

ICES SCICOM REPORT 2010

ICES SCIENCE COMMITTEE

ICES CM 2010/SCICOM:01

REF. BUREAU

Report of the ICES Science Committee (SCICOM)

4–6 May 2010

Charlottenlund Castle, Copenhagen



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. 2010. Report of the ICES Science Committee (SCICOM), 4-6 May 2010, Charlottenlund Castle, Copenhagen. 32 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.

© 2010 International Council for the Exploration of the Sea

Contents

1	Opening.....	1
2	Adoption of agenda and timetable.....	1
3	Follow up on decisions taken at the meetings of SCICOM (September 2009) and Bureau (17–18 February 2010)	1
4	SCICOM business procedures	2
	4.1 Establishing a SCICOM business group.....	2
	4.2 SCICOM Action Plan /Performance Evaluation.....	2
	4.3 Procedures for intersessional approval of resolutions	3
	4.4 Review of updated Guidelines for Chairs.....	3
5	Update on SG activities	4
	5.1 SSGEF	4
	5.2 SSGHIE.....	4
	5.3 SSGRSP.....	5
	5.4 SSGESST.....	7
	5.5 SSGSUE	7
6	Update and approval of SCICOM/ACOM Strategic Initiatives	8
	6.1 SCICOM/ACOM Strategic Initiative on area-based science and management	8
	6.2 SCICOM/ACOM Strategic Initiative on Stock Assessment Methods (SISAM).....	9
	6.3 SCICOM/ACOM strategic initiative on Biodiversity.....	10
	6.4 SCICOM Strategic Initiative on Climate Change	11
7	Discussion on new strategic research priorities.....	13
8	Update on SCICOM activities.....	14
	8.1 Data Management Group.....	14
	8.2 ICES Publications and Communications Group (PUBCOM).....	15
	8.3 ICES Training Group (ITG)	17
	8.4 SCICOM Working Group on Science Cooperation (SWGSC)	18
	8.5 Cooperation with other organisations	18
	8.6 Awards Committee (new membership/request for nominations for Outstanding Achievement Awards 2010)	21
9	ACOM/SCICOM linkages	22
	9.1 Subgroup on Prediction of Advisory Needs.....	22

10	Annual Science Conference 2010, 2011, and 2012	22
10.1	Update by Conference Coordinator	22
10.2	Increased funding for young scientists.....	24
10.3	Preview of Theme Sessions for ASC 2011 in Poland	24
11	Symposia 2010–2012 (progress report)	24
12	Other business.....	25
13	Closing.....	27
	Annex 1: List of participants.....	29

1 Opening

The SCICOM Chair welcomed the participants to Charlottenlund Castle, former ICES Headquarters from 1936 to 1980. The list of participants is provided in Annex 1.

The Chair conducted a tour de table, introducing all members. Apologies had been received from the SCICOM members of Poland and Estonia, Dariusz Fey and Toomas Saat. Dr Van Holliday, former SCICOM member who had passed away just after Christmas, was remembered.

The Chair presented his thoughts and visions for SCICOM. With the restructuring 'empowerment' should be the key word for SCICOM and the importance of SCICOM recognising this new responsibility was strongly emphasised. With the new mandate, SCICOM is authorised to make Science decisions, although any financial implications for the organisation would need approval by Council. This mandate requires SCICOM to be more strategic in shaping "the ICES that we want in 2015". The Chair encouraged originality and innovation in the thinking of members, and recognition that ICES will need to increase its networking to tackle future challenges. Individual empowerment within SCICOM should also be given more weight. SSG Chairs have a substantial level of responsibility and this should be recognised.

Among the challenges ahead at this meeting is the need to shape the role of the SSGs, designing the Strategic Initiatives and give them legs to run, as well as evaluating SCICOM performance. In this context it would be important to get a clearer perception of the view of SCICOM by member countries.

2 Adoption of agenda and timetable

The agenda was adopted without any comments.

3 Follow up on decisions taken at the meetings of SCICOM (September 2009) and Bureau (17–18 February 2010)

The Chair asked for comments to Doc 5, "Summary of SCICOM decisions, September 2009" page by page. SCICOM agreed that all decisions had been followed up.

The Chair referred to Doc 7, "Funding decisions of ICES Bureau February 2010 with respect to SCICOM activities." SCICOM was informed that a total of DKK600,000 had been allocated to SCICOM activities and the process for the use of funds allocated under items 1 and 4 is to be decided by SCICOM:

- 1) SIF funding for additional activities of a SCICOM operational group over and beyond national contributions – DKK 50,000
- 2) SIF funding for young scientists from Universities and non-governmental research centres wishing to attend ICES 2010 – DKK50,000
- 3) SIF funding for 3 ICES scientists chairing P/ICES sessions in PICES 2010 and 1 ICES scientist planning the 2010 OceanObs symposium – DKK 55,000
- 4) SIF funding to kick-off new SCICOM priority areas from the ICES Science Plan in 2010, under the direction of SCICOM and advise from ACOM – DKK 400,000

Items 2 and 3 would be implemented directly by the ICES Secretariat.

4 SCICOM business procedures

4.1 Establishing a SCICOM business group

The Chair presented Doc 6 and the background for establishing a SCICOM business group. The creation of a SCICOM “operational” or “business” group would recognize the collective responsibilities of SSG and SI Chairs and would also carry forward the SCICOM process intersessionally. This would not diminish the responsibilities of SCICOM as the only delegated ICES body on science matters.

In terms of workload, members would be asked to join WebEx conferences approx. every second month, and in addition members of the Business Group could also be asked to represent SCICOM on behalf of the SCICOM Chair (funding for travel support available for this purpose). Membership of the SCICOM Business Group would not significantly increase the workload for SSG and SI Chairs. On the contrary it would recognise the already existing workload. Another positive dimension of the business group forum was that it would enable more frequent conversation among SSG chairs to share ideas and develop concepts.

Business Group ToRs:

- To coordinate the implementation of SCICOM decisions between sessions of the committee.
- To assist the SCICOM Chair in the implementation of science decisions.
- To engage with the ACOM Leadership Group in preparing ACOM/ SCICOM discussions and joint activities.
- Others as required

Decision: The SCICOM Business Group was accepted.

Action: The Chair will contact individual members and appoint them for an initial 1-year term.

4.2 SCICOM Action Plan /Performance Evaluation

The Chair presented Doc 8a and 8b, “SCICOM performance evaluation” and “Action Plan proposal of September 2009”. SCICOM had not made a decision in September based on Doc 8b. The SCICOM action plan was originally planned to reflect the actions in response to science plan needs as decided by SCICOM. As an alternative, the Chair proposed instigating a system for Council to evaluate SCICOM’s performance. A possible structure of a SCICOM Performance Evaluation was proposed:

- Introduction
- Report of SCICOM SSG Chairs
- Report of SCICOM Business Groups
- Report of Strategic Initiative Leaders
- Recommendations

SCICOM felt that it would be useful to have a targeted and condensed report with emphasis on progress in relation the Action Plan, rather than a Performance Evaluation report. The SCICOM progress report will be a live document to report on the steps taken towards the implementation of the science plan.

Decision: As a mechanism for Council to assess the implementation of the ICES Science Plan, SCICOM agreed to produce an annual SCICOM Progress Report to Council. The first report would be tabled at the October 2010 Council meeting.

Action: SCICOM Chair to produce a template and provide guidelines to all contributors of the SCICOM Progress Report.

4.3 Procedures for intersessional approval of resolutions

It was noted that very few comments and responses had been received for the last round of intersessional approval of SCICOM resolutions. The Chair asked SCICOM for comments on how to make the process more effective.

Decision: It was agreed to announce short timelines (max. 2–3 weeks) for SCICOM approval of proposed resolutions and to finish the timeline with a WebEx meeting. All comments to be submitted to the Secretariat in writing before the agreed timeline.

4.4 Review of updated Guidelines for Chairs

The Head of Science Programme (HoS) presented Doc 9, “Draft Guidelines for Chairs of ICES SCICOM/ACOM Expert Groups” which had been drafted by the Secretariat as a replacement of the old ‘Guidelines for Chairs of Expert Groups and Committees’ (2007) following the extensive reforms of the Advisory and Science Programmes.

It was noted that guidelines had not been drafted for the SCICOM Operational Groups. The HoS asked for comments as to the need for such guidelines, and the Chairs of PUBCOM and TRAINING stated that formalised rules were not needed at present.

Concerns were raised over whether Council members needed to be informed of the names of ICES workshop participants invited by the Chair, given that workshops are open meetings.

Decision: It was confirmed that attendance to workshops is open to everyone. However, for logistical reasons the Secretariat should be informed of participation beforehand. Council national delegates would only need to be informed (via the list of participants in the report) after the meeting.

A short discussion followed on the need, benefits and disadvantages of the current system requiring that Council national delegates be informed of the Chair-invited Expert Group members, prior to an EG meeting. The Secretariat supported the existing formalised procedure as a core process of the national commitment of resources from the ICES member countries. There was also agreement in SCICOM that some degree of monitoring was needed.

Decision: SCICOM supported the existing membership rules that include national core membership being provided by national Council delegates (and SCICOM). Chair-invited members were valid for one year, unless subsequently nominated by national members or reappointed by the Chair.

Guidelines for Executive Summaries

A request was made to include the Guideline for the Production of Executive Summaries prepared by PUBCOM in 2008 and approved by Consultative Committee the same year.

Action: PUBCOM Chair and HoS to have the correct text included.

Decision: SCICOM welcomed the Guidelines for Chairs of ICES SCICOM/ACOM Expert Groups and commented that this new document was seen as an improvement to the previous version.

5 Update on SG activities

5.1 SSGEF

SSGEF Chair, Pierre Petitgas, presented an update on the activities of the SCICOM Steering Group on Ecosystem Functions (SSGEF).

SSGEF work in relation to the High Priority Research Topics (HPRT) of the Science Plan

All SGEF EGs had been given a ToR to fill in tables mapping their work against the Science Plan High Priority Research Topics. The SSGEF Chair presented a table overview showing the statistics of EG involvement in the relevant HPRT of the Science Plan. Overall, SCICOM members found the exercise useful in making visible and identifying gaps and strengths. This would support the practice of revising ToRs for EGs, as well as merging or initiating new groups.

The SSGEF Chair also reported that for the ASC 2010, SSGEF was planning to change the reporting session into a topical session on "Individual, population and community level growth, feeding and reproduction, the quality of habitats and the threats to them and indicators of ecosystem health". EGs have been asked to contribute with a presentation.

The idea of producing a tangible output, such as position papers or other forward looking documents, was raised. The planning process for such documents should be established as a long-term objective targeting specific areas. In any case it would be useful to have some outlook of the future work of the SSG, perhaps at the ASC.

SCICOM congratulated SSGEF for identifying relevant HPRT topics in relation to the Science Plan and encouraged the SSG to produce clear outputs and recommendations on how to move forward as a result of the ongoing activities.

Position of SSIs and their relationship / difference with SSGs

The SSGEF Chair (based on his experience with SSICC and SSGEF) encouraged a discussion on how to better define the differences between SIs and SSGs and whether SIs should be inside or outside SSGs. There was a brief discussion on the difference in concept between Strategic Initiatives (SIs) and SCICOM Steering Group (SSGs), resulting in overall agreement that the function of SSGs is to steer, while SIs are much more focused, crosscutting, and also the SIs could be established for a fixed time-scale, i.e. a much more flexible approach compared to the SSGs. As long as SSIs have a strong and clear mandate, they should be able to operate either within the existing structures or with a degree of independence.

5.2 SSGHIE

The SSGHIE Chair, Erik Olsen, gave an update on the intersessional activities of the Steering Group on Human Interactions on Ecosystems (SSGHIE). The main focus was on the OSPAR advice related to fish farming and the need for a coordinated effort on mariculture science in ICES. More attention would be given in SSGHIE to the "mariculture" EGs within ICES and their cooperation. A webex meeting with attendance of all SSGHIE EG chairs would be held after the SCICOM (May) meeting to give a summary of issues

brought up by SCICOM, and to follow up on aquaculture integration, to initiate a discussion on how to integrate work on contaminants, eutrophication and habitat change as well as cumulative impacts. Also, on the agenda would be the ICES Strategic Initiative on Marine Spatial Planning, and plans for resolutions, workshops and theme sessions.

During the last WebEx discussion, it had become clear that socio-economics are very relevant in the context of aquaculture research, and SSGHIE requested SCICOM approval to pursue this area and set up a new Study Group.

Decision: SCICOM approved an initial, cost-neutral planning meeting for this Study Group to be held during the ASC.

It was discussed that the old Mariculture Committee had struggled to stay alive. As a way of revitalizing this initiative it was suggested that SSGHIE and the EGs should reach out to relevant groups outside ICES, such as the following:

- European aquaculture technology and innovation Platform (EATIP)
- World Aquaculture society
- The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
- Federation of European Aquaculture Producers (FEAP),
- The European Aquaculture Society (EAS)
- Others as relevant

Action: The SSGHIE Chair, in his discussions with the mariculture EGs, should make a specific request for investigations and guidance on how to develop more effective links to mariculture organisations currently outside the ICES network.

Action: SSGHIE agreed to conduct an exercise to look at how EGs are implementing the Science Plan, similar to the one conducted by SSGEF.

The Chair thanked Erik Olsen for having taken two roles as leader of SSGHIE and the Strategic Initiative on Area-based Science and Management in his first year at SCICOM. The Chair supported the strong focus on mariculture and emphasised the need for ICES to keep these groups in its portfolio and even to increase the ICES engagement in this area.

It was also discussed that SSGHIE EGs should investigate their possible contributions to advice of targets and indicators of ecosystem use. This issue was revisited under Agenda Item 9.1.

Action: The SSGHIE Chair to consult with his EG Chairs

5.3 SSGRSP

SSGRSP Chair, Yvonne Walther, reported from the Steering Group on Regional Sea Programmes (SSGRSP) which had held two intersessional WebEx meetings in December 2009 and April 2010. The vision of SSGRSP is to identify real world application of science with a spatial interest at the Regional Sea level. There are currently four programmes developing under SSGRSP: the Baltic Sea, the North Sea, the Bay of Biscay/IBISROOS, and the NW Atlantic. The goal is to extend and transfer the experience and existing system for the Baltic Sea to the new programmes. For the Bay of Biscay, SSGRSP is aiming to present a draft resolution for a new Expert Group in September this year.

The US SCICOM member, in his capacity of Chair of the Working Group on the North-west Atlantic Regional Sea (WGNARS), gave some perspectives. Ecosystem Assessment is a daunting task and it had been very beneficial for WGNARS to network and share experiences with others within the SSG. The Baltic is well ahead of the other regions in this regard.

The SCICOM Chair invited Jan Thulin in his capacity of Co-Chair of the Working Group on Large Marine Ecosystem Programme Best Practices (WGLMEBP), which was recently added to SSGRSP, to provide a short update of his group. Jan Thulin explained that WGLMEBP aims at drawing the lessons learned from the 17 large marine ecosystem projects at their next meeting in July in Paris. The meeting will be back to back with the LME Consultative Committee meeting. The subsequent report will also refer to the relevant issues discussed during the LME Consultative Committee meeting and should be tabled at the ASC SCICOM meeting.

The SSGRSP Chair also informed SCICOM that the WGIAB and the fish stock assessment group (WGBFAS) met back to back in 2010. SSGRSP will launch a series of Benchmark Integrated Ecosystem Assessment workshops: WKRECO I (draft resolution for ASC 2010) followed by WKRECO (II and III – showcase workshops).

Action: It was suggested that the connection between the LME projects and other SSGRSP expert groups be developed in coming months.

SCICOM discussed the relationship between the BONUS-169 programme and ICES SCICOM. The SSGRSP Chair presented a figure illustrating the interaction between BONUS Research Projects and ICES EGs. SSGRSP would like to encourage BONUS scientists to participate in ICES EGs. The question was raised as to whether there is an overlap between the BONUS programmes and ICES WGs, as a repetition of activities would be unfortunate. The SSGRSP Chair explained that BONUS activities have a more academic approach and are not advice-oriented. Both are valuable and compatible. Closer links with BONUS would create the opportunity for ICES by engaging with the academic community.

Jan Thulin clarified that the Science Plan of BONUS was written by ICES and was intended to be complimentary to the work that is done in ICES. The agreement between the nine countries was based on the complimentary Science Plans of ICES and BONUS.

The SCICOM Chair informed the committee that this issue has been source of extensive communication between ICES and BONUS at all levels of the organisation. ICES is satisfied that there is now a very good framework for scientific cooperation with BONUS, as encapsulated in a Memorandum of Understanding between the two organisations. ICES invited BONUS to propose theme sessions for the ASC 2011. SCICOM welcomed the invitation for BONUS to propose theme sessions for the ASC 2011. The timing in 2011 would be extremely good for dissemination of BONUS results and there was agreement to send a written message

Action: SCICOM Chair will write a letter to BONUS, formally inviting them to propose theme sessions for the ASC 2011, and inviting them to send the letter around to the coordinators.

The SCICOM Chair thanked the SSGRSP Chair for the presentation.

A plan for a North Sea Region Climate Change Assessment Report (edited by GKSS) was introduced. The leaders of the initiative are asking to formalise relationship with ICES

and also for expert knowledge to review. SSICC would have been the appropriate recipient of this request, but since the current SI is coming to an end, SSGRSP should be the right mechanisms to take this on. SCICOM agreed to the proposed way forward.

Action: SCICOM Chair to communicate to the leaders of this initiative that ICES welcomes this and that the Steering Group on Regional Sea Programmes (SSGRSP) will provide the connection between this initiative and SCICOM.

5.4 SSGESST

SSGESST Chair, Bill Karp, briefed the Committee on the highlights of the first WebEx meeting of the Steering Group on Ecosystem Surveys Science and Technology (SSGESST) held on 23 February 2010. In general the SG was operating well despite the diverse and large number of EGs. A number of issues were raised in discussion.

The role of WGFAST in relation to observation technologies was raised. The SSGESST Chair welcomed comments and feedback from SCICOM to bring a broader perspective into the group and avoid concerns over the group becoming too isolated from other ICES observation initiatives.

The introduction and application of new technologies was discussed. Optical and acoustic tools have the potential to provide regular ecosystem indicators. WGISUR will look at new technologies and will evaluate how to effectively combine them in ecosystem surveys. In the same context, the question of how to capture and make sense of processes at small time and spatial scales was raised. A first discussion has already taken place in WGFAST but this will require further consideration when ocean observatories are brought into play. Survey standardisation was discussed, including the broadening of surveys to the northwest Atlantic side, as suggested by Robin Cook in the recent past. Strong linkages with WGNARS and other holistic initiatives may be required. With respect to the SSGESST vision for their SG session in Nantes ASC, the SSGESST Chair will wait for the report from the Chair of WGISUR as a lead on how SSGESST will proceed.

The Chair thanked Bill Karp for his presentation and extended his congratulations for running a successful WebEx with a large number of people.

5.5 SSGSUE

The SSGSUE Chair reported from the Steering Group on Sustainable Use of Ecosystems (SSGSUE). SSGSUE has worked by correspondence since the last SCICOM meeting and has made steady progress towards the goals of the ICES science plan.

Doc 34 was tabled, asking for SCICOM approval of two workshops:

MARIFISH-ICES Joint Workshop on Integrated ecosystem modelling; building our capacity to understand and manage marine ecosystems in a changing world (WKIEM), chaired by: M. Bernal, Spain, I. Allen, UK, S. Neuenfeldt, Denmark, E. Curchitser USA, and J. Ruiz, Spain to meet in Spain, 16–18 November 2010

Decision: SCICOM approved the WKIEM resolution and saw great potential for this initiative extending further than a workshop.

Joint ICES and Pelagic RAC Workshop on Pelagic Fisheries within the Marine Ecosystem: Tradeoffs and potential benefits of the Ecosystem Approach (WKPELECO), chaired by Aukje Coers, the Netherlands, Mark Dickey-Collas, the Netherlands, Christian

Olesen, Denmark, Sean O'Donoghue, Ireland, to meet in Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 29–30 September 2010.

Decision: SCICOM approved the WKPELECO resolution and welcomed that the RAC had approached ICES for collaborative work.

The SSGSUE Chair raised concerns over whether the recently created Council WG on Economic and Social Science (CWGESS) re-opened the discussion as to whether socio-economic science were part of the ICES Science Plan or not. The General Secretary clarified that the question discussed was whether ICES should advise on socio-economics. SCICOM looks forward to the report of the CWG.

The SCICOM Chair informed the committee about the 14th dialogue meeting to be held in Galway, Ireland in October 2010 scheduled two weeks after the RAC meetings at ICES. SCICOM would be very welcome to participate in the dialogue meeting.

The SSGSUE Chair informed SCICOM that his tenure will end with the 2010 calendar year, and so that a decision on a new chair is to be made in September.

Action: The SCICOM Chair asked SCICOM members to consider suitable candidates for SSGSUE Chair from within the committee, and approach him for discussions if necessary.

6 Update and approval of SCICOM/ACOM Strategic Initiatives

The SCICOM Chair opened this agenda item reminding the committee that SCICOM is the science arm of ICES, and that SCICOM needs to be innovative and creative in the development of ICES science and in the implementation of the Council's delegated responsibility on scientific matters. He reiterated the special nature of Strategic Initiatives, the need for them to be implemented in cooperation with ACOM, and the flexibility that we have in their design. Clearly a generic format will not fit every initiative.

6.1 SCICOM/ACOM Strategic Initiative on area-based science and management

Erik Olsen presented the proposal for SIASM drafted by him and Eugene Nixon (ACOM). It was emphasised that more input would be needed to complete the proposal and thus welcomed comments from SCICOM.

Two groups within the Strategic Initiative are to be established:

- STIG-MSP (Strategic Initiative Group on Marine Spatial Planning).
- Spatial Analysis EG (should report to SCICOM/ACOM and relevant EGs)

The total budget for the SI is DKK 115 000.

The SCICOM Chair congratulated Erik Olsen for taking this on and, together with Eugene Nixon, doing an enormous job in getting this into shape. The floor was opened and the following comments were made:

Scope. It is essential to make sure the SI is broader than area-based management of fisheries. Suggestion was made to avoid using the term 'management of marine ecosystems' and instead use 'management of human actions/activities'. A broader planning group taking in the expertise needed to capture the broader perspective should be invited. The SI should cover all types of human pressures (pollution, wind farms, oil pipelines, etc.). A couple of case studies covering different aspects, i.e. coastal, should be considered to run through the detail.

Competition or open doors. It was noted that the SI should not try to create a marine spatial planning agency inside ICES, but rather coordinate efforts. Regarding suggestions that the SI would be looking for ways of self-supporting its activities it was noted that Member Countries would not be prepared to support ICES competing within the upcoming 8th RFP funding. Erik Olsen emphasised that the SI is not a new structure; it is a process bringing together all member states to pull in the same direction, i.e. a networking mechanism, which is the strength and value added of ICES. There is no intention for ICES to submit applications to EC RFP calls. In contrast it would rather facilitate applications from others.

More focus on methodologies rather than the data itself. The group recommended that the SI spends less effort in trying to get the data together (there are other bodies ready for this) and more in the development of methodology (e.g. statistics for VMS analysis).

The SCICOM Chair thanked the initiative for a very useful discussion and encouraged the SI to broaden the participation of the planning group to capture the broader scope and possible synergies with SSGRSP and the initiative on biodiversity.

Decision: SCICOM approved the allocation of DKK 115 000 to this initiative.

Action: SI Chairs to organise a broad meeting to develop an implementation plan for the SI before the ASC. Supporting funds are available for participants from academic institutions.

6.2 SCICOM/ACOM Strategic Initiative on Stock Assessment Methods (SISAM)

Mark Dickey-Collas presented the SCICOM/ACOM Strategic Initiative proposal on Stock Assessment Methods, and explained that SSGSUE had received input and worked closely together with ACOM in its development. Through the Strategic Initiative, ICES will partner fisheries organisations, academia, and other interested parties, to carry out a joint global review of stock assessment methods over the next two to three years. The review will result in a number of publications (research papers in ICES JMS, CRR), and a repository of online, free, robust and tested stock assessment methods.

Action: SISAM requested the ICES Secretariat to send formal invitations to potential partners, i.e. FAO (already approached), ICCAT, IATTC, CCSBT, NAFO and IPhC, Network of Regional Fisheries Organizations Secretariats hosted by FAO, and NASCO.

Two meetings have already been planned. The first is a workshop scheduled for September 2010, and the second is an open symposium in spring 2012. Both meetings will feed into three products:

- Publication of the review of state-of-the-art methods in the ICES Journal of Marine Science,
- ICES Cooperative Research Report (CRR) full review of methods
- Online repository of codes, manuals and working data sets.

Formal requests for resources have not yet been provided, but an initial list would include:

- ICES Data Centre (web support for initiative and repository)
– 200 hours secretariat time

- Support for large conference (including travel for invited speakers)
– €30 000
- Large conference administration
– 200 hours secretariat time
- Support for publication
– €10 000
- Support for marketing and awareness building
– 50 hours secretariat time

A good discussion followed the presentation focusing on a number of specific areas:

- SCICOM felt that it was important to ensure that partner organisations help co-fund the initiative, as the benefits extend beyond ICES. As marine mammals are also assessment stocks perhaps NAMMCO could be approached as a partner.
- It was considered essential that the initiative does not stop at collating a set of state of the art methods, but that it seriously considers ways of evaluating how well each method is performing.
- SCICOM encouraged the leaders of the initiative to be ambitious and visionary. An increasing amount of data is becoming available to make integrated ecosystem assessments possible. The review should also consider examples of this nature to start moving ICES advice into a new level.
- At the same time SCICOM discussed that the best and most advanced models may not be appropriate for ICES, depending on the data availability and the ability of ICES to apply overly complex methods across the network.
- Depository of methods should be made and saved in an ICES database. It would be important to obtain commitment from partner organizations to the maintenance of such a database.

Mark Dickey-Collas thanked the SCICOM members for their comments. There was good support around the table for the Strategic Initiative, which had a clear output and should position ICES at the forefront of stock assessment methodologies.

Action (urgent): To ensure as good as possible participation for the workshop in September 2010, invitations would need to be extended as soon as possible. All important players should be invited.

Decision: SCICOM agreed to allocate funds (DKK 50 000) for travel to facilitate broad audience for the workshop. (However, key partners from other communities should be funding their own way. The targeted key people should not have any problem paying their travel.)

In terms of funding requests for the conference in 2012, and any other initiatives associated with this activity, formal proposals should be tabled the next SCICOM meeting.

6.3 SCICOM/ACOM strategic initiative on Biodiversity

Two meeting documents, Doc 14a and 14b, in support of this initiative, were presented by Simon Jennings.

Plans for the four-year joint SCICOM/ACOM Strategic Initiative on Biodiversity (SIBAS) were presented, under the joint leadership of Simon Jennings (SCICOM) and Mark Tasker (ACOM) for the first year. The proposal is not yet finalised, and input had been received from a number of players.

The SCICOM Chair thanked Simon Jennings for keeping the momentum going and invited comments from the SCICOM members:

- It was noted that the SI objectives resonate well with a number of priority areas in the ICES Science Plan (e.g. vulnerable/ sensitive ecosystems). ICES should be more proactive in this regard. However, some of the objectives of the SI may be too ambitious (e.g. ensuring that ICES is a leader in biodiversity science).
- The Role of WGBIODIV in the initiative was raised. Would the SI involve WGBIODIV and in what capacity? Would the SI provide ToRs for other EGs?.
- What is the strategy to engage with initiatives outside ICES? Linkage with MARBEF+ already envisaged and would be valuable in terms of academic input. What would be the role of the CoML, soon coming to an end, and any potential follow-ups? ICES appears to have a very good connection with OBIS, currently negotiating to come under IODE leadership. It was suggested that ICES should offer facilities to make cooperation more beneficial to other organisations (workshops, training).

Decision/Action: SCICOM was supportive to the establishment of a planning group to meet before the ASC to prepare a more detailed document in time for the ASC. The planning meeting should be followed up by an ASC meeting with the attendance of OBIS and Census of Marine Life (CoML). A detailed plan for the Strategic Initiative should be presented to SCICOM in September for approval.

Decision: SCICOM agreed to allocate DKK 50 000 to this Strategic Initiative to facilitate the meeting of a planning group.

Participation: Jake Rice's involvement, as co-author of the original proposal, would be welcomed. Paul Snelgrove has also been very supportive and interested to engage in this SI from his academic perspective.

6.4 SCICOM Strategic Initiative on Climate Change

SCICOM was informed that the deadline for the launch of the position paper had been postponed till mid-December 2010, due to delays in the production of some of the chapters. The PUBCOM Chair raised an issue regarding the review process of the position paper. A Review Group of the Position Paper on Climate Change (RGPPCC) was established in 2009 to deal with the scientific peer review of the paper. The Editors of the paper have recently informed the PUBCOM Chair that they would like to handle the peer review internally. The PUBCOM Chair raised his concern that running two parallel peer reviews may limit the number of potential independent and anonymous referees, with consequences for the scientific credibility of the paper. The SCICOM Chair expressed his view that given that this is a SCICOM position paper it would have to be reviewed by or under the mandate of SCICOM. SCICOM agreed to this view.

The authorship of the position paper was raised. From the outset the position paper was intended to be an *ICES position* on climate change, and not an authored document. Recognising the investment authors have made in writing this paper, a suggestion was made

to produce a CRR publishing the 13 chapters in which the authors would be acknowledged and, in addition, a separate and more integrative *ICES Position Paper on Climate Change*. The position paper should be signed off by SCICOM and also be passed to ACOM to ensure there would be no unforeseen policy implications. For future position papers, SCICOM would need to consider creating a publication series analogous to the Advice Series.

SCICOM recognised that this process would involve a considerable effort for the coordinators and contributors; however this would meet the criteria that the position paper should be the ICES view and at the same time ensure that authors receive credit.

Action: SCICOM Chair to communicate with the leaders of SSICC (L. Valdes and J. Alheit), and with the PUBCOM Chair, to discuss and reach an agreement on the review process for the position paper and on the question of authorship.

Continuation of the Climate Change initiative as a long-term SI

The SCICOM Chair presented Doc 15, the draft SSICC Report. The SCICOM Chair had asked the SSICC co-chairs to include their vision for the future of SSICC. Their proposal was presented in Annex 4, "Roadmap for an ICES cross-cutting programme on climate change", suggesting that climate change becomes a long-term strategic initiative in line with the three other strategic initiatives.

SCICOM appreciated the proposal from SSICC. There was a short discussion on the potential scope, focus and range of activities of a longer term cross-cutting structure for climate change in ICES. The need and benefits of such a cross-cutting effort versus other more traditional implementation structures (e.g. Expert Groups) were discussed. It was also noted that ICES and PICES have already a climate change-focused expert group (e.g. WGFCCIFS). Feedback of the discussion is to be given by the SCICOM Chair to the leaders of the SSICC for them to provide additional information to SCICOM so that a final decision can be taken in Nantes, at which time a draft of the position paper would also be available.

Action: SCICOM Chair to communicate the discussion to the leaders of the SSICC and request them additional information so that a final decision on the long-term future of the SSICC can be taken in Nantes.

Definition and format for Strategic Initiatives

The SCICOM Chair reminded the committee of the previous day's consensus of a definition of SSGs and SIs. SCICOM Steering Groups steer the activities of a number of Expert Groups in close cooperation with SCICOM. Strategic Initiatives are more targeted and potentially established for a shorter period of time. The issues are crosscutting, and might be relevant to several SSGs and to both SCICOM and ACOM. Although the three existing strategic initiatives are very different in nature, SCICOM should also have a common format to assess the need and outcomes of particular SIs. In particular, it would be expected of SI to be effective mechanisms for implementing the Science Plan.

At the moment, all SIs are co-chaired by a person from SCICOM. Beyond that, they have been asked to develop some level of self governance. Some SIs require a large group; some a smaller one.

SCICOM agreed to define Strategic Initiatives as 'time bound deliverables that can be audited by SCICOM and ACOM'. There was a discussion on nomenclature, but it was decided that changing the names at this stage would be sending a wrong signal.

7 Discussion on new strategic research priorities

Analysis of the ICES SCICOM Expert Groups database (2010)

The SCICOM Chair presented Doc 16, Analysis of ICES SCICOM EG database. The ICES SCICOM Expert Groups membership database (2010) was used to extract summaries of the participation of countries and experts in ICES activities. The presentation spurred a good discussion during which the following points were brought up:

- It was pointed out the statistics from the ICES Address Manager reflect membership and not participation.
- Regarding overall participation in EGs it was noted that the scientific network of ICES includes 1700 scientists from 36 countries.
- Would there be easy way to distinguish governmental and non-governmental? The General Secretary pointed out that in some countries some governmental institutions have an obligation to work with ICES.

Interesting observations extracted from the analysis:

- Chair-appointments bring a considerable number of new institutions into ICES.
- Ratio of members appointed by delegates is 75%. There might be a need to give more leeway to the chair to nominate members if we want to open up the network.
- There are some differences in overall participation across all the member countries, with 9–10 member countries providing a more considerable number of participants. It was noted that the numbers are absolute and not weighted by population size.

The General Secretary encouraged SCICOM national members to take part in the annual nomination procedure in cooperation with the national Council delegates.

SCICOM appreciated the analysis of the ICES SCICOM Expert Groups database and found that it would be interesting to compare the statistics over a number of years.

Action: The SCICOM Chair recommended that this analysis of the Expert Group database should be carried out by the Secretariat at the end of the year to compare the results with the actual attendance of EGs in 2010.

Science Plan Research Priorities and gaps

The SCICOM Chair presented Doc 17, Notes on the implementation of ICES Science. The database of SCICOM expert groups was used to classify EG into science areas. The information was used to do a simple mapping exercise between current EGs and ICES research priorities as identified in the Science Plan. The objective was to provide food for thought for discussions on where SCICOM should encourage or generate new research activity. SCICOM members contributed to the list of areas where ICES is not yet fully implementing the Science Plan:

- Sensitive ecosystems.
- Operational modelling (from physics to fish)
- Spatially-based assessment and management
- Statistical methods analysing indicators from surveys
- Invasive species (already covered by WGITMO and WGBOSV)
- Implications of the shift from the 'precautionary approach' to 'maximum sustainable yield'
- Evaluation of ecosystem goods and services
- Ecosystem modelling
- Social and economical analysis in the context of resource management
- Interaction inshore/offshore processes (management is different, but ecosystem processes are connected)
- Operational oceanography/observation
- Understanding of multiple human impacts (renewable energy, oil and gas, risk analysis)
- Nutrients and nutrient modelling

Action: SCICOM members were asked to pay special attention to the above list in developing future implementation plans. Some topics might be ideal for a theme session, workshop, or an EG. SCICOM should start thinking of areas that are ready for implementation. The aim will be to pick up some of these ideas in September for further elaboration.

8 Update on SCICOM activities

8.1 Data Management Group

With reference to Doc 18, Data Management Group update, the Head of the ICES Data Centre, Neil Holdsworth, gave a presentation outlining the WGDIM ToRs for the next meeting and the intersessional work done since last year. WGDIM last met in Copenhagen during May 2009; and the group is due to meet again on 24 May 2010. The work of WGDIM has evolved as a result of SCICOM's steering towards a more strategic role for the group. The short term Study Group on VMS data, its storage, access and tools for analysis (SGVMS) proposed by WGDIM is scheduled to have its first meeting in Hamburg in September 2010. Efforts have been made to extend and strengthen WGDIM's links with external bodies undertaking similar work, i.e. representatives from GBIF, Marine XML have been invited to attend the upcoming WGDIM meeting. WGDIM has been tasked to Draft the 2011–2015 Data Strategy in line with ICES Strategic Plan 2009–2013.

The proposal to host an extensive database developed for herring larvae at the ICES DC was discussed. It was suggested to extend to also include all ichthyoplankton surveys. The Data Centre confirmed that the data model is flexible and can be extended to include more than herring.

Some concern was voiced in relation to SGVMS and whether the SG would go beyond the technical aspects and into governance issues. The ACOM Chair was concerned how the work of the SG should be coordinated between the advisory and science sides of ICES. SGVMS will mainly be dealing with the technical side, but we should also have a “political solution” for the unique identifiers.

SCICOM complemented WGDIM on their change in approach.

8.2 ICES Publications and Communications Group (PUBCOM)

Pierre Pepin presented Doc 19, the Interim Report of the Publications and Communications Group, and discussed decisions related to PUBCOM in Doc 5.

Communications Strategy

The General Secretary updated SCICOM on the developments of the Communication Strategy. The Communications Strategy proposed by PUBCOM was modified according to input from various bodies within ICES. During the February 2010 meeting of Bureau, the modified document received support with the following changes:

- 1) Because SCICOM has national representation the Delegates did not consider necessary to establish a similar representation in PUBCOM. As a result a smaller group was created with representatives from ACOM, SCICOM and the ICES community in a way that addresses the organisation’s interests;
- 2) Increased requirements for the production of publications through the Secretariat would be handled internally;
- 3) Matters pertaining to Internal Communications (ICES, Marine Science Community) will be handled through PUBCOM. Matters related to Public Relations will be handled through Bureau and will likely involve the eventual creation of a new position to address ICES needs.

As a follow up, the President, the First Vice-President and the General Secretary will, in cooperation with communication experts from national institutes nominated by ICES Delegates (6 out of 20 delegates responded and provided names) provide an updated draft of the Communications Strategy to Bureau and Council with a view to approve the Communications Strategy in October 2010. One of the key questions is ‘What is the division between ICES and the national institutes in relation to external communication?’

SCICOM thanked the Chair of PUBCOM and took note of the updates provided. SCICOM looks forward to seeing the Communications Strategy from Council.

ICES Website

Council approved the realignment of funds to cover the consulting costs associated with the design of the ICES website. A Group has been set up within the Secretariat (Chaired by Wim Panhorst (Head of IT), Bodil Chemnitz (Webmaster), Neil Holdsworth (Head of Data Centre), Bill Anthony (Executive Editor)) to address changes to the ICES website. The Report of the Workshop on the Format of the ICES Advisory Report (WKFAR) has recommendations that will have to be considered as part of any restructuring of the website. The Head of IT updated SCICOM on the ongoing process of website developments. The ICES website has grown to include approx. 37 000 links, which is far too much for effective management. A questionnaire completed by high school students demonstrated that the general public have difficulty finding general information on the organisation. A questionnaire for users, and analysis of the IP addresses of visitors are planned to better

understand what is required. Should the website be split into smaller entities for better management?

Progress in renewing the website has nevertheless been limited owing to other priorities and staff availability but there should be significant information available at ASC after consultation with PUBCOM, SCICOM and ACOM.

The following comments and feedback was received from SCICOM members:

- At the last SCICOM meeting it had been agreed that there would be consultation between Secretariat and PUBCOM with regard to the redesign of the website. PUBCOM created some reports that should be useful. The Head of IT agreed to improve communication and collaboration with SCICOM and PUBCOM on the development of the ICES website.
- It would be useful to find out who are the main users of the website, across a number of user categories.
- Only EG reports from a few years back are available. It would be useful to have better access to older documentation.
- It would be useful to know SCICOM's and ACOM's views for website development. There is representation from ACOM and SCICOM on PUBCOM to ensure that this information is effectively transferred.

The SCICOM Chair stressed the importance and urgency of this issue. Through PUBCOM, the Secretariat group was asked to report to SCICOM in September.

Proceedings of ASC: ICES Conference Series

In September 2009, the Chair of SSGEF (Pierre Petitgas) put forward a proposal to publish the proceedings of the ASC. The Proceedings would be additional to the CM documents. PUBCOM's consensus recommendation is that **SCICOM should not support the proposal as it stands.**

Decision: SCICOM agreed to follow the PUBCOM recommendation not to create a new Conference series.

Action: PUBCOM will explore possible solutions to re-organize information from the ASC via the website to make the material that is currently not available more accessible.

ICES JMS backlog

SCICOM was informed that a considerable backlog of material for publication has accumulated in the ICES JMS over the course of the last year and, as a consequence, no ASC theme session circular would be issued to convenors for the 2010 ASC. The publisher has agreed to eliminate the backlog by publishing an additional 500 pages, beyond the regular 1800 pages currently budgeted. Furthermore, PUBCOM agreed with the journal that no "out of the blue" requests to publish small, topical suites will be considered in 2010 unless specifically supported by SCICOM or ACOM. Restrictions have also been agreed between PUBCOM and the journal on the size of manuscripts. Finally, OUP has agreed to increase the journal's page budget to 1950 pages starting in 2011. In discussion SCICOM members noted that the quality of the journal cannot be jeopardised, but also that the access to the journal by member countries' scientists needs to be protected. PUBCOM and the publisher feel strongly that a balance needs to be reached between

sustaining a reasonable size for the journal while facing an increased popularity and submission rate. The current rejection rate is around 50%.

Decision: SCICOM supported the measure suggested by Oxford University Press (OUP) to increase the rejection rate to 65%, with a clear message that any further increase in the rejection rate would not be acceptable as it would deter ICES scientists from submitting to the journal. PUBCOM was asked to look into alternatives and strategies for publishing manuscripts that do not meet the revised standards for the journal, and report back to SCICOM.

ICES JMS symposium proceedings requesting SCICOM approval

To bring down the backlog of material for publication, PUBCOM recommends reducing the size of symposium issues from 250 to 200 pp. This is to start for symposia scheduled for 2012 publication dates and beyond.

Decision: SCICOM accepts the recommendation from PUBCOM for new symposia, provided there is supplementary material allowed on the website. For already approved symposia, decision will be made on an individual basis, with possibly one of three symposia being afforded an extra 50 pages.

Action: Symposia Convenors to be notified that the original 250 pp per volume will now be reduced to 200.

8.3 ICES Training Group (ITG)

With reference to Doc 20, Gerd Kraus presented an update from the ICES Training Programme. He noted that the Training Group expects guidance from SCICOM Steering Groups with regards to the development of the Training Programme. Advice is specifically requested from the SCICOM/ACOM Strategic Initiative on Stock Assessment Methods (SISAM) on course instructors and on advanced stock assessment courses to announce in 2011.

SIF funding support for ICES Training Programme will run out in 2011. Therefore ICES should consider how to fund and continue Training Programme beyond 2011.

The SCICOM Chair thanked the Training Group for the report and expressed his appreciation of the programme as a very successful value adding exercise for ICES.

The Training Programme welcomes detailed proposals for future training courses, but other training ideas are also welcome – in particular proposals balancing the current bias towards fisheries oriented courses. Two suggestions for potential new training courses were noted:

- downscaling climate models for research use
- risk assessment course as integral part of the CROME course.
- Marine environmental management beyond fisheries.

The proposed summer course “Climate Impacts on Marine Ecosystems” was seen as potentially competing with university courses. SCICOM was informed that this proposal was included to balance the otherwise very strong fisheries-oriented programme.

Business model towards a self-sustainable ICES Training Programme

ICES training should develop a business model to become self sustained and not rely on support from Council. Different options have been discussed in the Training Group, such as grant funds and e-learning (distant learning), allowing live distant participation.

The incoming HoA (Poul Degnbol) suggested that ICES could be more proactive in adding direct value to management via proposals for ICES training courses under the umbrella of the Framework Programme. This would increase the chances of projects being funded and at the same time this might also be a way towards self-sustainability for the ICES Training Programme.

Action: The SCICOM Training group was asked to explore, at their September 2010 meeting in Nantes, a two-tier course structure with a core set of training courses, partially funded by ICES, and a second tier that is broader and running when funding is available.

8.4 SCICOM Working Group on Science Cooperation (SWGSC)

Ólafur Astthórsson and Markku Viitasalo presented the draft report of the SCICOM Working Group on Science Cooperation (SWGSC) report to SCICOM on behalf of Chair and Spanish alternate, Begoña Santos, who could not attend this meeting.

The SCICOM Chair congratulated the group for the comprehensive report.

The General Secretary reminded the committee that cooperation with other organisations will always be subject to approval by Council. Letters of Agreements (LoA) do not necessarily have to go to Council, but need to be passed by Bureau. For Memoranda of Understanding (MoU) which have financial implications, requests should always go through Council.

Action: The SIs under development were asked to look at the recommendations of SWGSC when forming their groups.

The SWGSC recommended that a questionnaire was circulated to EGs to complete our understanding of partner organisations and cooperation issues. The Chair raised concern about workloads of EG's and whether group emails were the most effective way of getting the information we need. An alternative would be to make the questionnaire available at the ASC for response by attendants.

Action: Chair to work with Secretariat to include the questionnaire with the papers for the ASC.

8.5 Cooperation with other organisations

HoS presented Doc 22, Cooperation with other organizations – summary of activities.

Arctic Ocean Science Board (AOSB)

As a follow-up to the meeting of the Arctic Ocean Science Board of the International Arctic Science Council (IASC) at ICES Headquarters in Copenhagen in January 2010, the ICES secretariat on behalf of SCICOM invited the AOSB to formalize cooperation on science issues. The Arctic Ocean is explicitly mentioned in the ICES Science Plan under the topic of sensitive ecosystems, and it may receive much more attention under climate change. The AOSB Secretary prepared a Letter of Agreement between the two science boards. IASC will endorse the LoA at their meeting in late April.

Decision: SCICOM recommended approval of the LoA by Bureau in June.

Scientific Committee on Ocean Research (SCOR)

ICES has been invited to join the annual SCOR meeting to be held in Toulouse, France, right before the ASC in Nantes.

ICES has offered support to SCOR WG 137 through WGHABD. The Chair of WGHABD should be informed once the venue and dates for the WG 137 meeting are available. SCOR should be provided with ToRs of other relevant EGs including WGPME.

Decision/Action: SCICOM decided that it would be appropriate to establish a mechanism for SCICOM to review proposals and to set up mechanism where ICES is present in SCOR WGs. The PUBCOM Chair volunteered to follow up on this on behalf of SCICOM.

Action: Decision to link to Theme Session was already made by SCICOM. Secretariat should inform WGHABD that Chair and members are welcome to attend the SCOR WG.

SAHFOS

Since 2006, the ICES Strategic Investment Fund (SIF) has supported the digitization of historical zooplankton data at SAHFOS. HoS informed the meeting that the interim report of SAHFOS was available in the SCICOM SharePoint site under background documents. The work done by SAHFOS is so far highly satisfactory and the results from data evaluation during 2010 will be exciting. The final report is expected on time.

Action: HoS to contact Abigail McQuatters Collop at SAHFOS and ask for draft to be submitted before print.

PICES

HoS presented the proposed Terms of Reference for a joint PICES/ICES Study Group. The objective of the group is to develop a formal framework for cooperation between ICES and PICES to serve as the basis for linkages of our science plans and longer-term strategic planning.

Decision: Three SCICOM members were nominated as members of the ICES/PICES Study Group: Mark Dickey-Collas, Begoña Santos and Bill Karp. As currently only two members per organisation are expected the Chair of SCICOM will discuss the composition of the group with the nominees.

MARCOM +

HoS presented MARCOM+ and explained that the main activities in 2010 will be so-called open fora for open and discussions focusing on research policy and governance. The first is organized by the ESF Marine Board to be held in Brussels, 25 November 2010. Moreover, in 2010 and 2011 a total of five panels will be organized, for which nominations for membership are sought from ACOM and SCICOM:

- Interdisciplinary dialogue across science panel;
- Technology transfer panel;
- Policy interface panel;
- Research infrastructure development panel;
- Foresight panel (2011)

Action: Secretariat (HoS) to send an email to SCICOM with descriptions of the five panels, requesting nominations (preferably SCICOM members) by 11 May. Funding is available for this process.

IPCC

SCICOM nominated nine experts from the ICES community to be considered as Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, or Review Editors for the Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Appointment letters are anticipated to be sent in the late spring of 2010, but so far ICES has not been informed of outcomes of the nomination process.

OceanObs'09 Working Group IFSOO-TT (Integrated Framework for Sustained Ocean Observations Task Team)

ICES is represented in the Working Group on Promoting and Implementing Operational Ocean Observing Systems Worldwide by Barbara Berx. ICES contributions will be based on WGOOFE, WGHABD, IGWG and on its cooperation with existing networks such as EuroGOOS and MyOcean. The WG will consider the outcomes and recommendations from the OceanObs'09 Conference and, in consultation with the organisations they represent, shall "develop a recommended framework for moving ocean observations forward in the next decade that will ensure the continuation of current observations and the integration of biogeochemical and ecosystem observations". The WG will also "recommend governance for an integrated ocean observing system, considering how best to take advantage of existing structures".

Action: The Chair of WGFAST (Rudy Kloser) to be included in mailing list for this group.

GBIF

The Head of the ICES Data Centre met with the GBIF Secretariat in late 2009 and a rough draft of the proposed areas of mutual cooperation were formulated. In time, it is envisaged that this will become a Letter of Cooperation between the Secretariats.

EUROCEANS

The SCICOM Chair explained that when EUR-OCEANS (European Network of Excellence for Ocean Ecosystems Analysis) came to end, it became a consortium linking 15–20 research institutes throughout Europe. They are looking at ways of building a sustaining legal entity and linking with ICES more effectively. At a recent meeting EUR-OCEANS and ICES discussed the possibility of transferring the EUR-OCEANS coordination activities into the ICES Secretariat. This would involve benefits for both sides. For ICES it would create a closer connection with a large number of academic institutions; for EUR-OCEANS a long-term future and access to the ICES network, ASC and symposia promotions.

Within their current activities they plan to hold foresight workshops to which ICES will be invited, mostly resulting in publications. SCICOM has been asked to look at the first round of workshop proposals, of which there will be funding for four - some more aligned to ICES than others.

Action: Four SCICOM members, Simon Jennings, Pierre Pepin, Kris Cooreman, and Daniel Duplisea, volunteered to provide a SCICOM view on the EUR-OCEANS workshop proposals to be passed to EUR-OCEANS via the SCICOM Chair.

The SCICOM Chair thanked the volunteers.

8.6 Awards Committee (new membership/request for nominations for Outstanding Achievement Awards 2010)

David Griffith was formally recognised with an award in 2005 for his long and outstanding service to ICES in what was a precursor to the present Outstanding Achievement Award. The Awards Committee requests that SCICOM formally recommend adding David's name to the list of awardees (Griffith, Daan, Rice) and that David's name be added to the awards plaque in the Secretariat Office.

Decision: SCICOM recommends adding David Griffith's name to the list of awardees (Griffith, Daan, Rice) and that David's name be added to the awards plaque in the Secretariat Office.

The SCICOM Chair encouraged all members to consider nominations for the outstanding achievement award.

Markku Viitasalo presented a proposal which was linked to the discussion concerning the ASC and funding for young scientists:

- The prize for winning the Best Early Career Scientist Award (ECSA) could be a free entrance to an ICES training course (value 500 €), or alternatively travel support to attend an ICES Expert Group (value 1000-1500 €).
- In order to advance the careers of young scientists, the number of ECSA awards should be increased to 2-3. This would not decrease the value of the award, but would rather increase the opportunities for talented young scientists.

- To help finding out who is eligible to the ECSA award, the potential candidates should identify themselves already when submitting the abstracts to ASC. This would require clear guidelines.

Action: Proposal to be sent to the Awards Committee for their consideration.

9 ACOM/SCICOM linkages

9.1 Subgroup on Prediction of Advisory Needs

The Subgroup on Prediction of Advisory Needs was proposed and agreed by SCICOM in September 2009, however there had been no action taken since then. The SCICOM Chair tabled Doc 28 of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) and suggested that this document could serve as a starting point/basis for the discussion in the subgroup.

There were supportive comments in SCICOM in favour of using the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) as a basis for the work of the group and for carrying out a SWOT analysis. Based on input from the 11 MSFD task groups, the document would provide a legislative background.

Decision: Simon Jennings together with Einar Svendsen and an ACOM representative were asked to lead the subgroup in preparation of a meeting in Nantes, September 2010. The subgroup membership consists of the ACOM leadership group and the SCICOM Business Group. The subgroup was asked to identify scientific needs emanating from Doc 28 (MSFD), and to make a gap analysis as to whether ICES has the relevant expertise. Funding may be made available if needed.

It was recommended that part of the joint ACOM/SCICOM meeting on 24 September be dedicated to a presentation of the work of the Subgroup on Prediction of Advisory Needs.

The ACOM Chair informed SCICOM that a new format for the advice has been implemented. One is the format for fisheries advice with sections calling for comments on ecosystem considerations; second is agreement on format for non fisheries advice. A new introduction has been drafted for the advice series with an increasing focus on ecosystems.

10 Annual Science Conference 2010, 2011, and 2012

10.1 Update by Conference Coordinator

The ICES Conference Coordinator, Görel Kjeldsen, presented Doc 29a.

ASC 2010

In total 575 abstracts had been submitted, a high number compared to previous years. The theme session conveners have accepted 351 papers for oral presentation and 179 for poster presentation. The rest may have to be considered as rejected.

At the venue in Nantes, La Cité des Congrès, there will be free WIFI in some of the meeting rooms and in an area of the Grande Hall at the Congress Centre. There will also be cabled access to the Internet and an internet café with 10 computers and printing facilities.

Social events

The Opening night reception will be held on Monday 20 September at 19.00 probably at the Castle of the Dukes of Brittany in Nantes (to be confirmed). Under all circumstances it will be held at a central place in Nantes to avoid bus transportation. The Mayor of Nantes will be present.

The Poster session will be held on Tuesday 21 September, between 18.00 and 20.00 hrs. The hosts will offer two free drinks and there will be a cash bar. After the Session there will be some musical entertainment by the Jacques Massé Jazz band.

The Conference dinner will be held on Thursday 23 September from 19.30 to 23.30 at “Les Machines de l’Ile” in Nantes. It will be a “standing dinner” followed by traditional music and dances from Brittany. The tickets will cost Euro 40.

The President will host a dinner for former Presidents of ICES. In total there will be nine former presidents with spouses invited. IFREMER and ICES will co-sponsor the dinner.

The final ASC programme will be available in June.

Saturday 18 September	PUBCOM meeting (full day)
Sunday 19 September	ACOM meeting (full day) SCICOM meeting (full day)
Monday 20 September a.m.	SCICOM Steering Group meetings
Monday 20 September midday	General Assembly, Open Lecture
Monday 20 September afternoon to Friday 24 September midday	Plenary Lectures, Theme Sessions, Science Steering Groups, Closing Session
Friday 24 September p.m. after Closing Session	Joint ACOM/SCICOM
Saturday 25 September	ACOM meeting SCICOM meeting (full day)

The SCICOM Chair announced that there would be a SCICOM plenary open to all participants before the Monday SSG meetings.

For the joint ACOM/SCICOM meeting on the afternoon of 24 September, the ACOM/SCICOM Chairs would identify the issues to be dealt with jointly to avoid double reporting.

The SCICOM Chair reminded SCICOM members that Saturday, 25 September, would be a full-day meeting for SCICOM which could conclude with a joint dinner.

Format of Session R

Maurice Héral, in his capacity of co-convenor of ASC Theme Session R (Delivering more science with fewer resources: How do we make best use of our investment in science through joint programming, communication and knowledge management) asked for SCICOM approval of a different format for this theme session featuring keynotes by the Head of DG RTD, Lars Horn; the Coordinator of RCN, the ICES General Secretary/Head of Science Programme and MariFish Coordinator, John Lock.

Decision: SCICOM approved the special format for Session R and asked for the keynotes to be focused on MARCOM and the joint programming.

ASC 2011

On 5 September 2008, the ICES General Secretary received a formal invitation from the Polish Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development, to host the 2011 ASC to be held in Gdańsk at the Centrum Kongresowe of the Polish Philharmonic from Monday 19 to Friday 23 September. The Secretariat is awaiting the signed agreement between the Ministry and the Conference Centre.

ASC 2012

SCICOM was informed that ICES has received an invitation from Norway to host the ASC 2012 to be formally endorsed by Council in October.

10.2 Increased funding for young scientists

According to a Bureau decision in February, the budget for travel funds for young scientists has been increased from DKK 50,000 to DKK 100,000. SCICOM was asked to consider whether it would be appropriate to waive the registration fee for young scientists, as this has been the practise for young fishermen.

Decision: SCICOM agreed to waive the conference fee for young scientists.

Decision: SCICOM was in favour of inviting stakeholders, rather than funding young fishermen. SCICOM recommended (to the Bureau) reallocation of the SIF money for invitations to be extended to stakeholders, and to discontinue funding for young fishermen starting in 2011.

10.3 Preview of Theme Sessions for ASC 2011 in Poland

A call for theme session proposals for ASC 2011 will be opened soon with a deadline of 6 September. The call will be circulated widely. Additional theme sessions emanating from SSG meetings during the ASC (after the official deadline) will be considered. However, all proposals should be submitted by Wednesday afternoon at 18:00. The ASC group chaired by Dariusz Fey should schedule a meeting for 23 or 24 September (Thursday or Friday) of the ASC week. The SCICOM Chair encouraged SCICOM members to volunteer to take part in the ASC group and the pre-selection of theme sessions for the ASC 2011.

Action: Volunteers for the ASC group were requested to inform the SCICOM Chair.

Action: Invited speakers for the 2011 Annual Science Conference will be decided at the 2010 ASC. The HoS encouraged all SCICOM members to consider qualified candidates for the keynotes based on the topics.

Action: SCICOM members were asked to review the preliminary list of theme session proposals (Doc 30) and send their comments to the Secretariat.

Action: For the theme sessions carried over from last year, the Secretariat will contact conveners to update proposals.

Action: The Secretariat will contact PICES to ensure that joint ICES/PICES theme sessions have been approved by PICES.

11 Symposia 2010–2012 (progress report)

SCICOM reviewed the following three new proposals for ICES co-sponsorship of symposia:

- 1) Symposium on “Integrating biogeochemistry and ecosystems in a changing ocean – Regional comparisons”, 10–14 October 2010, Crete, Greece.

Decision: SCICOM concluded that, given the short notice co-sponsorship for the IMBIZO II conference would not be possible. SCICOM usually requires a timeframe of at least a year to make an impact to the programme and to address relevant science priorities in the Strategic Science Plan.

- 2) Symposium on “Forage fish interactions: Creating the tools for ecosystem based management of marine resources”, 10–14 September 2012, Nantes, France.

Decision: SCICOM agreed to support this symposium. The following three action items were agreed:

Action: The symposium is scheduled to take place right before the ASC, which is unfortunate. The ICES Secretariat was asked to contact the coordinator/convener (Stefan Neuenfeldt) and ask for dates to be revisited.

Action: Mark Dickey-Collas as a member of the Scientific Steering Committee was asked to ensure that the programme will develop in line with ICES requirements.

Action: PUBCOM to assess by correspondence whether the ICES JMS should be granted.

- 3) Symposium on “The Seventh International Conference on Marine Bioinvasions (ICMB-VII)”, 23–26 August 2011, Barcelona, Spain.

Decision: SCICOM agreed to postpone the decision until September. It was noted that ICES sponsored the last bioinvasions symposium, but that the experience had not been considered a success. The Secretariat was asked to contact the ICES representatives at the SSC and communicate the concerns of SCICOM concerning the US-bias in the composition of the SSC (a similar problem from the previous bioinvasions conference), and to ascertain if they had been consulted in the preparation of the conference. The topic was seen as relevant to the ICES Science Plan.

Action: HoS requested ICES nominations for the Scientific Steering Committee of the Second International Symposium on the Effects of climate change on the world’s oceans, to be held in May 2012 in Yeosu, Korea.

12 Other business

Request from PUBCOM

Action: SCICOM members were asked to nominate potential candidates for a CCR series editor. A modest honorarium adjusted depending on workload will be offered. Retired but experienced editor often are best for the job. Deadline: within the next ten days.

Action: Plankton fish series discontinued. A disclaimer is to be placed on the website (Secretariat).

Draft letter of agreement between NAMMCO and ICES

Doc 32, the draft Letter of Agreement between NAMMCO and ICES was tabled. SCICOM was supportive of the LoA and recommend to Bureau to look into the final wording of the letter.

ICES letter in support for research proposals

The ICES Secretariat had received a request to send a letter to the Commission in support of a research proposal. In this particular case there were no competing proposals. A discussion was opened as to whether ICES should support proposals competing with European or national proposals.

Decision: There was agreement in SCICOM that a standard letter would be a valuable way of showing support when a proposal is considered appropriate to ICES. The letter should state the relation of the proposal with the ICES Science Plan, but it should not in any way express ICES support to the proposal.

Action: Secretariat to prepare a standard letter with three paragraphs: 1) describing what ICES is, 2) expressing that ICES does not support particular competing proposals and, 3) a paragraph identifying the relevant area of science and in what way the research proposal is linked with ICES. The draft letter should be circulated to the ACOM/SCICOM Chairs for approval. Following approval, SCICOM members would be asked to communicate to their network that such a letter is available.

WGCRAN

Gerd Kraus presented Doc 35, a request from the German Government for MSC certification for German brown shrimp fisheries.

Decision: SCICOM decided that the request would be passed to WGCRAN by the SSGEF Chair (Pierre Petitgas) for response to ACOM.

Member country perception of SCICOM

The Chair asked for a tour de table on the view of SCICOM by the member countries. In particular he was interested in knowing if SCICOM is visible enough in member countries, if member countries consider SCICOM a useful body and whether delegates would value the assistance of the SCICOM Chair in promoting the activities of SCICOM in their country. The following key points were brought up:

- SCICOM seen as very important to avoid reinventing the wheel, to secure international scientific connections and to help member countries think more broadly.
- SCICOM is seen to support the collaborative nature of research activities for common issues.
- International membership helps motivate application of standards and best practises
- ICES is however not well known in the academic sector.
- As ICES broadens its scope the member countries may have to do the same. For the major part national science priorities are well coordinated with the ICES Science Plan and for some countries, the Science Plan has (to some extent) served as a basis for national plans.
- Visibility could be increased and Science Plan better communicated.
- The SCICOM structure comes across as complicated; people have some difficulty understanding how it is operating and how they can benefit.

- Science Plan has been well received but is not very widely known. Although multifaceted, the Science Plan is weak in physical oceanography, social ecology, and anthropogenic impacts on marine systems.
- If pollution and climate change is not included in the ecosystem approach to marine management, it will not be relevant for some countries. Pollution has been neglected in the ICES community. Environmental researchers are moving away from ICES.
- SCICOM has less identity in member countries than ACOM.
- Strategic Initiatives hold great potential for member countries and will be seen as positive.
- Member countries have benefitted greatly from regional EGs and there are good perspectives for continued participation in spite of poor funding prospects.
- In this context it is worth noted that in many countries the funding for SCICOM and ACOM comes from different sources. Most attendance is in areas useful to advice. In many cases funding to attend SCICOM activities has been an issue, including EGs participation in recent years.
- SCICOM delegates are unaware of their official mandate to encourage people to get involved.
- For new ICES member countries, where there is no strong tradition for exploration of the sea, there is limited funding and not much support for participation in ICES EGs.

Chair thanked all members and expressed his commitment to support members in strengthening the status and exposure of SCICOM in member countries. The aim will be to make this committee the heart of ICES.

The Chair also encouraged member to use Doc 11, summary of responses on mechanisms for bringing academic scientists into ICES, in their interactions with national delegates.

A discussion followed on how to make EGs more attractive to academics. Given the lack of direct funding EGs should be more project-driven and come out with attractive products such as opportunities to publish in high profile papers or research proposals. The USA-ENSIS model was raised as an option, albeit travel to ENSIS meetings is covered. It was noted that several EGs seem to have a good academic participation (e.g. WGEVO, WGFE).

The Chair also informed the group that Fred Serchuk circulates recent and relevant research papers to him and the ACOM leadership. He will work with the Secretariat to make these PDFs available through the SCICOM SharePoint.

Action: Chair and Secretariat to place PDF's on the SharePoint and inform SCICOM of the outcome.

13 Closing

The SCICOM Chair thanked the committee for their contributions and thanks were extended to the Secretariat for their support. All members were reminded that they have a crucial role in sending the messages of SCICOM across to their national delegates and

scientific colleagues in their home countries. SCICOM recognised the new Chair for a very positive, fun and productive meeting. The General Secretary thanked the local organisers at Charlottenlund Castle for supporting the logistics of the meeting. A present was given to the local staff as a sign of appreciation.

Annex 1: List of participants

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX/EMAIL
Chair		
Manuel Barange	Plymouth Marine Laboratory Prospect Place, The Hoe PL1 3DH Plymouth United Kingdom	Phone +44(0) 1752 633160 Email manuel.barange@ices.dk
SSG Chairs and Chairs of operational groups		
Mark Dickey-Collas, SSGSUE Chair (also listed as national member, Netherlands)	Mark Dickey-Collas Wageningen IMARES P.O. Box 68 NL-1970 AB IJmuiden Netherlands	Phone +31 317 487166 Fax +31 255 56 46 44 Email mark.dickeycollas@wur.nl
Bill Karp, SSGESST Chair	National Marine Fisheries Services Alaska Fisheries Science Center 7600 Sand Point Way N.E., Building 4 Seattle WA 98115 United States	Phone +1 206 526 4000 Fax +1 206 526 4004 Email bill.karp@noaa.gov
Gerd Kraus, TRAINING Chair (also listed as national member, Germany)	Johann Heinrich von Thünen- Institute, Palmaille 9 D-22767 Hamburg Germany	Phone +49 Fax +49 Email gerd.kraus@vti.bund.de
Erik Olsen, SSGHIE Chair	Institute of Marine Research P.O. Box 1870 N-5817 Bergen Norway	Phone +47 Fax +47 Email erik.olsen@imr.no
Pierre Pepin, PUBCOM Chair	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, SSGEF Chair	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
Yvonne Walther, SSGRSP Chair	Swedish Board of Fisheries Institute of Marine Research Utövågen5 SE-371 37 Karlskrona Sweden	Phone +46 455 362 852 Email yvonne.walther@fiskeriverket.se
Ex Officio		

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX/EMAIL
Mike Sissenwine, Chair of the Advisory 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 (ILVO) Ankerstraat 1 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 P.O. Box 1000 Mont-Joli QC G5H 3Z4 Canada	Phone +1 418 775-0881 Fax +1 418 775-1898 Email Daniel.duplisea@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Brian R. MacKenzie (Denmark)	National Institute of Aquatic Resources Section for Fisheries Advice Charlottenlund Slot Jægersborg Alle 1 DK-2920 Charlottenlund Denmark	Phone +45 33 96 34 45 Fax +45 33 96 34 34 Email brm@aqua.dtu.dk
Toomas Saat (Estonia)	Toomas Saat 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 (SYKE) Marine Research Centre P.O. Box 140, FI-00251 Helsinki Finland	Tel.: +358 40 5034848 Fax: +358 9 5490 2290 Email: markku.viitasalo@ymparisto.fi
Maurice Héral (France)	Maurice Héral Ifremer 155 rue Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Technopolis 40 F-92138 Issy-les-Moulineaux France	Email mheral@ifremer.fr
Gerd Kraus (Germany)	Gerd Kraus Johann Heinrich von Thünen-Institute, Palmaille 9 D-22767 Hamburg Germany	Phone +49 Fax +49 Email gerd.kraus@vti.bund.de

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX/EMAIL
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)	Niall Ó Maoiléidigh Marine Institute Marine Institute Catchment Research Facility Furnace Newport Co. Mayo Ireland	Phone +353 1 9842300/9842314822 8200 or 353 1 822 8209 Fax +353 1 9842340 Email niall.omaoleidigh@marine.ie
Georgs Kornilovs (Latvia)	Institute for Food Safety, Animal Health and Environment (BIOR) 8 Daugavgrivas Str. LV-1048 Riga Latvia	Phone +371 76 76 027 Fax +371 762 6946 Email georgs.kornilovs@bior.gov.lv
Sarunas Toliusis (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)	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
Yorgos Stratoudakis (Portugal ; alternate)	INRB - IPIMAR Avenida de Brasilia PT-1449-006 Lisbon Portugal	Phone +351 213027000 Email yorgos@ipimar.pt
Oleg M. Lapshin (Russian Federation)	Russian Federal Research Institute of Fisheries & Oceanography 17 Verkhne Krasnoselskaya RU-107140 Moscow Russian Federation	Phone +7 0952649721 Email lapshin@vniro.ru
Konstantin Drevetnyak (Russian Federation; alternate)	Knipovich Polar Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography 6 Knipovitch Street RU-183763 Murmansk Russian Federation	Phone +7 8152 472 231 Fax +7 8152 473 331 Email drevko@pinro.ru

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX/EMAIL
Antonio Bode (Spain)	Instituto Español de Oceanografía Centro Oceanográfico de A Coruña 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)	Swedish Board of Fisheries Department of Research and Development P.O. Box 423 40126 Göteborg Sweden	Phone +46 31 743 03 50 Fax +46 31 743 04 44 Email marten.astrom@fiskeriverket.se
Simon Jennings (United Kingdom)	Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science Lowestoft Laboratory Pakefield Road NR33 0HT Lowestoft Suffolk United Kingdom	Phone +44 1502 562244 Fax +44 1502 513865 Email simon.jennings@cefasc.co.uk
Steven Cadrin (United States)	NOAA/UMASS School of Marine Science and Technology 200 Mill Road Fairhaven MA 02719 United States	Phone +1 508 9106358 Fax +1 508 9106396 Email steven.cadrin@noaa.gov
ICES Staff		
Søren Anker Pedersen	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	gerd@ices.dk
Bill Anthony, Executive Editor	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	bill@ices.dk
Poul Degnbol	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	poul.degnbol@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
Neil Holdsworth, Head of Data Centre	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	neilh@ices.dk
Görel Kjeldsen, Meeting & Conference Coordinator	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	görel@ices.dk
Wim Panhorst, Head of IT	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	wim@ices.dk
Vivian Piil, Departmental Secretary, Science Programme	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	vivian@ices.dk
Jan Thulin, Senior Advisor	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	jan@ices.dk
Claire Welling, Supporting Secretary, Science Programme	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	claire@ices.dk