial planning and maps by taking advantage of the tools that exist e.g. GIS experts.
- Strategic benefits are obvious by integrating the work of several working groups in a single exercise. The product would be a citable document that defines best practices, strengths and weaknesses of approaches and indicators, feeding into the ecosystem approach to management dealing with

cumulative impacts and providing a means to advise on management actions that would have the greatest benefit.

Impacts of renewable energy in the coastal zone

- Designation of priority areas for renewable energy in the framework of spatial planning, assessing the cumulative impacts on essential fish habitats and on biota, for instance using habitat modelling or using the indicators as metrics of impacts. Evaluating tradeoffs with the socio-economics.
- Strategic benefits: this is a growing issue in all member countries while several countries are only in the early stages of assessing the impacts. This may also have a long term impact in terms of capacity building in ICES.

Organism level (physiological) response of individuals to ecosystem stresses

- Could be developed through a series of workshops with invited experts and ICES scientists where individual physiological or molecular indicators would be identified as early warning systems for ecosystem stresses, e.g. contaminants.
- Strategic benefits would emerge from increased expertise of ICES on this by engaging the academic community. Presumably a study group or working group could come from this and thus build a larger expertise within ICES.

Invasive species

This should involve and start from existing Expert Groups in ICES. The strategic benefit emerges from the increasing importance and long-term perspective of the issue globally. ICES activities are becoming a model for other areas such as WESTPAC and have served as a model for activities in PICES, e.g. WG21.

Theme 3 Developing options for sustainable use

The group took a different approach, trying to identify one key initiative that could be taken under each of the four science priorities under theme 3.

Marine living resource management tools

The ICES community already has a significant amount of experience and expertise and there is a promising set of current activities. At present no specific project was identified that could be supported and that would greatly change or speed up these ongoing activities.

Operational modelling combining oceanographic, ecosystem, and population processes

Modelling of physical – biological linkages has become a strong field within the ICES community, e.g., through our GLOBEC involvement. While there will be room for advances in the way we treat multi-genera communities, the seeds have already been planted that will lead to ICES scientists addressing the work needed to make those advances.

Priority:

There are already several WGs on these integrative methods and the natural ICES flow of events will likely result in future theme sessions, CRRs, papers, etc.

Marine spatial planning, including the effectiveness of management practices [e.g. Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)], and its role in the conservation of biodiversity

This topic is one of considerable international interest and is as yet, not as well-defined as it should perhaps be. ICES has some limited experience in this area, but we should consider convening a workshop with the objectives of:

Priority: MSP objective and tools

- Defining explicit objectives for Marine Spatial Planning activities
- Examining the tools that are available now and that will be needed in the future for marine spatial planning,
- Improve communications between the scientific community and policy makers, especially regarding the language used to describe the concepts, tools, and issues that are specific to this marine spatial planning, and to,
- Define the relevance and value to society of marine spatial planning.

Socio-economic understanding of ecosystem goods and services, and forecasting of the impact of human activities

A discourse with social scientists should be started and a workshop organized as a way to proceed. There is an existing group of ICES associated people who are ready to start this discourse. From among several proposals from the Baltic community there should be at least one titled "Introducing coupled ecological – economic modelling and risk assessment into management tools"

Priority: Couple ecological – economic modelling and risk assessment

The workshop would:

- Review the state-of-the-art in integrating economic (modelling), stock assessment and fisheries management plans
- Identify the data and information required for integrated economic modelling of fisheries
- Identify ways to develop and use ecological-economic modelling tools to be used in fish stock management
- Identify ways to evaluate risk assessment scenarios