

ICES MCAP Report 2007

ICES CM 2007/MCAP:02

Report of the Management Committee on the Advisory Process

5–6 FEBRUARY

ICES HEADQUARTERS, COPENHAGEN, DENMARK



International Council for the Exploration of the Sea
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

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

© 2007 International Council for the Exploration of the Sea

Contents

1	Opening and welcome.	1
2	Review of action points from MCAP-MICC Report 2006 (Doc 3).	1
3	Review the status of communication with Client Commissions and the status of the renewal of MoUs with Clients.	1
3.1	Status on communication.....	1
3.2	Agenda for MCAP-MICC (Doc 6, MCAP-MICC Draft Agenda).....	2
3.3	Status on MoUs (Doc 4)	3
4	Review the status of discussions concerning the timing of the fisheries advice with the EC, and take appropriate action if required (Doc 15a and 15b)	3
5	Review the progress with the Quality Assurance work in 2006 and the implementation in 2007 (Doc 7)	4
6	Review the progress with ICES involvement in the EU Data Collection Regulation (Doc 8)	4
7	Report from the MCAP-MIRAC meeting in January 2007 (Doc 5)	4
8	Review experiences with special requests for advice in particular with the development of advice through e-mails or other forms of electronic communication (Doc 9 and 19)	4
9	Progress on the reform of the advisory and science structure	5
9.1	Progress on the implementation plan for the reform of the advisory structure (Doc 11).....	5
9.2	Report of the ConC discussions and proposal for reform of the ICES science system (Doc 12).....	5
9.3	Draft implementation plan for the reform of the advisory system (Doc 10).....	5
10	Bureau working group on updating the ICES Strategic Plan - Progress update (Doc 11b)	6
11	Status of the work in the Advisory Committee in 2006 – Lesson learned	6
12	Review the working plans for 2007 for the Advisory Committees and decide on the agendas for the advisory committees (Doc 12, 13a, 13b, 14a and 14b).	6
13	Proposal on Industry representative’s participation in expert groups. Review of the relevant chapters in the Chairman’s Handbook. (Doc 16). Pilot project for 2007 (SGMAS).	7
14	Future of the ICES Oceanographic database – advisory aspects (Doc 17)	8
15	Key points for presentation to Bureau	8
16	Any other business	9
Annex 1:	10
Annex 2:	11
Annex 3: Document List	13

1 Opening and welcome.

Paul Connolly chaired the meeting and welcomed everybody. The participants are listed in annex I. The adopted agenda is presented in annex II. Annex III is the list of documents.

2 Review of action points from MCAP-MICC Report 2006 (Doc 3).

The action points from MCAP September 2006 meeting are summarised in Doc 3. The group review these action points. All points were addressed and progressed and some significant items are further dealt with under specific agenda items at this meeting.

During the action point discussions, a more general 'brainstorming' session developed on the role of ICES in the context of the rapidly changing environment in which it now operates. The group emphasised the need for ICES to "sell itself more". There is a perception that ICES is inflexible and is not moving fast enough in a rapidly changing world. The point was also made that "no one seems to know ICES outside ICES". There is a need to sell the uniqueness of ICES. ICES should produce more marketing material on itself (what it is; what it can do) and a possible funding source could be the Strategic fund. ICES is currently built on the two pillars of science and advice. The issue of ICES developing a "third pillar", that of a Data Centre for the North Atlantic, was also discussed. It was emphasised that a wide debate needs to take place on this issue.

The concluding discussions proposed a three step approach to "marketing ICES more". Step 1 involves promoting ICES through the production of increased marketing material on ICES itself and through various high level activities such as the ICES response to the EU Green Paper. Step 2 involves ICES meeting with the ERANETS, ESF-MB, EFARO and other marine bodies to see where ICES "fits" in relation to the marine activities of these bodies (avoid duplication and be clear on the different roles). Step 3 would involve holding a special ICES Dialogue meeting with Member Countries Administrations to promote the work of ICES and show these administrations the added value and coordination role of ICES in relation to marine science issues.

Action Point: ICES needs to sell itself more. A first step in this process is to produce marketing material on ICES, the organisation and what it can do for clients. The three step approach outlined above, while not strictly an MCAP issue, should be considered by ICES as part of its 2007 work plan..

3 Review the status of communication with Client Commissions and the status of the renewal of MoUs with Clients.

3.1 Status on communication

Communication with DG Fish is generally good. However, there has been little contact with DG Environment. Furthermore, there have been some complaints from HELCOM and OSPAR on specific elements of the advice. The General Secretary has met with the HELCOM and OSPAR Secretariats. This resulted in OSPAR being represented at the ACOM consultations at the ASC in September 2006. The ACOMs found this very useful and considered it a major improvement in communication. This communication should be a feature of the annual ASC. Furthermore, to establish a more direct link between the OSPAR and HELCOM committees, the ACE and ACME chairs shall represent ICES at selected OSPAR and HELCOM committee meetings. The Secretariat has until now represented ICES at these meetings. It is now a priority for the Secretariat to open the communications channels with DG Environment.

Action point: Secretariat to contact DG Environment to ensure that communication channels are open and that they participate in MCAP-MICC meeting in May.

Communication between ICES and EC is also expanding. As an example, Gerd Hubold mentioned ICES involvement in developing a response on the research and advisory needs of the EU in relation to the Green Paper on Maritime Policy. He is mandated by the Council to represent ICES in meetings about the Green Paper and similar meetings. He stressed that EC is more than DG Fish and DG Environment and proposed that DG RTD also be invited to MCAP-MICC.

Action point: DG Fish, DG Environment and DG Research should be invited to the MCAP-MICC meeting in May.

3.2 Agenda for MCAP-MICC (Doc 6, MCAP-MICC Draft Agenda).

MCAP considered the MCAP-MICC draft agenda. The agenda should be focused on the advisory needs of clients under existing and emerging marine (and maritime) policies. Clients would be encouraged at the meeting to summarise their future needs and how ICES could meet these needs. It was suggested that ICES is perceived as being inflexible, does not move fast enough in an ever-changing world. MCAP considers that ICES needs to explore these perceptions with clients and that MCAP-MICC might offer an appropriate opportunity.

MCAP reviewed the list of invitees and advised that the Joint Norwegian-Russian Fisheries Commission (JNRFC) should be invited to MCAP-MICC.

Gerd Hubold reported from the recent Marifish EraNet workshop in Stockholm. These EraNets apparently wish to build networks in direct competition to ICES. He stated that ICES should respond to this challenge. MCAP-MICC may not be the appropriate forum for this debate and a number of other contacts points mainly in national ministries were identified as key targets for an ICES “PR-Offensive“.

ICES needs to market itself more by showing clearly to clients and stakeholders “What can ICES do for you”. Several suggestions were discussed including the use of fact sheets on status and trends of environmental components and the production of targeted, issue driven, marketing material. In spite of the doubts expressed on the appropriateness of this the MCAP-MICC forum as target for a PR-campaign, the ACOM chairs was asked to prepare a 5-10 min presentation for the MCAP-MICC meeting on their plans for 2007 and which would address the topic of “what we can do for you”.

The MCAP-MICC meeting should be a two way dialogue with inputs from both ICES and the Client organizations. ICES would like clients to clearly present their future needs and policies. This represents an important opportunity for ICES to listen and act. The MCAP-MICC agenda will specifically ask clients for a 5 minute tour de table presentation of their future needs and future policies and ICES will consider these needs in the context of “What ICES can do for you?”

This exercise will give a clear indication of the match between ICES capacity and the requirements of the clients. In the context of the advisory reform - these presentations and discussions might identify areas where ICES should consider further reform.

Progress on the reform of the ICES advisory system should be a key agenda item for the MCAP-MICC meeting. ICES should be conscious of the EC comments that the reforms should structure its advisory programme in whatever form ICES feels is appropriate. However, ICES should continue to deliver impartial scientific advice that has buy-in among the member countries, based on best science, peer reviewed, and that is relevant, timely and

credible among stakeholder. ICES should clearly explain to clients why the reform process has been launched.

MCAP recognises that this discussion on ICES reform is not restricted to the advisory programme and invited ConC to contribute to this discussion. MCAP also realises that suggestions to the Council for improving ICES involvement, would require extra funds and hoped that such funds could be found.

Action point: 1) The revised agenda should be sent to clients as soon as possible. The Secretariat should invite a broad range of ICES clients and ask them to present their future needs and policies. It is important that DG Research and DG Environment are present. We must avoid a “preaching to the converted” meeting. 2) The ACOM chairs will present their work planned for 2007 with emphasis on the “what ICES can do for you” theme.

3.3 Status on MoUs (Doc 4)

Hand Lassen updated MCAP on progress with the various MoUs.

NASCO – The draft text is agreed except for the financial issues. NASCO is moving towards bi-annual advice. The outstanding question is what it should pay, if NASCO does not request annual advice.

NEAFC – ICES is waiting for an input from NEAFC. NEAFC has established an internal working group to consider NEAFC’s advisory need and based on the findings of that group the NEAFC Secretariat will prepare its wishes for revision of the MoU.

OSPAR – Both OSPAR and ICES have signed a revised MoU. Compared to the old MoU, revisions concern mainly ICES role as the OSPAR Thematic Data Centre. ICES role is unchanged, but the MoU is made more explicit in the obligations of both sides: OSPAR shall provide data as a prerequisite for ICES to fill its role as the thematic Data Centre.

EC – The text is agreed on both sides, for ICES by Council decision in October 2006. The MoU is enlarged and it is made clear that the MoU covers the entire EC needs for ICES input. The relevant institutions are DG Environment, DG Fish, DG Research and possibly JRC. As far as the specification of the fisheries advice, the new MoU between ICES and the EC is different from old one in that it gives ICES a bit more freedom. It also includes input for the data collection and for ICES presenting the advice to by the RACs. Concerning the fisheries advice the new MoU is amended to account for the disappearance of IBSFC. Unofficially, ICES has been informed that DG Budget has approved the EC MoU.

4 Review the status of discussions concerning the timing of the fisheries advice with the EC, and take appropriate action if required (Doc 15a and 15b)

It has been suggested by EC to move the fisheries advice to the spring. ICES has responded to the EU on this matter and will consider the timing of advice issue in an open minded way. ICES has established a pilot project on the timing issue, by moving the advisory deadline to June for the North Sea Demersal stocks. This pilot project was welcomed by Commissioner Joe Borg, but he also informed ICES that the EC has not yet developed a final position on this issue. Furthermore, some EU member countries have not made their positions clear and ICES has not yet received a reply from the EC. Should the EC answer before July 1, it will be possible for ICES to amend its procedures for 2008, after this time it becomes increasingly difficult to introduce radical changes in the timing of advice for 2008.

5 Review the progress with the Quality Assurance work in 2006 and the implementation in 2007 (Doc 7)

Progress on Quality assurance was reviewed. The process of setting up fish stock assessment manuals, etc. is nearly finished. The question as to whether the ICES advisory process should be certified (e.g. ISO) was discussed. However, Council had already decided that ICES should not be certified.

6 Review the progress with ICES involvement in the EU Data Collection Regulation (Doc 8)

The EU DCR revision is continuing and ICES is very much involved in this process with the EC. ICES participates in regional coordination meetings and in the research planning groups. There is a meeting (SGRN-07-01) coming up where research surveys will be reviewed and prioritised for DCR funding. ICES will participate and present a report of which surveys are used in the fish stock assessments. MCAP commented that such an analysis might be taken further to consider the quality of these surveys. Also, at SGRN-07-01 ICES presents a report on the DATRAS surveys giving such information.

7 Report from the MCAP-MIRAC meeting in January 2007 (Doc 5)

This meeting was considered a success in furthering cooperation between the RACs and ICES. The RACs and ICES have agreed to compile a list of RAC meetings in which ICES will participate in 2007. The ICES Secretariat will meet with the Secretariats of the RACs in London and at this meeting develop a proposal for a calendar. ICES will also undertake to coordinate scientific participation at priority RAC meetings in 2007.

8 Review experiences with special requests for advice in particular with the development of advice through e-mails or other forms of electronic communication (Doc 9 and 19)

Doc 9 provided a list of special requests. The list includes those handled in 2006 and the requests that have been accepted for 2007. The list is available on the ICES website. For 2007, there are a few requests which have not yet been accepted. ICES normally accept requests within 2-3 weeks, but need to make sure, if we have access to the expertise required.

ICES must develop advice outside the formal meeting schedule and is using e-mail and other electronic communication for this purpose. However, some members of advisory committees are not actively participating in this new electronic communications process and there is a major problem with low response rates. The use of electronic communications will be an important feature of the advisory reforms. The lack of participation will become very visible and the buy-in by advisory committee members which is essential may be a stake. The President has proposed that at least 50% of the members should react before an advice text is approved; silence cannot be taken as consent in all cases. There must be a "stick and carrot" approach to the issue of non response to electronic communications.

Action Points: 1) ICES needs to develop a firm policy on electronic communications. This will be an integral part of the ICES advisory reforms and as such should form part of the Implementation Plan being developed by Paul Keizer. 2) A firm procedure for the development of "fast track" advice should also be developed. The Secretariat should impress the importance of the members of ACOMs to participate in the development of advice through electronic communications.

9 Progress on the reform of the advisory and science structure

9.1 Progress on the implementation plan for the reform of the advisory structure (Doc 11)

The Council recommended in October 2006 that the reform be taken to the next stage and that a detailed implementation plan should be developed. Paul Keizer will lead the process of developing the Implementation Plan during December 2006 and January 2007. This plan was presented and discussed by MCAP. Most elements of this plan were accepted by MCAP. However, MCAP discussed how the reform can accommodate integrated advice (ecosystem approach). It was emphasised that this is mainly a problem with the advisory process rather than the structure. It is the structure that is in focus of the reform.

Paul Keizer presented how he would introduce the implementation plan to the ICES community and promote a discussion of this plan. This will include a presentation to AMAWGC, to the ACOMs, to ConC and to MCAP-MICC (to cover the Clients). Furthermore, the discussion forum set up on the ICES website should be widely advertised. The Bureau at its June meeting should have an in-depth discussion and decide if the implementation plan can be used as a basis for planning 2008 at the ASC.

The plan will be refined and a draft budget on the cost of the advisory reforms will be submitted to the Finance Committee in May.

MCAP stressed the needs for keeping Clients informed. MCAP would also update the Delegates on a monthly basis and encourage their active contribution to the debater on advisory reforms.

The limited resource pool of scientists in the ICES community was highlighted and MCAP sees an urgent need for a major discussion and resolution of on the resource allocation issue.

This debate should start at EFARO. This issue was also highlighted at the MCAP-MIRAC meeting.

MCAP recognised the progress that has been made on the Implementation Plan and is still working on the basis that the start of advisory reform implementation will take place at the Helsinki ASC in September 2007.

9.2 Report of the ConC discussions and proposal for reform of the ICES science system (Doc 12)

Harald Loeng presented the outcome of a ConC Sub Group meeting held in January 2007 on the reform of the science system. This Group developed a proposal that will reform the ICES science system over a two year period (2007 and 2008) The Group emphasised the need to link Science strategy, implementation of science strategy and conducting science. Harald Loeng elaborated on these three levels in detail. The roadmap in Doc 12 suggests that the proposal will be finalised during ASC 2007 and hopefully endorsed by the Council in October 2007.

9.3 Draft implementation plan for the reform of the advisory system (Doc 10).

Paul Keizer presented the Implementation Plan. The general linear process of the advisory system was presented. A discussion took place on the standard stock assessment process (e.g. annual update assessments). The group concluded that it will probably be necessary to leave annual updates out the expert group process. It was generally acknowledged though that the job of national labs is to feed into expert groups. The idea was developed that traditional update assessment work should be carried out in national labs. This will free up some expert

group time in the new system. It was decided that Paul Keizer should further develop this idea as part of the Implementation Plan.

The next steps in the advisory system were discussed and the importance of peer review was emphasised. The role of the new advisory committee was discussed and among the items discussed were; the question as to whether the new Director (old MCAP Chair) should be recruited from among the delegates; the importance of consistency of language in the ToRs for expert groups; probable commitment on the part of the Director and ACOM chairs to be approximately eight weeks a year. No definitive conclusions were reached but these are important issues.

In the coming months, the discussions within the ICES community on the new advisory reforms will reach a critical point. MCAP scheduled an additional meeting directly after the MCAP–MICC meeting in May to review progress on the Implementation Plan.

Action Points: 1) MCAP sees an urgent need for a major discussion and resolution of the resource allocation issue. 2) The costs associated with the Advisory Reforms will be submitted to the finance committee in May. 3) A detailed consultation will start with the wider ICES community. 4) MCAP will update delegates on progress. 5) Paul Keizer to include the issue of National Laboratories conducting update assessments as part of the advisory reforms. 5) MCAP to schedule a special meeting directly after the MCAP-MICC meeting in May to review progress on the Advisory Reforms.

10 Bureau working group on updating the ICES Strategic Plan - Progress update (Doc 11b)

BWGUPDATE met in mid-January. The report from this meeting was not available to MCAP. However, the feeling of those who participated suggests that the ICES Strategic Plan needs to be reformed rather than just updated. The new Strategic Plan will be built around six goals. ICES is a special organisation that does not control most of the resources used to develop its products. The new Strategic Plan is thus very different from the old document. A draft Plan shall be presented to the Bureau in June with a view to have this adopted by the Council in October. The BWGUPDATE report will be on the agenda for the Bureau in February.

Action Point: The BWGUPDATE will be discussed by the February Bureau. It is likely that MCAP will be tasked to produce a draft ICES advisory strategy for the June Bureau.

11 Status of the work in the Advisory Committee in 2006 – Lesson learned.

12 Review the working plans for 2007 for the Advisory Committees and decide on the agendas for the advisory committees (Doc 12, 13a, 13b, 14a and 14b).

Agenda points 11 and 12 were taken together.

ACFM: As in previous years, in 2006 ACFM delivered the regular advice as planned and on schedule. There has been little progress with the mixed fisheries advice and the Ecosystem Approach.

In 2007 a clear action point is to secure feedback for the DCR from the chairs of the assessment working groups.

Observers and their role at ICES meetings were discussed; again recognising that the decision responsibility is with the Council. Martin Pastoors argued for RAC involvement in several

groups. MCAP has approved that industry and RAC be invited to participate at the SGFI meeting and some workshops as part of a pilot project in 2007. It will be very important to get feedback from the chairs of these meetings as we move from “observers” to “participants” at expert groups. The importance of developing the relationship with RACs was emphasised and will be a key part of the ACFM 2007 work plan. The need to develop a code of conduct for chairs was emphasised. Martin Pastoors will present a paper with reflection on where we are with the MSY target at the WKREF in Gdynia.

The work plan for 2007 focuses on the same themes as in 2006, but with slightly different goals. There is work planned on reference points and on mixed fisheries.

MCAP accepted the ACFM work plan.

ACME: The requests have primarily been received from OSPAR and there has been no request from the EC. Paul Keizer reported difficulties with quality assurance and listed last year’s report as an example. Some sections were released without being carefully read, and some information should not have been included. There was confusion as to whether specific advice was the remit of ACE or ACME. The options mentioned to avoid these problems in the future were 1) Going through each paragraph in plenary 2) Check by the Secretariat before release. Hans Lassen informed MCAP that the Secretariat is extending the quality control procedure applied to fisheries advice to ACE and ACME. Concerning the specific case, Paul Keizer would review the report and decide if it should be revised or completely be removed from the ICES website.

As to the issue of priorities for ToRs, it was agreed to reinstate the old process of finalizing the text at the annual meeting.

As with ACFM the plans for 2007 will not change from last year. No other issues regarding advice this year.

MCAP approved the ACME work plan, emphasising the need to engage with clients at the MCAP-MICC meeting. It was also emphasised that OSPAR, HELCOM and DG Environment be invited to the ASC.

ACE: The major request which is for the attention of ACE is from OSPAR on changes in abundance and distribution from environmental variability including climate change. This process is well underway in several ecological groups. Another topic of high priority is to get better access to VMS data and to merge these data with logbook information. Currently, ACE is working on an evaluation of a list of threaten species for OSPAR, this work is about to be finalized. However, as always answering this request created another problem, ACE considered that criteria for threatened species are to be improved and this will be on the ACE to-do-list.

MCAP approved the ACE work plan, and again emphasised the need to engage with clients at the MCAP-MICC meeting.

The MCAP chair emphasised the need for all ACOMS to fully engage with the Advisory Reform consultations in the coming months.

13 Proposal on Industry representative’s participation in expert groups. Review of the relevant chapters in the Chairman’s Handbook. (Doc 16). Pilot project for 2007 (SGMAS).

At present, observers are not allowed in ICES expert groups. Workshops have in practice been regarded as public meetings and a recommendation from a workshop has little standing within ICES. Concerning SGMAS (January 2007) this meeting was opened to industry participants as a pilot project which MCAP will evaluate in September.

MCAP paid special attention to the parenting of expert groups. The main effect of moving an expert group from a science to advice is a slight change in rules for expert group membership and participation in the meetings. There was a long debate on review groups, their openness, and observers in review groups. However, MCAP noted that this is the remit of the Council. In 2005, the Council accepted that chairs of expert groups could appoint members in consultation with delegates. Such participants are not members and serve for one meeting. MCAP discussed the role of observers and participants in experts groups and emphasised that this is a critical area for the advisory reforms. MCAP developed the Table shown below summarising the access rights for observers/participants at Expert Groups, Review Groups and in the ACOMs. Paul Keizer should look at the current rules and develop such a table and a clear policy as part of the Implementation Plan.

EXPERT GROUP	
Observer/representative	Not allowed
Participant	By Delegate
	By Chair in consultation with Delegate
	By application to MAP
REVIEW GROUPS	
Appointed by MAP	
Observer/representative	Not allowed
Participant	By appointment
ACOM	
MAP appointed by Council	
Participants by National Delegates	
Observer/representative	Open
Participant	By appointment

Action Points: 1) MCAP to conduct a pilot project in 2007 inviting industry participants at various expert group meetings. Feedback from Chairs would be very important for an evaluation. 2) Paul Keizer to develop protocols for the selection of participants and observers at expert groups, review groups and at the ACOM as part of the Implementation Plan on advisory reforms.

14 Future of the ICES Oceanographic database – advisory aspects (Doc 17)

The document was tabled for MCAP for information and to invite comments on the advisory needs of the oceanographic data. MCAP recognises that within the ecosystem approach oceanography data have a distinct role. Furthermore, there is work ongoing where oceanography data are used in prediction of fish recruitment.

15 Key points for presentation to Bureau.

The Chair summarised the main points that MCAP agreed should be presented to the Bureau on 7 February.

- 1) ICES must sell the uniqueness of ICES better and to that effect we have to produce more marketing material.
- 2) The need for a debate on “resource allocation” must be presented to the Bureau.
- 3) Reform of ICES advice – the new implementation plan is to follow the path marked out. The plan has been endorsed by MCAP and will be presented by Paul Keizer to the Bureau meeting.
- 4) The need for key decisions to be made by the Bureau in July.
- 5) The search for a new MCAP Chair (or new Director of the ACOM) must get underway.

16 Any other business.

Martin Pastoors informed MCAP on a planned workshop under the SAFMAMS project, a project that aims at bringing managers and scientists from a range of disciplines together to consider better approaches to fisheries management. The workshop would facilitate discussions between scientists and policy makers in relation to the EU Common Fisheries Policy. Several MCAP members expressed an interest in participating in this workshop. Martin Pastoors would discuss such participation with the organisers (IFM).

The request from the EU Commission on the formulation of a NEA mackerel management plan was discussed. The ACFM chair favoured a two step approach. Step 1 would involve a joint workshop with the Pelagic RAC to explore the issue. Step 2 would involve the formal ICES process for developing such a plan. MCAP concluded it would be wise to discuss the matter further with the client before making a formal decision. The point was made that the views of Faroe Islands, Russia, Norway and EU would be critical in whatever process was followed. MCAP agreed that the process should be an ICES process and that the invitation to the workshop should be wider than the Pelagic RAC. How this process would best be designed was discussed after the MCAP meeting with the Norwegian Delegate. The Secretariat subsequently sent a proposal to the Commission for approval including a cost estimate.

The Chair emphasised the importance of the current debate on the reform of the advisory process. We are at the “critical dialogue stage” with the wider ICES community. He thanked the participants for their contributions and closed the meeting.

Annex 1:

PAUL CONNOLLY (CHAIR)	ICES MCAP CHAIR	MARINE INSTITUTE RINVILLE, ORANMORE CO. GALWAY IRELAND	+353 91 637900	PAUL.CONNOLLY@MARINE.IE
Gerd Hubold	ICES Secretariat, Gen.Sec.	ICES H.C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 DK-1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	+45 33386700	gerd@ices.dk
Paul Keizer	ICES ACME Chair	Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans Bedford Institute of Oceanography P.O. Box 1006 Dartmouth, NS B2Y 4A2 Canada	+1 902 426 6138	keizerp@mar.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Hans Lassen	ICES Secretariat	ICES H.C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 DK-1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	+45 33386700	hans@ices.dk
Harald Loeng	ICES ConC. Chair	Institute of Marine Research P.O. Box 1870 Nordnes N-5817 Bergen Norway	+47 55 238466	harald.loeng@imr.no
Helene Metz	ICES Secretariat	ICES H.C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	+45 33386700	helene@ices.dk
Martin Pastoors	ICES ACFM Chair	ICES HC Andersens Boulevard 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	+45 33 38 67	martin@ices.dk
Mark Tasker	ICES ACE Chair	JNCC Dunnet House 7, Thistle Place Aberdeen AB10 1UZ United Kingdom	+ 44 1 224 655 701	mark.tasker@jncc.gov.uk

Annex 2:

**Draft Agenda for MCAP
ICES HQ
Monday 5 – Tuesday 6 February 2007**

Chair: Paul Connolly, Ireland

Monday 5 February 10:00 – 13:00

- 1) Opening and welcome.
- 2) Adoption of agenda (Doc 1).
- 3) Review of action points from MCAP-MICC Report September 2006 (Doc 3).
- 4) Review the status of communication with Client Commissions and the status of the renewal of MoUs with Clients.
 - 4.1) Status on communication.
 - 4.2) Agenda for MCAP-MICC (Doc 6a and 6b).
 - 4.3) Status on MoUs (Doc 4).
- 5) Review the status of discussions concerning the timing of the fisheries advice with the EC, and take appropriate action if required (Doc 15a, 15b and 15c).
- 6) Review the progress with the Quality Assurance work in 2006 and the implementation in 2007 (Doc 7).
- 7) Review the progress with ICES involvement in the EU Data Collection Regulation (Doc 8).
- 8) Report from the MCAP-MIRAC meeting in January 2007 (Doc 5).
- 9) Review experiences with special requests for advice in particular with the development of advice through e-mails or other forms of electronic communication (Doc 9 and 19).

Monday 5 February 14:00 – 18:00

- 1) Progress on the implementation plan for the reform of the advisory structure:
 - 1.1) Review of Council recommendations and the planned process (Doc 11a and 11b).
 - 1.2) Report of the ConC discussions and proposal (Doc 12).
 - 1.3) Draft implementation plan for the reform of the advisory and science process (Doc 10a, 10b and 10c).
- 2) Bureau working group on updating the ICES Strategic Plan - Progress update.
 - 2.1) What drives the advisory work programme – the MoUs or the ICES Strategic Plan?

Tuesday 6 February 09:00 – 13:00

- 1) Status of the work in the Advisory Committee in 2006 – Lesson learned.
- 2) Review the working plans for 2007 for the Advisory Committees and decide on the agendas for the advisory committees (Doc 12, 13a, 13b, 14a and 14b).

Tuesday 6 February 14:00 – 18:00

- 1) Proposal on participation in expert groups. Review of the relevant chapters in the Chairman's Handbook. (Doc 16). Pilot project for 2007 (SGMAS).
- 2) Future of the ICES Oceanographic database – advisory aspects (Doc 17).
- 3) Key points for presentation to Bureau.
- 4) Any other business.
- 5) Closing the meeting.

Annex 3: Document List

List of Documents

DOC NO.	DOCUMENT TITLE
1	Draft agenda
2	Document list
3	Action points from MCAP-MICC Report 2006
4	Status of MoUs with EC, NASCO, NEAFC and OSPAR
5	Report from MCAP-MIRAC 2007
6a	Draft agenda and recommendation for MCAP-MICC 2007
6b	Document List for MCAP-MICC 2007
7	Progress with quality assurance programme
8	DCR progress
9	Status on special requests
10a	Implementation plan on reform of advisory structure
10b	Stock assessment – Advisory process reform
10c	Financial consideration – Advisory process reform
11a	Council resolutions for reform of ICES science and advisory structure
11b	Draft report of the Bureau WG on updating the ICES strategic plan
12	Status of ConC's discussion on reform of science structure
13a	Draft agenda for ACE 2007
13b	Work plan for ACE 2007
14a	Draft agenda for ACFM 2007
14b	Work plan for ACFM 2007
15a	Draft agenda for ACME 2007
15b	Work plan for ACME 2007
15c	Requests for advice ACME
16	Timing of the fisheries advice
17	ICES rules for membership and access to meetings
18	Future of ICES' oceanographic database
19	Rules for e-mail procedure for adoption of advice.