

ICES SCICOM REPORT, MAY 2011

ICES SCIENCE COMMITTEE

ICES CM 2011/SCICOM:01

REF. BUREAU, COUNCIL

Midterm report of the ICES Science Committee (SCICOM)

3–5 May 2011

WHO, 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. 2011. Midterm report of the ICES Science Committee (SCICOM), 3-5 May 2011.
ICES CM 2011/SCICOM:01. 48 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.

© 2011 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 2010), Council (October 2010) and Bureau (February 2011).....	1
4	SCICOM working procedures.....	2
4.1	SCICOM <i>Modus operandi</i>	2
4.2	EG Evaluation	2
4.3	EG Coding	3
4.4	Business Group 2011/2012.....	3
	Business Group Terms of Reference	3
5	Science Delivery: SCICOM Steering Groups.....	4
5.1	SSGEF	4
5.2	SSGHIE.....	4
5.3	SSGRSP	5
5.4	SSGESST.....	6
5.5	SSGSUE	7
	SSG Chairmanship	8
6	Science Delivery: SCICOM Operational Groups	8
6.1	Data Management Group	8
6.2	ICES Publications and Communications Group (PUBCOM).....	9
	Empowerment of PUBCOM	9
	6.2.1 Review process for TIMES and CRR publications	10
6.3	ICES Training Group (ITG)	10
7	ICES website.....	11
8	Science strategy	12
8.1	Operational Oceanography	12
8.2	Ecosystem Modelling	13
8.3	BASIN.....	13
8.4	UN Regular Process (Global Integrated Assessment)	14
8.5	World Fisheries Congress (WFC)	15
9	Science Cooperation.....	15
9.1	MARCOM+.....	15
9.2	Other cooperation.....	17
10	ASC 2011 – Conference programme	18
10.1	Update from conference coordinator	18

10.2	Appointment of ASC Award Selection Group	19
10.3	Appointment of ASC 2012 Theme Session Group	20
10.3.1	Evaluation of theme sessions against Science Plan HPRTs.....	20
10.4	ASC 2012 Keynote speakers	20
11	ASC 2011 – SCICOM Business meetings	21
11.1	SCICOM Plenary Session.....	21
11.2	SCICOM SSG meetings.....	21
11.3	SCICOM/ACOM business meetings	22
12	Science Delivery: SCICOM/ACOM Joint Initiatives.....	22
12.1	SCICOM/ACOM Strategic Initiative on area-based science and management (SIASM).....	22
12.2	SCICOM/ACOM strategic initiative on Biodiversity (SIBAS)	23
12.3	SCICOM Strategic Initiative on Climate Change (SSICC)	24
12.4	SCICOM/ACOM Strategic Initiative on Stock Assessment Methods (SISAM).....	25
12.5	SCICOM/ACOM Steering Group on the EC Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD).....	25
13	ACOM/SCICOM linkages	26
14	Symposia 2010–2012 (progress report)	27
15	Review and approval of draft resolutions.....	29
16	Dates for 2012 SCICOM May meeting: options.....	30
17	Any other business.....	30
18	Closure.....	30
	Annex 1: SCICOM list of participants.....	31
	Annex 2: Action list.....	35
	Annex 3: Minutes from the Joint Meeting of ACOM Leadership and SCICOM Business Group	41

1 Opening

The SCICOM Chair welcomed the participants and conducted a tour de table introducing all members. Participants were invited to give a brief statement of their views on the most urgent challenges facing SCICOM in the reform of the Science Programme. The following statements were noted:

- How to get the best of the science across to advisory services, particularly in relation to new uses of the marine environment (not just fisheries). We need to develop additional scientific capacity and expertise to handle these.
- How to integrate the science that we do and the knowledge that we acquire in a coherent way – avoiding fragmentation in the science and confusion in the resultant messages.
- Ensure that we also support the science that does not lead to advisory needs – ICES is a marine science organization.
- Make the most of the potential that the re-structuring of the Science Programme provides – this is a new car that needs to be tested. Better ways of engaging, guiding, understanding and using our expert groups are needed to deliver the Science Plan effectively.
- Balance the theoretical needs of the ICES network with the practical realities of individual member countries: from scientific priorities to financial limits.
- Address a scientific challenge: quantifying the dynamics of the ocean in space and time; and a strategic challenge: balancing biodiversity conservation and sustainable exploitation, with our strategic activities and EG portfolio.
- Ensure we communicate and get material from expert groups to a broader audience of relevant stakeholders.
- Promote cooperation with like-minded organizations, like PICES, to tackle challenging issues like climate change research.
- Continue to make ICES a fun environment to do science in a cooperative way.

The SCICOM Chair thanked members for their statements and asked for these to be kept in mind during the meeting.

The Chair gave a special welcome to the new members of the committee: Atso Romakkaniemi (Finland), Henn Ojaveer (Estonia), and Jean-Jacques Maguire (incoming ACOM Chair).

The list of participants is provided in Annex 1.

2 Adoption of agenda and timetable

The agenda was accepted without any comments. An extra item had been proposed by Oleg Lapshin, which would be dealt with during the meeting (see Section 17).

3 Follow up on decisions taken at the meetings of SCICOM (September 2010), Council (October 2010) and Bureau (February 2011)

The SCICOM Chair brought the attention of the committee to a number of follow-up actions emanating from the last meeting of SCICOM. There were no comments arising

ing from the SCICOM Chair's minutes from the Council October 2010 meeting and the Bureau February 2011 meetings.

4 SCICOM working procedures

4.1 SCICOM *Modus operandi*

At the suggestion of the Chair of SSGHIE, SCICOM discussed the balance between business issues and strategic discussions at SCICOM meetings. Currently, all resolutions involving Expert Groups are tabled at SCICOM meetings or SCICOM-wide WebEx conferences for discussion and approval. While some resolutions need SCICOM input (e.g. creation and closure of EGs, inclusion of ToR from other EGs or ICES structures, etc.) it was agreed that some issues do not need SCICOM's full attention (e.g. discussions on the date, venue and chair of particular EGs). SCICOM proposed that when possible, these decisions should be handled directly between EGs and their SSG Chair, or through discussions between SSG chairs and the SCICOM Chair, if appropriate. However, when particular issues have broader implications the relevant SSG Chair should table these at SCICOM meetings. This streamlining does not remove SCICOM's overall responsibility and control of the implementation of the ICES science programme. SCICOM will continue to be asked to approve all resolutions, but only matters of substance need to be discussed in plenary or through WebEx conferences. This process should also apply to SCICOM operational groups, providing more time for strategic discussions at SCICOM meetings and empowering SCICOM structures to deliver on their commitments.

Action: SSG Chairs will continue to bring matters of substance regarding their portfolio of EGs to the attention of SCICOM at annual or intercessional meetings. SSG Chairs, in consultation with the Chair of SCICOM and other SSG Chairs, can make decisions on operational issues (e.g. venue, Chairs, meeting dates). SCICOM will however continue to be responsible for the final approval of resolutions, by correspondence if possible, or through WebEx if required.

4.2 EG Evaluation

SCICOM discussed procedures for the evaluation of Expert Groups, in the context of implementing the ICES science programme with measures that favour the dynamic development and scientific innovation of the ICES EG portfolio. Currently SCICOM does this through the creation of new EGs or by adding/modifying the ToR of existing EGs. It was agreed that additional measures should be considered to facilitate innovation and development while keeping the ICES portfolio of EGs scientifically balanced, and financially viable, for member countries. After thorough discussion SCICOM agreed to the principle of limiting the duration of EGs, except for cases (e.g. data- or survey-oriented EGs) where longer term EGs are necessary. At the end of their given term the outputs of EGs would be evaluated by the EGs and by SCICOM. This evaluation would include requests for term extensions, or for proposals of a new EG to be considered, with new objectives, deliverables and terms. This measure is not intended to exert top-down control of the portfolio of EGs, but rather to work with EGs and their networks in responding more effectively to changes in scientific priorities and opportunities, and to increase their scientific footprint in the community through focused outputs and deliverables.

Action: A subgroup consisting of SCICOM Chair, Daniel Duplisea, Christian Möllmann, Bill Karp, Niall Ó Maoléidigh and Erik Olsen was appointed to develop a strategy based on the above principles, with adequate detail and procedures. This strategy will be shared with EG Chairs to ensure such a significant change in modus operandi is implemented with participation and buy into from EGs. It is intended to complete the strategy before the 2011 ASC, for discussion and consideration by SCICOM.

4.3 EG Coding

Pierre Petitgas presented Doc 9 on Coding of EG ToRs and there was agreement in SCICOM that the overview achieved from this exercise would be helpful in mapping against the Science Plan and it would also be useful to look at this when considering new ToRs. The EG coding exercise would not provide an evaluation of the contents. A further comment was made that the current Science Plan takes us only until 2013.

A question was raised whether ACOM should be involved to add the perspective of activities carried out on the advisory side.

Action: This question would be brought forward to ACOM at the forthcoming joint meeting of the ACOM Leadership/SCICOM Business Group.

Decision/Action: SCICOM agreed to map EG ToRs against the Science Plan 2009-2013. This should be done in conjunction with the Annual SCICOM Progress Report to SCICOM and the mapping would be carried out by SSG Chairs to ensure consistency. A shared dialogue with EG Chairs would be useful.

Action: The SCICOM Chair will consult the Bureau on whether ICES expects SCICOM will revise/update the Science Plan when it ends in 2013.

4.4 Business Group 2011/2012

The SCICOM Chair referred to Doc 10 and informed the committee that while the existence of the SCICOM Business Group had been formalized, there was not a document stating its membership. Doc 10 addressed this shortcoming.

In May 2010 SCICOM created a “Business Group” recognizing the collective responsibilities of a number of SCICOM members over and above their statutory obligations. The responsibilities of the Business Group are to assist the SCICOM Chair in matters regarding the implementation of SCICOM decisions, and in preparation of business before discussions at SCICOM. The membership of the Business Group reflects the structures of SCICOM, particularly Steering Group Chairs and leaders of Strategic Initiatives. Additional membership must be considered by SCICOM.

As the members rotate off their respective responsibilities the incoming leaders will also take their seat at the Business Group.

Business Group Terms of Reference

- 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.

5 Science Delivery: SCICOM Steering Groups

5.1 SSGEF

SSGEF Chair, Pierre Petitgas, gave an update from the SCICOM Steering Group on Ecosystem Function (SSGEF). In 2010/11 the group includes 13 Working Groups, 8 Study Groups and 3 Workshops.

SSGEF reporting at ASC: In line with last year, SSGEF was planning to organize a topical session at the 2011 ASC to address one of the cross-cutting issues of the Science Plan. 3-5 highlights from this session may lead to a synthesis document from SSGEF. This topic was discussed and a decision is reported in item 5.2.

The new setup by SSGEF was seen as a way of revitalising the SSG ASC meetings and as an alternative to EG reporting from every single EG. However some EGs wanted opportunities to report. Balancing EG reporting vs. science development was discussed under item 11.2, SCICOM SSG meetings.

EG overlaps: Concern raised by SSGEF Chair that there may be overlaps between a number of working groups under SSGEF dealing with ecosystem modelling, coupling of models and physical-biogeochemical models, and it might be worth considering establishing a cluster of these groups with joint/back to back meetings

- WGE2E (new proposal), WGPBI, WGOOFE (+ WGSAM): do we have too many WGs for ecosystem modellers to populate?
- Overlap between WGE2E and WGPBI: coupling of models
- Overlap between WGOOFE and WGPBI/ WGE2E: observation needs

The issue of overlap between the ecosystem modelling groups would be dealt with under item 8.2 of the agenda. The Chair noted that if EGs had limited duration the community would be able to move to a different topic (and evolve the structure of the groups) rather than create additional groups thus fragmenting the support base.

5.2 SSGHIE

SSGHIE Chair, Erik Olsen gave an update from the Steering Group on Human Interactions on Ecosystems (SSGHIE). Following the example set by SSGEF, the Chair coded the ToR of SSGHIE expert groups (11 working groups, 2 study groups, 1 strategic initiative) against the Science Plan. Analysis of the coding demonstrated a high footprint of SSGHIE on issues of contaminants, eutrophication and habitat change, and a very low footprint in issues such as renewable energy and coastal zone management. ToRs of expert groups appear to be very specific to address the higher-level objectives of the science plan, specifically:

- Ecosystem carrying capacity and sustainability for aquaculture
- Marine spatial planning. How do we integrate the science on effects and monitoring into integrated marine spatial planning?
- Cumulative effects of different human pressures. Only dealt with by one EG

The Chair will use this analysis to guide his steering of the group.

SSGEF reporting at ASC: To save time at the ASC 2011 the Chair of SSGHIE was considering asking EG chairs to send in a condensed report to him, allowing for a single 30-minute presentation to be delivered, summarizing the highlights of EGs. This would save time to devote to a workshop-style meeting tackling 2–3 science issues, with recommendations for ICES to follow.

Given the similarities in the issues raised by SSGHIE and SSGEF in terms of business meetings at the ASC, it was agreed that a number of cross-cutting issues could be addressed in workshop style, bringing scientists from all SSGs.

Action: SSG Chairs agreed that the Monday morning SSG session at the 2011 ASC will be focused on EG reporting while the Wednesday afternoon slot will be focused on a number of cross-cutting topics to be discussed in workshop style. SSG Chairs will discuss potential topics by correspondence.

Finally, the SSGHIE Chair referred to two outstanding issues:

- ICES Council in October 2010 noted that the EGs that deal with specific ecosystem uses (fisheries, marine renewables, mariculture) are not well integrated. SSGHIE will work, through the strategic initiative on Marine Spatial Planning, to connect them better than is currently the case.
- Sustainability of aquaculture – this is perceived as an increasingly relevant issue, but ICES infrastructure may not be fit for purpose. Low attendance led to cancellation of the meeting of the Working Group on Environmental Interactions of Mariculture (WGEIM). It may be appropriate to consider restructuring WGEIM and merge it with the Working Group on Marine Shellfish Culture (WGMASC), as a way of ensuring a significant group with re-focused priorities. The groups supported this analysis.

In this context, the SCICOM Chair brought the attention of SCICOM members to Annex 2 of Doc 8. The annex includes an analysis of participation in EGs, showing how some member countries appear to find it difficult to populate all EGs with adequate scientists.

Action: SSGHIE Chair will act on the above outstanding issues.

The SSGHIE Chair asked for comments and feedback from SCICOM members regarding review of EG reports. The Head of Science Programme (HoS) informed SCICOM that in 2007 PUBCOM was requested by Consultative Committee to provide recommendations on the need for peer review of expert group reports. The conclusion was that it would not be viable to set up an external review process, but that we need to encourage groups to produce outputs that are accessible to review. Serious consideration should be given to the outputs from EGs. If EGs cannot produce a good summary, SCICOM should consider whether there is basis for them to continue.

5.3 SSGRSP

SSGRSP Chair, Yvonne Walther presented an update from the Steering Group on Regional Sea Programmes (SSGRSP). The SSG has five Working groups, two Study groups and 1 Workshop. Four of the working groups are on integrated assessment of regional seas and these have now reached the implementation phase. The Workshop on Benchmarking Integrated Ecosystem Assessments (WKBEMIA) is scheduled to meet in late November 2011 with representatives from all four groups. The plan is to have a second workshop with involvement of ACOM, and a third workshop which will involve stakeholders. The Study Group on Integration of Economics, Stock Assessment and Fisheries Management (SGIMM) will present case studies as a contribution to WKBEMIA.

Action: The ACOM Chair had attended WGINOSE and WGIAB and had suggested establishing an advice drafting group in the autumn, involving people from these

groups, tasked to define what Integrated Assessment (IA) means and to provide a straw man proposal for how this can be done. SSGRSP to follow up.

The question was raised of how to persuade scientists to go to ICES meetings, as well as BONUS and HELCOM meetings, and not instead of. In reply, SSGRSP Chair explained that there is competition for scientists and there is no easy solution to this problem. An analysis of the interlinkages between ICES and BONUS was made and some were identified. On the positive side, there are long-term platforms in ICES that can create the science.

Finally, the SSGRSP Chair explained how the RSP Expert Groups fit well with the objectives of the European MSFD, which is why she is also chairing the ACOM-SCICOM Steering Group on the MSFD.

In terms of future developments, she noted the intention of reconstructing SGEH, as a key element feeding to the Integrated Assessment, the possibility of extending the programme to other ICES regions, and the options concerning socio-economic research development.

Action: SSGRSP Chair to work with the Secretariat Head of Advice and ACOM Chair to update and develop the ecosystem descriptions in the advice documents¹.

5.4 SSGESST

SSGESST Chair, Bill Karp, gave an update from the Steering Group on Ecosystem Surveys Science and Technology (SSGESST), which is the largest in our portfolio of EGs. The Chair brought to the attention of SCICOM:

- action has been taken towards combining meetings for WGIPS and WGNAPES as per SCICOM recommendations
- WGMEGS, WGEGGS, WGACEGG, SGSIPS – Following SCICOM recommendations SGSIPS is proposing a meeting in 2012 with participation from all ichthyoplankton survey EGs, leading to consolidation.
- A new EG on improving the use of survey data for assessment and advice has been created (WGISDAA).

He also summarized the work programme of the EGs. He then opened discussions on a number of issues:

- Lack of EG infrastructure on observation systems (following the closure of WGOOS – see agenda item 8.1)
- Positive developments in the relationship with FAO regarding WGFTFB
- Need to engage better with the EC Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STEFEC).
- While possibly beyond SCICOM's mandate, worth noting the concerns raised by scientists in some member countries over funding and de-funding of surveys and their scientific consequences.

¹ This topic was further addressed at the ACOM/SCICOM meeting on May 5.

Action: With a view to facilitate streamlining and overview, the SCICOM Chair suggested producing a brief position paper explaining how the different Survey EGs contribute to a single strategy for the SSG. Perhaps a “herringbone” illustration to visualize the structure of the survey groups, similar to the one used to map SSGRSP EGs would be useful. The SSGESST Chair agreed that this would be useful and this task could be completed before the ASC.

In discussion it was noted that some survey groups are becoming increasingly static, and that a position paper would help engender dynamism. ACOM and SCICOM need also to agree on a procedure for surveys, including a fall-back strategy if one country says no to a particular survey. It was agreed that this issue was connected to the vision/position paper and should be included.

The separation/ overlap of expertise and personnel between surveys and assessment groups was discussed.

5.5 SSGSUE

The incoming SSGSUE Chair, Daniel Duplisea, gave an update from Steering Group on Sustainable Use of Ecosystems (SSGSUE), which includes 8 working groups, 4 workshops and 3 study groups. The Chair send a questionnaire of 12 questions to EG chairs recently, and based on the responses he concludes that most groups are working well, are able to meet their ToRs, and have sufficient expertise to do so. For some groups low attendance is an issue (driven by limited funding from member countries), and although SSGSUE is probably the closest SSG to ACOM, groups are crying out for closer interaction with ACOM.

The Chair also perceives that most EGs do not have a clear long-term strategy, some appear disinterested and all depend on the quality of the Chair. He proposed a number of suggestions:

- Adopt fixed terms for EGs
- Promote a vision development in groups
- Have a recruitment strategy and vision for continuation
- Create a group in conjunction with ACOM on total fishing mortality

The SCICOM Chair suggested brainstorming ideas to improve interactions with ACOM, and asked whether ICES may need to break the divide between SCICOM and ACOM EGs. There was general support to this consideration.

On specific discussions the Chair informed and sought advice on the following:

- Working Group on Quantifying All Fishing mortality (WGQAF). The annual meeting of this group was cancelled last year, as they had had problems with participation and in particular attracting participation of assessment scientists. This was seen as an important topic and ICES would be missing out without this group.

Action: Proposal for a joint workshop with ACOM to be raised at the joint meeting of the ACOM Leadership/SCICOM Business Group.

- Working Group on Maritime Systems (WGMARS). Concerns were raised over the broad nature of the ToR, and whether the group was intending “to review ACOM”.

Action: WGMARS ToR to be discussed at the SCICOM/ ACOM meeting on May 5 for decision.

The SCICOM Chair thanked the five Steering Group chairs for doing an excellent job and emphasized that their work was very much appreciated and crucial to the success of the ICES Science Programme.

SSG Chairmanship

Decision: The SCICOM Chair informed SCICOM that three of the Steering Group chairs would end their term in 2011 and suggested to make use of the possibility of extending the term by one year for two of the SSG Chairs in order to have a staggered process. SCICOM agreed that it would be useful to the SSGRSP and SSGESST chairs for one additional year in light of the complexity of their portfolio and the state of their integration efforts. Although Pierre Petitgas would rotate off, he will remain in SCICOM as the French national member.

Action: A call for proposals will be opened to identify a new SSGEF Chair. SCICOM members were welcomed to approach Pierre Petitgas or the SCICOM Chair directly with suggestions. Current members of the SSGEF family would also be considered as candidates.

6 Science Delivery: SCICOM Operational Groups

6.1 Data Management Group

Neil Holdsworth, Head of the ICES Data Centre, presented an update from WGDIM on behalf of the WGDIM co-Chairs, Helge Sagen and Ingeborg de Boois. He noted that WGDIM meets after the May SCICOM meeting. He reported progress and issues on a number of topics:

- Study Group on VMS

The SG suggested that a centralized database be established in the ICES Data Centre in order to deliver standardized data products, and that a working group be established to work on VMS methodologies and standards. This led to some discussion as to ICES VMS needs and the role of ICES given the complex regulatory framework in member countries. It was explained that the database effort is more on the technical side, which is dissociated from the legal complexities. SCICOM also asked that WGDIM clarifies how the ICES work on VMS differs from the JRC database.

- Egg and Larvae Database

ICES Data Centre is developing the database structure for the data and will report to WGDIM 2011. The data will be available on the ICES portal.

- FishFrame

Regional coordination meetings have been discussing options towards a regional database for catches, landing, effort etc. FISHFRAME has been proposed as a platform for a supra-regional database. ICES has agreed to manage and maintain the FISHFRAME database, transferring it from DTU-Aqua in 2012. Database will operate for Atlantic, North Sea and Baltic region but it is open for Mediterranean to join too. It was explained that funding will be required, but this is likely to be included in the MoU with the EC.

- MSFD

Within EU and ICES the MSFD is discussed frequently, and in particular the need for storage of new data, indices correlating with the MSFD descriptors, etc. He noted that the ICES Data Centre is already very active with marine litter, spatial facilities and INSPIRE, WISE-Marine and EMODNET.

Discussions followed on whether the recently approved ICES Data Strategy provides sufficient guidance for WGDIM. It was noted that the Chairs of WGDIM would value more direct involvement from SCICOM in implementing the strategy.

Action: A subgroup consisting of the SCICOM Chair, Mark Dickey-Collas and Einar Svendsen volunteered to take part in a WebEx meeting with the WGDIM Chairs, to set up implementation plans for the data strategy.

6.2 ICES Publications and Communications Group (PUBCOM)

Review Group of the ICES Position Paper on Climate Change

SCICOM was informed that the process for the cooperative research report (CRR) appears to be nearing the end and it is now aiming for publication before the ASC. It has grown to be a large technical product of over 300 pages. The **position paper** (an extended abstract of the Executive Summary of the CRR) would be a more visually appealing document for policymakers and communicators, and should be easily accessible. SCICOM was reminded that they are responsible for the review process of this approximately 5–10-page document. The position paper is being developed by Jürgen Alheit, and Manuel Barange and Brian Mackenzie have been co-opted to help him develop the paper before it is reviewed by SCICOM.

Concern was raised that the speed of development of Climate Change research may make some of the contents of the CRR out of date before the volume is published. It was noted that the Sendai Climate Change and Fisheries symposium volume will come out before the CRR. Do we need the Position Paper to reflect all the ICES literature on Climate Change or just the CRR? There was preference for the former, but this needs to be discussed with Jürgen Alheit in the near future. Both the CRR and the Sendai CCF volume will be out in time for the IPCC.

Action: PUBCOM Chair to continue engaging with the production of the CRR. The SCICOM Chair and Brian Mackenzie to engage with Jürgen Alheit in the development of the Position paper.

Empowerment of PUBCOM

The PUBCOM Chair appealed to SCICOM to give PUBCOM authority to streamline procedures and modus operandi as agreed for SSGs (item 4.1). While operational matters should be handled by PUBCOM with delegated authority from SCICOM, matters of substance need still to be approved by SCICOM.

Decision: SCICOM agreed to empower PUBCOM to make decisions on non-strategic issues.

SCICOM was informed about a recent request for financial support from ICES for the publication of a book titled “Marine plankton: A practical guide to their identification and ecology for the North Atlantic” developed by Keith Brander. The proposal is currently incomplete but the financial request (10,000 GBP) is considerable. Discussions are ongoing but there were indications that SCICOM would prefer other

mechanisms to support this initiative (e.g. through a willing publisher). SCICOM has no other cases of precedence.

The Editor-in-chief, Andy Payne, will retire at the end of his term (December 2011). The Chair of SCICOM was tasked with chairing the search committee for a replacement. Mark-Dickey-Collas serves as the PUBCOM representative on the committee. The deadline for applications is 9 May 2011, and interviews will be held at the end of June.

6.2.1 Review process for TIMES and CRR publications

PUBCOM Chair informed SCICOM that the scientific review of the material contained in manuscripts submitted to the CRR and TIMES series (following interim or full approval of a category 1 resolution) is the responsibility of the Steering Group Chair for documents submitted through SCICOM, and the Chair and vice-Chairs of ACOM for documents resulting from the advisory process. Review coordinators (relevant SSG Chair or individuals appointed by SSG Chair) may be required to seek peer review of submissions from knowledge experts from the area of marine science most directly relevant to the subject matter of the report. It is preferable that the individuals consulted have not been part of the Expert Group (EG) from which the document originates, but some exceptions may be possible. For example, manuscripts developed by a subgroup of an EG can be evaluated for scientific merit and accuracy by other members of the EG that have not been involved in the development or authorship of the document (the internal review process applied by the Marine Chemistry Working Group is such a case). Once the scientific review is completed, the assessments along with the response to referee comments are to be submitted to the Executive Editor as part of the submission process for the CRR or TIMES series.

This process was established by Consultative Committee; however incoming SSG Chairs were not aware that when one of their EGs submits a report, the above process is in operation. It is the responsibility of the ICES Executive Editor, Bill Anthony, to make sure there is approval by the SSG Chair, before the manuscript is forward to the series editor.

Action: SSG Chairs to familiarise themselves with the process of approval/ review of TIMES and CRR publications

6.3 ICES Training Group (ITG)

Søren Anker Pedersen presented an update from the Training Programme (see Doc 14 and PP-presentation) on behalf of the Training Group. SCICOM was informed that almost 300 students from more than 30 countries have attended 10 ICES courses, with the majority coming from ICES Member Countries (8 of them contributing >15 students to the Training Programme). In 2011 six courses have or will be conducted, with a seventh postponed to 2012 due to lack of applicants. Four training courses are planned for 2012, with another 3 under consideration.

It was discussed that the Training Programme is perceived as predominantly fisheries oriented. It might be appropriate to develop training courses with and co-sponsored by HELCOM, OSPAR and other organization, as a way of diversifying the programme and make it more viable. FAO may also be interested in further develop the Training Programme. It was mentioned that ICES has partnered a Marie Currie Training network proposal (SEEDMAR) that would contribute to the development of

the training programme (at the time of writing these minutes the outcome is unknown).

The ICES Training Programme has funding through SIF to run courses at this level for two more years until the end of 2012. ICES SCICOM members were invited to contribute with ideas for the funding of ICES Training Programme. The following ideas were presented at the SCICOM May meeting:

- Suggestion to consider whether a reduction of the fee for ICES instructors is viable. Considering that ICES is part of their work, a *per diem* may be adequate;
- Some training courses may be held back-to-back with the ASC so that travelling costs are not borne by the Training Programme. Training courses in different places e.g. in the Mediterranean area, may provide some savings.
- Given that the costs of re-running a course are lower (including the lecturer's fee) perhaps the budget for the Training Programme should be adjusted accordingly.
- It may be necessary to double the course fees (approximately a 8000 Euro shortfall per course).
- It was discussed whether students from non-ICES countries should pay significantly more than MCs. There was diversity of opinion on this, with pros and cons either way. Ideally courses should be self-sustained.
- Suggestion to explore the possibility of EC co-funding of the Training Programme (SCICOM Chair offered his assistance in raising this issue with the EC on behalf of the Chair of the Training Programme if felt necessary).

Action: SCICOM asked the Training Group to prepare two business models, one focused on ICES outreach, and one focusing on training as an internal strategic tool. The business models should cover all aspects, i.e. if a "no increase in fees" is recommended by Training Group, there has to be a solution where to find that money. Training Group to present the business model to SCICOM in September 2011.

Action: SCICOM members were urged to advertise courses more widely at their institutes. In two cases there had been too few participants for a course, and SCICOM, ACOM and Council members would be informed in such cases.

Action: As a continuous request, SCICOM member were informed to send new and preferably detailed proposals for training courses to the Secretariat (sorenap@ices.dk) for consideration by the Training Group.

7 ICES website

The Head of IT, Wim Panhorst, presented a mock-up of the ICES website, as drafted by the Secretariat website group (SecWeb) and approved by the ICES Senior Management Group (SMG), as a joint proposal from the Secretariat.

The aim had been to present ICES as a common unit providing various services. There would be a "here-and-now" news board, and an outreach box, displaying ICES cooperation and stakeholders. New on the website are links to social media (Facebook and Twitter). The expected timeline for the website to be launched is the end of the year.

SCICOM was critical of development regarding website re-development. SCICOM appointed a subgroup in September 2010 to work with the Secretariat. At the time

concerns were being expressed at the lack of communication from and interactions with the Secretariat on this crucial part of the ICES communication and management strategy. Yet, the subgroup had no communication from Wim Panhorst until a few days before the May SCICOM meeting. The current status quo is clearly unsatisfactory. The subgroup raised a number of issues that did and still do require consultation and debate, e.g. target audience, website policy, among others.

SCICOM members commented on the need for further development of the ICES social media (in particular Facebook and the need to expand the ICES Facebook network). Access to reports (for a longer time frame than the current three years), maps, data and archives was seen as an important issue, and some concern was raised over duplication on the website, for instance for the ASC there were four entries from the main website.

Action: The Head of IT was asked to organize a WebEx meeting with participation of Pierre Pepin, Yvonne Walther, Einar Svendsen and Erik Olsen within the next two weeks to set up a workplan, timeline, objectives and strategies for the ICES website. ACOM should be represented with participation of Bill Turrell, UK.

8 Science strategy

8.1 Operational Oceanography

The SCICOM Chair presented Doc 16 prepared by Jon Hare on The Need for Basin-Scale Science within ICES. The document analyses the problems/opportunities that have arisen from the dissolution of the ICES-GOOS Working Group (IGWG) leaving a gap in the ICES science portfolio in terms of coordination of observing systems. SCICOM was very appreciative of Jon Hare's attempt to fill the gap, and his efforts to consult with EGs Chairs of relevance. After some discussion SCICOM felt that the creation of an EG to coordinate North Atlantic Ocean Science was not addressing the needs in relation to ocean observing systems and their coordination in the ICES area. In the discussion, a number of important relevant issues were raised:

- While ocean-observing systems are largely coordinated from outside ICES there are some requirements under the MSFD that would need an ICES lead in this area.
- The GOOS activities in Europe and internationally are very focused on physics and weather forecasting, such as MyOcean (FP7 EC project). ICES strength is in the Ecosystem approach, and while we have a good structure for coordination of fisheries-linked information, the same cannot be said for environmental and operational technologies. The task is to take all this data, also from GOOS community, and extract it in a useful format for the ICES community.
- The Head of the ICES Data Centre noted that we still have a strong connection with the European Global Ocean Observing System, EuroGOOS. Last year EuroGOOS asked for ICES datasets. They are now asking SeaDataNet for this information. ICES needs to engage or we will lose out.
- Jon Hare's document raised the need to develop a regular status report for the whole North Atlantic. This may provide a very useful mechanism for EG coordination.

- The document is not limited to ocean observation and includes some process understanding. A basin scale look may be very useful in fulfilling ICES goals (this is linked to item 8.3 below).
- At some point the delegates may need to be engaged to ensure that ICES re-engages its science in the area of ocean observations (beyond fisheries and fisheries-related research).

Action: The SCICOM Chair will respond to Jon Hare along the lines expressed above. It is suggested that a group be appointed to continue developing plans to respond to needs. From SCICOM, this group will include the SCICOM Chair, Einar Svendsen, Mark Dickey-Collas and Pierre Pepin. Additional members may include Barbara Berx (ICES rep in the Integrated Framework for Sustained Ocean Observation task team, IFSOO-TT), and ICES scientists involved in the EMODNET Marine Observations and Data Expert Group (Glenn Nola, Antonio Bode, Christopher Zimmermann and Neil Holdsworth). The group would work by correspondence and possibly meet at the forthcoming ASC.

8.2 Ecosystem Modelling

ICES SSGSUE received a proposal for a new EG on Ecosystem End to End Models (WGE2E), to be sponsored by ICES, PICES and CIESM. This proposal follows on a period of discussions inside and outside ICES on better coordination and focus of the rapidly evolving area of ecosystem modelling (both in hindcast and forecasting mode). The proposal was scientifically strong but SCICOM noted potential overlaps with the broad mandate of the WG on Physical-Biological Interactions (WGPBI). SCICOM heard that WGPBI and the potential WGE2E proposers have been in contact and had opened discussions to develop a strong ICES presence in this science area.

SCICOM noted that WGPBI is a strong expert group that could benefit from a new focus. It was agreed that the best option would be to create a new WG merging the strengths and communities behind WGPBI and WGE2E. In light with the discussions under agenda 4.2, the new group could be time limited and focused on specific deliveries, thus allowing a broad group to move in a stepwise fashion.

Action: The SCICOM Chair was asked to convey this message to the incoming Chairs of WGPBI and the proposers of WGE2E, and encourage them to develop new ToR for a combined EG.

In connection to this item SCICOM tabled an invitation from PICES to co-sponsor an International Workshop on Development and Application of Regional Climate models (RCM, Korea, October 2011). As an opportunity to further develop ICES plans on ecosystem modelling, it was suggested to send one of the incoming Chairs of WGPBI (Myron Peck), to strengthen the connections with PICES in this area. Two of the proponents of the WGE2E are already invited to this workshop, thus providing further opportunities for dialogue.

Decision: SCICOM supported this proposal. The SCICOM Chair will contact Myron Peck to ascertain his availability.

8.3 BASIN

The SCICOM Chair presented Doc 18, an update of the EURO-BASIN project with information on equivalent initiatives in the Western Atlantic. ICES has been approached with an invitation to coordinate this transatlantic cooperation and host an

International Project Office for the North-Atlantic-wide BASIN initiative. SCICOM was asked whether it would be desirable for ICES to be involved in coordinating and running of a programme of this nature. Responding to questions it was agreed that while EURO-BASIN is a European project with specific timelines, the umbrella BASIN programme may become a large programme with activities in Europe and in North America and in need of a high level of coordination. ICES was perceived as the logical place for this coordination to occur. There was generic support from SCICOM members and agreement to communicate ICES positive response. However, SCICOM would need to wait until science funding is in place on both sides of the basin before a firm decision can be made. SCICOM is aware that there are funding considerations that would have to be addressed outside SCICOM.

Action: SCICOM Chair will approach Mike St John to convey the positive comments from SCICOM, and the message that SCICOM would like to await the development in the US and Canada before planning further steps.

8.4 UN Regular Process (Global Integrated Assessment)

SCICOM was informed that the Secretariat had been contacted in December 2010 by the UN with an invitation to participate in the “Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole” as part of the “Regular Process for Global Reporting and Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment, including Socio-economic Aspects (AHWG)”. The meeting took place in New York, 14–17 February 2011. Due to time urgencies the Secretariat approached the Chair of the Study Group on Integration of Economics, Stock Assessment and Fisheries Management (SGIMM, Jörn Schmidt), who travelled with funding from Kiel University. ICES was also encouraged to be involved by the current secretary of the AHWG, who is the former secretary of OSPAR.

SCICOM was informed that the first assessment is due in September 2014. The intention of the UN is to organize a set of regional workshops to set up the process, review available information and establish the feasibility of the assessment for all regions. The North Atlantic, Mediterranean and Black Seas are expected to be part of one of these workshops, and regional organizations are asked to consider their support to the process. These workshops are likely to take place between now and the middle of 2012 for the process to keep abreast of deadlines. SCICOM considered that there were strategic reasons for ICES to actively participate by coordinating the relevant regional workshop.

There was strong support from SCICOM to get involved in the integrated assessments and the AHWG. The ACOM Chair commented that this should be a joint ICES activity and not only SCICOM.

Action: The first stage would be for the Secretariat to respond in a positive way, saying that we are prepared to organize the workshop. At a later stage Member Countries need to establish their commitment and appoint scientific leaders.

The next preparatory meeting takes place in June 2011. SCICOM agreed that an ICES representative needed to be found. The Chairs of ACOM and SCICOM agreed to discuss participation with the Secretariat.

Action: The SCICOM Chair asked the secretariat to get in contact with the regional conventions and with the CIESM. ACOM and SCICOM chairs were very supportive of this and would be willing to attend the meeting to send a signal that ICES takes this seriously.

Finally it was noted that PICES was contacted on this same issue. At the recent Science Board meeting (attended by the SCICOM Chair) PICES agreed to follow the lead of ICES.

Action: ICES HoS to communicate ICES approach to PICES.

8.5 World Fisheries Congress (WFC)

The SCICOM Chair referred to Document 22a. ICES had been approached to organize a number of sessions at the forthcoming World Fisheries Congress (WFC) "Sustainable Fisheries in a Changing World", 7–11 May 2012 Edinburgh Scotland, UK, organized by the Fisheries Society for the British Isles (FSBI). The SCICOM Business Group had been engaged to identify scientific topics of interest to ICES. The proposed sessions are now advertised by the organizers of the WFC in the draft programme. ICES is expected to organize these ICES-sponsored sessions, including a) identification/ invitation of Chairs for the sessions (funding not available from ICES or the WFC); b) Identification/ invitation of keynote speakers for the session (funding may be available from the WFC); c) Develop the sessions further.

Action: SCICOM members were requested to send their proposals for Chair candidates by e-mail within the next two weeks to the SCICOM Chair. The short deadline would give the chairs a chance to take ownership for the proposals and propose speakers themselves. After the deadline, the SCICOM Chair would engage with the business group again to try to find a balanced group of Chairs. Once identified the Secretariat would invite them to become session Chairs.

A request from the organizers of the WFC for a modest financial support to the conference was also tabled.

Decision/action: SCICOM agreed to co-sponsor the WFC in May 2012 with £ 1000 as a contribution to the travel grant fund. Formally, this will require a resolution to be drafted by the Secretariat.

The SCICOM Chair encouraged the Secretariat to consider having a stand at the Conference, as this is a good opportunity to engage with a very large global community.

9 Science Cooperation

9.1 MARCOM+

HoS presented Doc 23, an update from MARCOM+. Over the last year the project identified the relevant research networks on the marine and maritime sides, and priorities and commonalities were identified. A synthesis of the policy scene was also attempted. A series of panels on different themes were held in 2010, and a second round will continue this year. The goal is to bring the maritime and marine worlds together to achieve a more efficient use of human resources and funding, to create a competitive European research area and to provide the emerging knowledge-based society and its needs with the right science and innovation.

Later this year the Technology and Knowledge Transfer Panel (17 June), the Foresight Panel (7 October) and the Policy Interface Panel (3-4 November) will meet. A second Open Forum will also be held (Sep 8) to formulate concrete recommendations for the consortium on what and how to establish, and on how to develop and sustain mechanisms for the future work of MARCOM+. This future will depend on a MARCOM Forum, the structure and functioning of which is under discussion, probably

with their own Expert Groups, annual conferences and web-based portal-type interface. A secretarial role for the Forum could be taken by existing Secretariat resources run by ICES, for instance by the current ICES MARCOM project manager, Wojciech Wawrzynski, Professional Secretary for Scientific Cooperation.

SCICOM has been asked to become engaged in this initiative and make a strong impact from ICES side. SCICOM must also consider what commitments ICES should make to support MARCOM+ in the long term. The HoS explained that MARCOM+ is an opportunity to establish cooperation links with science organizations in the maritime area, apply the ecosystem approach to the various maritime activities well beyond fisheries, and increase ICES visibility among other scientific networks in Europe. In addition there are relevant items in the ICES Science Plan which could be tackled jointly with partners, such as mariculture, ocean energy and transport issues.

The SCICOM Chair noted that as it is developing, MARCOM+ may turn out to be a broader ICES. Do we want to re-invent a new ICES? The HoS acknowledged there is a need to develop MARCOM+ onto something we want, and asked SCICOM members to assist with drafting the topics around which a future Forum is likely to operate. An open discussion followed for SCICOM members to fully understand the process MARCOM+ is going through and the role of ICES in it. The HoS noted that there are stronger and weaker partners in MARCOM+, and that ICES is a strong partner and entitled to take the lead. He also noted that duplicating ICES is not a real threat, as science and advice on living resources and marine ecosystems will always be the expertise of ICES. However, there are other areas where ICES benefits from being part of MARCOM+, such as the mariculture area, as the European Aquaculture Technology Platform (EATP) is one of the partners. There is a political commitment made by the EU to create more synergies, and if we do not embark this train, others will.

HoS suggested that ICES pays special attention to topic # 1 of MARCOM+ (aquatic living resources), without disregarding topic 6 (maritime spatial planning), and with participation in all the other topics. Simon Jennings commented that he did not have a political perspective on whether ICES should be fully involved in MARCOM+ or only on some of the topics. Is part-engagement damaging to ICES? Is ICES strengthening other partners and weakening itself by engagement fully. HoS noted that all partner organizations will have to decide whether they are either fully in or fully out at some stage. ICES, as the coordinator of the initiative, will fail in the eyes of the consortium and the Commission if it decides to drop out.

Action: A subgroup, consisting of Erik Olsen, Henn Ojaveer, Kris Cooreman and Simon Jennings, were tasked to do an analysis of the political implications and consequences for ICES becoming part of the future Forum and to assist the HoS in detailing the topic 1 (aquatic living resources). The HoS will prepare an overview of the MARCOM+ Forum functionality as a draft once available which is likely to be in fall, perhaps even in September. HoS thanked SCICOM members for their comments and welcomed more ownership of MARCOM+ by SCICOM.

9.2 Other cooperation

With reference to Doc 24a, b, d, and e, HoS presented updates on:

SAHFOS report

In 2007, the Consultative Committee commissioned the Digitization of plankton data/SAHFOS plankton project, which began in April 2008. The report "Digitization, analysis and interpretation of plankton data for pre-1914 ICES sampling in the North Sea and adjacent waters" authored by Abigail McQuatters-Gollop (SAHFOS), David Johns (SAHFOS), Paul Dowland (University of Plymouth) was finalized in April 2011. The report has been endorsed by the Chair of WGZE, Mark Benfield. A paper introducing the key findings of the analysis will be presented at the 2011 ASC by Abigail McQuatters-Gollop. At this stage SCICOM is be asked for approval, as well as a comment on whether this activity was good value for money (DKK 1.7 million).

Decision: SCICOM approved the report and concluded it was good value for money.

IFSOTT

SCICOM acknowledged that OceanObs IFSOO-TT, and in particular IOC, were expecting ICES to come forward with suggestions and approaches for biological observing. The report from the IFSOO-TT group was discussed in the context of agenda item 8.1, and the ICES representative in IFSOO-TT (Bee Berx) has been in contact with SCICOM in relation to ocean observing initiatives.

Integration of European Marine Research networks of Excellence (Euromarine). A CSA under DG RTD funding, Environment (including climate change) (Doc 24)

Three FP6 funded Networks of Excellence, MARBEF, EurOceans and Marine Genomics Europe, have joined forces to set up a structure for sustained existence under one umbrella, at the request of the Commission. Currently MARBEF is cooperating with MARS and EurOcean had set up a consortium of European Research Institutes. Marine Genomics has made a separate effort to obtain continuous funding, the Marine Genomics for Users (MG4U), and invited ICES on the Advisory Board, to be attended by HoS. MG4U is closer to the industrial, maritime side than the other two networks.

There are opportunities for this new joint venture as all the networks represent different scientific aspects, and have different strengths, in areas of ICES interest. ICES was invited to the Advisory Board and attended the EUROMARINE kick-off meeting in Gothenburg (May 2011).

PICES

The ICES/PICES subgroup for strategic cooperation met in April 2011 back to back from the PICES Science Board intercessional meeting on ecosystem indicators. The HoS, SCICOM Chair, and two members of SCICOM (Begoña Santos and Mark Dickey-Collas) attended proceedings, with the later two delivering presentations on the use of indicators in the application of the MSFD in European waters. The subgroup on strategic cooperation aims to develop a document that describes the reasons, strategy, objectives and mechanisms of cooperation between ICES and PICES. The meeting followed on a preliminary get together at the 2010 ICES ASC. While both organizations have similarities that make cooperation conducive (e.g. expert groups, symposia, Annual Conferences with theme sessions), some differences need to be considered. For example, all PICES science groups are time-limited.

Action: The ICES/ PICES subgroup for strategic cooperation will produce a report for the consideration of SCICOM/ PICES Science Board in September 2011.

A number of specific areas of immediate cooperation were also discussed at length. The current ICES-PICES Working Group on Forecasting the Impacts of Climate Change on Fish and Fisheries and its future were discussed and reported to in these minutes under item 12.3. Two ICES Expert Groups, Working Group on Introduction and transfers of Marine Organisms (WGITMO) and ICES/IOC/IMO Working Group on Ballast and Other Ship Vectors (WGBOSV), have tried to establish cooperation with PICES and also have ToRs to expand their network to include CIESM. SCICOM discussed this topic, with a view to organize a joint symposium in the near future.

10 ASC 2011 – Conference programme

10.1 Update from conference coordinator

The Meeting and Conference Coordinator, Görel Kjeldsen, presented an update of the ASC in Gdańsk. SCICOM was informed that the theme session programme had not yet been finalized, as the Secretariat was still waiting for two theme sessions to be reviewed by the conveners.

Action: The final draft programme will be submitted to SCICOM for approval by correspondence in mid May.

The only change to the setup for business meetings is on the ACOM side, with the meeting of the Advisory Committee held on Friday afternoon, instead of Saturday.

Plenary Lectures – Invited speakers

In September 2010, SCICOM made a recommendation for future ASCs to appoint representatives of SCICOM to act as hosts and contact persons for the invited speakers and to invite them to lunch or dinner. The expenses incurred will be covered via the ASC income.

Decision/Action: The following SCICOM representatives were appointed to welcome and assist keynote speakers:

Jan Weslawski: SCICOM Chair and HoS

Ragnar Elmgren: Daniel Duplisea, Canada, and Dariusz Fey, Poland

James E. Cloern: Antonio Bode, Spain

Evening course on presentation skills

Martin Pastoors and Sarah Kraak have proposed to host a 2-h Interactive Workshop for Presentation Skills to be held as an evening session in Gdańsk. This would follow on a very successful Workshop held at the 2009 ASC in Berlin (session S).

Decision/Action: SCICOM supported the initiative and agreed to make a room available on Wednesday evening. Good announcement would be important to attract participation in the evening. The Secretariat will convey this message to the course instructors.

Format of the 2011 ASC Handbook

In September 2010, SCICOM discussed options to reduce the carbon footprint of the conference, including replacing the ASC Handbook, or part of it, with a USB stick. The ICES Secretariat presented three proposals for the production of the handbook and DVD or USB sticks:

- 1) Reduced printed handbook including welcome pages, agendas and time-tables only. Book of abstracts on USB stick. Programme folder as always. DVD information to be included in the USB.
- 2) The whole handbook and DVD on USB. Programme folder as always.
- 3) Status quo – handbook including all abstracts, programme and welcome pages, plus the DVD, including all CM docs (EG reports, papers and posters for the ASC theme sessions), SCICOM reports, PUBCOM reports, Delegates documents, Gen docs and the Book of Abstracts.

It was noted that the expense of options 1 and 3 would probably be the same, as the printing costs would balance the cost of the USB.

Decision: SCICOM agreed to go for option 1 for the 2011 ASC as a trial.

For future years, it was suggested that ICES investigates developing an iPhone application.

Registration and accommodation

SCICOM members were informed that the hotel booking website is open and they were recommended to make their bookings as soon as possible.

Action: The allocation of hotel rooms on the conference website offered to conference participants should run from the first Friday to the second Saturday to Sunday during the ASC.

Dariusz Fey provided a short update on behalf of the local organizers confirming that plans for the 2011 ASC are moving smoothly forward.

10.2 Appointment of ASC Award Selection Group

SCICOM was informed that from 2011 three Early Career Scientist Awards will be given at the ASC (two Oral Presentations and one Poster Presentation). The prizes are framed certificates and vouchers for €1,000, to be used to cover participation costs in an ICES-sponsored activity, i.e. Training Course, EG Meeting, Symposium, Workshop, but not the ASC. The voucher must be redeemed within 24 months of the award. A list of eligible candidates and allocation of theme sessions will be provided by the Secretariat.

Action: SCICOM appointed the 2011 ASC Award subcommittee: Ólafur Astthórsson (Chair), Niall O Maoiléidigh, Georgs Kornilovs, and Atso Romakkaniemi. After the meeting a nomination for Max Cardinale from ACOM was received. An additional ACOM member is expected. As all abstracts have been received and eligible candidates are known the committee is asked to consider their work as soon as it is feasible. The subcommittee is to identify the three award winners at the ASC.

10.3 Appointment of ASC 2012 Theme Session Group

SCICOM was informed that the call for Theme Session proposals for the ASC 2012 would open soon. In line with last year an online rating tool was set up to assist SCICOM in preselecting their favourite theme sessions.

Action: SCICOM appointed a subcommittee to propose the ASC 2012 Theme Sessions, based on SCICOM ratings and the need to provide a balanced programme. The group is to be chaired by the SCICOM host of the ASC (Einar Svendsen), and includes Mark Dickey-Collas, Bill Karp, Christian Möllmann, Niall O Maoiléidigh, and Dariusz Fey. The group will make a pre-selection of theme sessions for consideration and final approval of SCICOM in September 2011.

10.3.1 Evaluation of theme sessions against Science Plan HPRTs

SCICOM Chair presented Doc 27. In September 2010 SCICOM agreed to do the exercise of linking the theme sessions to the Science Plan. SCICOM will continue this exercise to keep a record of the alignment with the Science Plan

10.4 ASC 2012 Keynote speakers

Two of the selections for the keynote speaker slots for the 2011 ASC could not accept the invitation due to prior commitments. To avoid a similar situation for the 2012 ASC the SCICOM Chair asked whether it would be appropriate to consider one or both of the selected speakers for 2011 to the 2012 ASC at an earlier stage. There was agreement in SCICOM that it would be appropriate to appoint one keynote speaker at an earlier stage, but that it would be preferable to make the decision on the second and thirds keynote speakers after the approval of the theme session package. Einar Svendsen, SCICOM host of ASC 2012, informed the committee that the 2012 ASC would focus on the Northern region, the Arctic, climate change and sustainable aquaculture.

It was also agreed that as a general rule, SCICOM should try to obtain a gender balance in the keynotes and furthermore that at least one invited speaker be from the host country.

Decision/action: SCICOM agreed to invite Carl Folke, Sweden, as a keynote / invited speaker for the ASC 2012. The Secretariat will proceed with the invitation. The remaining keynotes would be decided in connection with, or shortly after, the ASC 2011.

Although nominations have not been requested, Beth Fulton (Australia) was suggested as a potential speaker.

11 ASC 2011 – SCICOM Business meetings

SCICOM discussed how to run the Monday morning SCICOM plenary and SCICOM Steering Group meetings on Monday and Wednesday. The following preliminary programme for the science business meetings was presented by the Secretariat:

Saturday 17 September

PUBCOM meeting (full day)

Sunday 18 September

SCICOM meeting (full day)

Monday 19 September

SCICOM Plenary – [Update SP + Science Highlights]

SSG meetings (morning) – business session

Wednesday, 21 September

SSG meetings (afternoon) – topical session

Friday 23 September

pm – SSG chairs (finalize resolutions)

Saturday 24 September

SCICOM meeting (full day)

Note: does not include all meetings (ACOM, Delegates, etc).

11.1 SCICOM Plenary Session

SCICOM was highly supportive of having a SCICOM plenary session “Bringing science to the Fore”. This will entail an opening presentation delivered by the SCICOM Chair, with science highlights of the year from Expert Group and the wider ICES community. The presentation, however, will be delivered on behalf of SCICOM.

Last year, SSGEF had extracted highlights from EG reports and it was suggested that this process to identify highlights should be carried out for all SSGs.

Action: the SCICOM Chair will send a ‘call for contributions’ for EG / ICES highlights to the SSG Chairs, to be presented at the SCICOM Plenary. Examples of science taken up in advice should be particularly highlighted.

Action: the Secretariat will distribute an announcement of the SCICOM plenary to all ASC participants by the end of June before summer break to attract good participation. The note must clarify that the Monday and Wednesday sessions are open to all ASC attendees.

11.2 SCICOM SSG meetings

During the SCICOM midterm meeting the SSG Chairs agreed to change the setup for SSG ASC meetings, with a business-oriented session on Monday morning and a topical session on Wednesday afternoon. This arrangement was intended to engage more widely with the ASC audience, and promote coordination across SSGs.

SSG Chairs were asked to consider whether Wednesday would be the right day for the topical sessions and adequate time would also need to be allocated for the review and approval of Resolutions, especially in light of the recent empowering of the SSGs to make operational decisions regarding EGs ToRs without requiring discussion at SCICOM.

It was discussed whether a single topical session was preferable to several cross-cutting themes. It was mentioned that the selected crosscutting topics could be connected to the Monday plenary session.

Action: A WebEx meeting is to be scheduled between all SSG Chairs to start planning the ASC SSG meetings, and in particular the topic(s) of the topic session.

11.3 SCICOM/ACOM business meetings

Action: Pending the final ASC programme, the SCICOM Chair will consult the ACOM Chair with a view to scheduling the SCICOM-ACOM business group/leadership meeting during the ASC. Most likely the meeting would have to be held in parallel with one of the theme sessions.

12 Science Delivery: SCICOM/ACOM Joint Initiatives

12.1 SCICOM/ACOM Strategic Initiative on area-based science and management (SIASM)

Erik Olsen presented an update on the SIASM and informed SCICOM that the process had been very rewarding and dynamic. In summarizing the achievements of the initiative he noted:

- The report of the 1st SIASM Workshop on ‘The Science for area-based management: Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning in practice (WKCMSPP)’ (Portugal, November 2010) was now available.
- A SIASM questionnaire on MSP needs and opportunities had received 28 EG replies.
- The initiative had led to significant networking, particularly in the HELCOM area and the EEA networks.
- The Working Group for Marine Planning and Coastal Zone Management (WGMPCZM), led by Andreas Kannen, is taking up a lot of MSP-related tasks. This WG was seen as an ideal group to participate in the initiative and a candidate for continuing the momentum of the initiative.

The response of EGs to the additional ToR added by SIASM was discussed. Although there were some initially negative comments, some of the EGs found them useful. It was noted that some of the EGs needed more time to organize themselves before answering. It was suggested that a little more context would help the Chairs, for example through a PowerPoint presentation on the objectives of the SIASM.

SCICOM discussed how well the initiative was connected to relevant European/global projects. At the European level contacts are good, such as with the EU HARMONY project, as are with Canadian initiatives. Links in the USA are less developed.

Action: SSGEST and SIASM Chair to communicate on this after the meeting.

Action: Suggestion to link the planned 2011 ASC Wednesday afternoon topical session to marine spatial planning, and to invite relevant stakeholders and contacts in this field.

12.2 SCICOM/ACOM strategic initiative on Biodiversity (SIBAS)

Simon Jennings presented an update on SIBAS and the outcome of the Workshop on Marine Biodiversity (WKMARBIO) held in Copenhagen from 9–11 February 2011. The workshop had 38 participants, many of which were new to ICES and the meeting saw a good mix policy, science and advice representatives.

WKMARBIO recommendations

The [WKMARBIO report](#) recommends a number of actions relating to ‘data and assessment’, ‘indicators and reference points’ and ‘science priorities’ in relation to biodiversity issues, and SCICOM members were encouraged to read the report. The WKMARBIO Chairs were very pleased with the response from some of the EGs, and in particular how the Working Group on Biodiversity Science (WGBIODIV) had begun addressing some of the recommendations.

Action: A review of WKMARBIO recommendations will be discussed at the SCICOM-ACOM meeting on 5 May.

SCICOM was asked for feedback on the following key questions related to the continuation of the Strategic Initiative:

- Do we support ICES taking first steps towards investigating institutional links with the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)?

SCICOM was informed that the main activity of CBD is to establish global targets for biodiversity for individual nations to sign up to. This implies that ICES Member Countries are bound to try to meet these targets. The CBD secretariat function supports nations towards meeting targets. CBD require support on the science level. Currently they generally seek this advice outside ICES. One important potential linkage might be to provide data/ evidence-based support and it is believed that the CBD would welcome this. It was questioned whether there may be conflicting issues of perception, and such concerns may need to be explored with CBD at a formal level.

Decision/action: SCICOM recommended strong engagement with CBD and recommends that this should be taken to the Bureau.

Decision/actions: SIBAS members will draft a short rationale for initiating discussions on a CBD link, to be reviewed by SCICOM and ACOM Chairs and then go to Bureau

Decision/action: ICES is currently revisiting links with FAO, and it was agreed that ICES linkages with FAO may be expanded to cover biodiversity issues.

- SIBAS leadership

SCICOM was informed that Mark Tasker’s term has already ended his term in the ACOM leadership, and that Simon Jennings will rotate off SCICOM at the end of this year. The leadership of the group needs revisiting.

Action: the continuation of SIBAS was discussed offline. Simon Jennings and Mark Tasker were asked to remain involved in the leadership of the SIBAS despite rotating off committees, and they both kindly accepted. The possibility of including Henn Ojaveer to the leadership group was considered, and this will be discussed with the Estonian national delegate to SCICOM.

- ICES-IUCN Policy Forum at World Biodiversity Conference

The World Biodiversity Conference in Aberdeen, Scotland, UK, takes place from 26–30 September 2011. ICES has been invited to be part of a policy forum led by Jake Rice and Serge Garcia, co-sponsored by IUCN.

The SCICOM Chair informed that he had already accepted the offer on behalf of ICES and that it was his intention that Jake Rice would represent ICES.

Action: The SCICOM Chair will send an official e-mail to Jake Rice to confirm that he has the mandate of SCICOM to organize such Forum with IUCN on behalf of ICES.

- Life in a Changing Ocean

Henn Ojaveer informed SCICOM that he was involved in a global research programme formed last year at the occasion of the end of the CoML programme, and would be a member of the science planning committee of this new programme for the next three years. The new programme is named 'Life in a Changing Ocean' (LICO). The extended version of draft texts outlining the work plan for the four themes of LICO will be ready in time for the World Biodiversity Conference. One theme (on Biodiversity and Sustainable Ocean Use) will be co-led by Henn Ojaveer; Brian MacKenzie, and Simon Jennings agreed to contribute to the drafting. The SCICOM Chair thanked Henn for this important information and for engaging ICES in this process.

Action: Henn will maintain contact with Paul Snelgrove to keep SCICOM aware of progress with the LICO programme.

Erik Olsen noted the close links between several issues addressed by SIBAS and SI-ASM and that the members of the Initiatives had not attended each other's workshops. Both workshops had recommended data and data handling issues and their recommendations were entirely compatible.

Action: Erik Olsen and Simon Jennings to discuss commonalities in the work of these Initiatives and identify any action that may be required to facilitate each other's work.

12.3 SCICOM Strategic Initiative on Climate Change (SSICC)

Brian Mackenzie presented Doc 27a, a Science Plan for the ICES-PICES Strategic Initiative on Climate Change effects on Marine Ecosystems (SICCME). The initiative follows on the ICES SSICC (led by Luis Valdes and Jürgen Alheit), which ended in 2010, and the P/ICES Working Group on Forecasting Climate Change Impacts on Fish and Shellfish (WGFICCFs, led by Anne Hollowed, Suam Kim, Harald Loeng and Manuel Barange), which concludes its activities in 2011. The SICCME is planned to be co-led by Anne Hollowed, Suam Kim (PICES) and Jürgen Alheit, Harald Loeng, and Brian MacKenzie (ICES). The new joint initiative would be a unique opportunity to combine strengths, to speak with a single voice from the northern hemisphere, with real added value for both organizations. The initiative is centred on a major symposium every 3-5 years, similar to the 2010 Sendai symposium on Climate Change impacts.

The SCICOM Chair informed the group that PICES had agreed to the principle of this initiative, and their Science Board had asked the proponents to provide implementation details to ensure the programme of activities were manageable under the lighter PICES structure. This is, in particular, because PICES does provide funding to its Expert Groups, while ICES does not.

SCICOM asked whether a joined activity of this nature could operate in the usual ICES funding system, and the SCICOM Chair noted that this is how the WGFICCFs operated in the past, making use of opportunities like ASCs and science symposia to bring the group together. However, he asked the proponents (via Brian Mackenzie) to consider in their implementation plan whether additional funding may be needed.

Decision: SCICOM members agreed to continue the process of developing the ICES-PICES Strategic Initiative on Climate Change effects on Marine Ecosystems.

Action: A draft implementation plan will be delivered by the leaders of the initiative in time for a final approval by SCICOM at the September 2011 meeting. The implementation plan will be submitted to PICES for approval at their annual Science Board meeting in October.

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

Mark Dickey-Collas gave an update on SISAM and explained the difficulties encountered in implementing this initiative. There had been problems of participation, and the WKADSAM report (the first activity of the SISAM) had been delayed. Without the report, further steps had stalled.

SCICOM noted that the initiative is central to ICES's business and must be re-ignited. A discussion ensued on whether the objective of the SI was to find what constitutes the "best model", and it was agreed that this must be qualified by the best in terms of its appropriateness and applicability. It was noted that this initiative has significant outside players, and that for ICES it would be important to break our current dependence on data-rich models. Simplicity may be more appropriate than complexity.

Mark Dickey-Collas explained that the current leadership of the SI felt overworked and unable to deliver what is needed without the engagement of private consultants. SCICOM showed concern over the involvement of consultants, both financially and in terms of scientific focus. The SCICOM Chair asked the ACOM Chair to take some leadership in this initiative, and the ACOM Chair agreed that it would be very important to find the right individuals to move this initiative forward from the advisory side.

Additional discussion was held to clarify, for the benefit of the ACOM Chair and SCICOM, how the initiative plans to build on relevant synergistic initiatives conducted elsewhere, to ensure there is no duplication of work. It was noted that a WebEx is to be held in May 2011 between the leaders of the initiative to follow on the planning process.

Action: Stronger ACOM involvement and leadership will be requested at the joint meeting of the ACOM Leadership/SCICOM Business Group.

12.5 SCICOM/ACOM Steering Group on the EC Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD)

Yvonne Walther informed SCICOM that ICES has established a Joint ACOM/SCICOM MSFD Steering Group to support Member States and Regional Conventions' implementation of the MSFD. The Steering Group was co-chaired by herself and Eugene Nixon (ACOM Vice-Chair). The Steering Group would be time-limited; once the tasks have been completed it will be dissolved.

ICES has agreed to assist member states by, in particular, taking a lead in developing Descriptor 3 on Commercial Fisheries and Shellfish. It was noted that HELCOM expects ICES to deliver on this descriptor despite the lack of a formal request. A core group has been established, chaired by Gerjan Piet (The Netherlands), and will report in autumn 2011. Some member countries have expressed concern over the extra costs associated with the meetings of this group, and the General Secretary informed that some funding from the SIF could be made available.

One of the first activities of the SG had been to develop a number of ToRs for all EGs to:

- Identify elements of the EGs work that may help determine status for the 11 Descriptors set out in the Commission Decision;
- Provide views on what good environmental status (GES) might be for those descriptors, including methods that could be used to determine status

Yvonne Walther informed the group that this request had received mixed responses from EGs, with several voicing concerns over the lack of time to prepare adequate responses. However, many EGs had provided useful information to move the initiative further. She also informed the group of efforts towards improving coordination with HELCOM and their CORSET activity on developing descriptors. The communication lines with HELCOM scientists in this initiative are open and informal. A general comment was made by Erik Olsen that SCICOM needs to sell their requests for additional ToRs to the EGs better and suggest that in addition to having the ToRs streamlined and timed, SCICOM should also prepare a presentation package to explain why this is important.

A question was raised regarding integration with the Barcelona convention and the Mediterranean region. This would be possible if there was to be interest, for example as members of the core group. There has been some communication with the Commission on this, but it was noted that CIESM has no direct interest in engaging on issues regarding advice.

In summarizing the work of the Strategic Initiatives, the SCICOM Chair noted that progress was evident in all of them with perhaps the exception of the SISAM. At some point SCICOM need to assess which SIs have completed their mandate and develop exit strategies.

13 ACOM/SCICOM linkages

The SCICOM Chair presented the agenda for the joint meeting of the ACOM Leadership/SCICOM Business Group of May 5, and asked for comments. The following issues were raised:

- At the ACOM/SCICOM meeting in Lisbon a new template for single stock advice was introduced, and that ecosystem information was generally lacking or insufficient. Simon Jennings echoed this comment and added that the ecosystem descriptions associated with single stock advice are disappointing, often unchanged since the times of ACE, and occasionally inconsistent with the advice. It was agreed that this requires discussion ACOM-SCICOM.
- Should ACOM EG ToR be coded to the Science Plan as agreed for SCICOM EG ToR (agenda item 4.3)? SCICOM is the Consultative Committee

of ICES, and this the Science Plan applies to the entire community of expert groups. This will be brought to the attention of ACOM.

- Should WGITMO and WGBOSV report to SCICOM as well as ACOM? These two groups do science and would appreciate feedback on their work from the SCICOM. Furthermore, WGITMO is not providing any advice to ACOM, its parent body. ACOM Chair agreed that having this group report to SCICOM would be useful.
- Henn Ojaveer raised whether the division between ACOM and SCICOM EGs was useful or a handicap to the working of the groups and the coordination between both arms. The ACOM Chair commented that the current structure is significantly better than the previous structure in this regard, but that this issue needs to be monitored.
- Relating to MSFD, Kris Cooreman commented that he would like to see ICES engaged in other descriptors, in addition to Descriptor 3, such as Descriptor 8. ACOM Chair clarified that the core group will look at more than Descriptor 3.

The notes from this joint meeting can be seen in Annex X (not yet ready).

14 Symposia 2010–2012 (progress report)

HoS presented the new requests for ICES co-sponsorship of symposia, as listed below. The SCICOM decision for approval or rejection is shown in the last column of the table:

DATE	TITLE	VENUE	CONVENERS	SCICOM COMMENTS
7-9 September 2011	YOUMARES	Bremerhaven, Germany	Stefan Meyer (Germany)	Request to list ICES as an official partner of YOUMARES, asking for the ICES logo on their website. No conflicting interests. Decision: APPROVED.
7-11 May 2012	World Fisheries Congress	Edinburgh, Scotland	Michel Kaiser, Bangor (UK)	See item 8.5. SCICOM agreed to co-sponsor the WFC in May 2012 with eight theme sessions and £1000 as a contribution to the travel grant fund. Decision: APPROVED
6–11 May 2012	8th International Abalone Symposium (IAS 2012)	Hobart, Australia	Nick Elliott (CSIRO)	Positive comments from PUBCOM in terms of the IJMS, however SCICOM felt that the request came at too late a stage for ICES to make an impact. Decision: DECLINED.

DATE	TITLE	VENUE	CONVENERS	SCICOM COMMENTS
13–15 May 2012 (under the Danish EU presidency),	Research and ecosystem-based management strategies supporting the implementation of the Marine Strategy Framework (Directive, 13/15 May 2012)	Jesper Andersen (Denmark)		IJMS requested. Positive comments that ICES should be involved in this. Decision: SCICOM sends a positive signal and requests a resolution with information on their expectancies in term of papers and they also need to provide their plans for actions (how to handle this) and identify editors.
February 2014	Symposium on “Ecosystem-based Responsive Fisheries Management in Europe”	Vigo, Spain	Anna Kristín Daníelsdóttir (Iceland), Marco Thorup Frederiksen (Denmark) and Rosa Chapela Pérez (Spain), plus two external conveners	Concern that ICES would be pre-empting other proposals. Proposal to be revised Decision: Co-sponsorship to be revisited in September 2011.
2–6 June 2014	Symposium on “Risk analysis for marine ecosystems”	Helsinki, Finland	Sakari Kuikka (FI), Elja Arjas (FI), and NN	SCICOM had concerns that this is a single-project output and that has to be broadened to be fully international and more far-reaching Concern that this is a single project output and that both conveners are from Finland. Proposal to be revised Decision: Co-sponsorship to be revisited in September 2011.
October 2014	5th International Otolith Symposium	Palma de Mallorca, Spain	Beatrice Morales-Nin (Spain), Audrey Geffen (Norway)	No detailed documentation available yet, and thus the proposal could not be fully considered. Decision: a resolution to be tabled at the ASC SCICOM meeting.

15 Review and approval of draft resolutions

There were 4 resolutions recommended for midterm approval under SSGESST:

- Working Group on Improving use of Survey Data for Assessment and Advice (WGISDAA).

The intent is for WGISDAA to have a broad scope. The idea is to improve the communication between science and advice relative to the data, and will also provide a useful framework on how the surveys are performing and how we engage in the EC process.

Action: WGISDAA should also report to ACOM. Approved.

- Working Group Integrating Surveys for the Ecosystem Approach (WGISUR) and Workshop on the Ideal Ecosystem Fishery Surveys (WKIEFS)

Action: Since WGISUR and WKIEFS will be meeting back to back in January 2012, and this should be specified. With this comments the ToRs for both groups were approved. Furthermore, it was recommended that the language in WGISUR ToRs be tightened and the outcomes more focused.

SSG Chairs were reminded that it is their responsibility to check the ToRs, including language, prior to recommendation for approval.

- The combined Working Group for International Pelagic Surveys (WGIPS), and Working Group on North East Atlantic Pelagic Ecosystem Surveys (WGNAPES)

Action: No negatives were noted. Approved.

There were 2 resolutions recommended for midterm approval under SSGSUE:

- Working Group on Maritime Systems (WGMARS)

Action: WGMARS ToRs need to be addressed together with ACOM. Approval of WGMARS ToRs postponed to the joint meeting of the ACOM Leadership/SCICOM Business Group.

- ICES-CIESM-PICES Working Group on the development of marine ecosystems end-to-end models (WGE2E)

Action: Approval of this WGE2E ToR is pending discussions with WGPBI on whether they wish to merge their activities. SCICOM Chair to take the lead in communicating with the leaders. The resultant EG to recommend to SCICOM to what SSG they would like to report to.

16 Dates for 2012 SCICOM May meeting: options

At the SCICOM September 2010 meeting, the Secretariat was asked to explore alternative meeting dates for the midterm meeting. This is because the high level of ACOM activity in April – May prevents SCICOM from meeting in the Secretariat.

The following dates were proposed for the SCICOM midterm in 2012:

- Week 10: Wednesday 7 – Friday 9 March 2012 – ICES Headquarters
- Week 13: Monday 26 – Friday 30 March 2012 – ICES Headquarters
- Week 18: Monday 30 April– Thursday 3 May 2012 – *venue to be decided*

Decision: SCICOM agreed in principle to move the dates forward.

Action: The final dates for the SCICOM midterm in 2012 will be decided by correspondence. The Secretariat will send a doodle request asking SCICOM members to indicate their preferred meeting dates in March.

17 Any other business

How does ICES take into account the minority opinion – example of the Workshop on Age Reading of Greenland Halibut (WKARGH, February 2011)?

Oleg Lapshin wanted to inform SCICOM of an issue that had arisen in the advisory Workshop on Age Reading of Greenland Halibut (WKARGH, February 2011). He was interested in hearing SCICOM's view on how to represent minority views in EG reports. It was explained that it is traditional in ICES to reflect the minority view as well as the majority view in the advisory group reports. When different views are voiced the first choice is to integrate this as a discussion in the main text of the report, but accept that the report may conclude in a way that does not accommodate all views presented in the discussion. The alternative option is to let the minority view be expressed in an authored annex. In the case under discussion a Russian minority statement was included in an annex to the report.

The SCICOM Chair felt that it was important for SCICOM to be made aware of this process, as for science expert groups several positions can be accommodated in the reports without leading to the same level of conflict. The issue was passed on to ACOM for further discussion, if necessary.

18 Closure

The SCICOM Chair thanked the Secretariat for all their help preparing the meeting. A special thank you was extended to the new members of the committee – and in particular to the ACOM Chair, Jean-Jacques Maguire, for his valuable contributions – and also to everyone participating. He concluded that this had been a very good meeting, providing excellent guidance to the Secretariat, the SSGs and to himself.

Annex 1: SCICOM list of participants

Apologies received from Portugal, Spain, France, and US (Bill Karp will be representing the US/Pierre Petitgas will be representing France).

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX/E-MAIL
Chair:		
Manuel Barange	Plymouth Marine Laboratory Prospect Place, The Hoe PL1 3DH Plymouth UK	manuel.barange@ices.dk
SCICOM Steering Group Chairs :		
Daniel Duplisea, SSGSUE Chair	Fisheries and Oceans Canada Institut Maurice- Lamontagne, Mont-Joli, QC, Canada G5H 3Z4	tel: (418) 775 0881 fax: (418) 775 0740 daniel.duplisea@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Bill Karp, SSGESST Chair (will also be representing the US at this midterm meeting)	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 bill.karp@noaa.gov
Erik Olsen, SSGHIE	Erik Olsen Institute of Marine Research PO Box 1870 N-5817 Bergen Norway	erik.olsen@imr.no
Pierre Petitgas, SSGEF Chair (will also be representing France)	Ifremer Nantes Centre PO Box 21105 F-44311 Nantes Cédex 03 France	Phone +33 240 37 40 00 Fax +33 240 37 40 75 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 yvonne.walther@fiskeriverket.se
PUBCOM:		
Pierre Pepin, PUBCOM Chair	Fisheries and Oceans Canada Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Center PO Box 5667 St John s NL A1C 5X1 Canada	Phone +1 709 772 2081 Fax +1 709 772 4105 pierre.pepin@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX/E-MAIL
Ex officio:		
Jean-Jacques Maguire, ACOM Chair	1450 Godefroy Sillery Quebec GIT 2E4 Canada	Phone +1 418 688 5501 Fax +1 418 688 7924 E-mail JJ.Maguire@ices.dk
Gerd Hubold, ICES General Secretary	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 DK-1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	gerd@ices.dk
National members and alternates:		
Kris Cooreman (Belgium)	Institute for Agricultural and Fisheries Research Ankerstraat 1 B-8400 Oostende Belgium	Phone +32 59569820 Fax +32 59330629 kris.cooreman@ilvo.vlaanderen.be
Brian R. MacKenzie (Denmark)	Brian R. MacKenzie DTU Aqua - 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 brm@aqua.dtu.dk
Henn Ojaveer (Estonia)	Estonian Marine Institute University of Tartu 2a Lootsi EE-80012 Parnu Estonia	Phone +372 443 4456 mobile: +372 5158328 Fax +372 6718 900 E-mail henn.ojaveer@ut.ee
Atso Romakkaniemi (Finland)	Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute Oulu Game and Fisheries Research Tutkijantie 2 E 90570 Oulu Finland	Phone +358-205751416 Fax +358-205751879 E-mail atso.romakkaniemi@rktl.fi
Christian Möllmann (Germany)	Christian Möllmann University of Hamburg Institute of Hydrobiology and Fishery Science Olbersweg 24 D-22767 Hamburg Germany	Phone +49 40 42838 6621 christian.moellmann@uni- hamburg.de
Ólafur S. Astthórsson (Iceland)	Marine Research Institute Skúlagata 4 IS-121 Reykjavík Iceland	Phone +354 5520240 Fax 3545623790 osa@hafro.is

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX/E-MAIL
Niall Ó Maoiléidigh (Ireland)	Marine Institute Farran laboratory Newport Co. Mayo Ireland	Phone +353 98 423 00 Fax +353 98 423 40 niall.omaoleidigh@marine.ie
Georgs Kornilovs (Latvia)	Head of Research Department LATFRA Daugavgrivas str. 8 Riga LV-1048 Latvia	Phone: +371 67676027 Fax: +371 67616946 Georgs.Kornilovs@lzra.gov.lv
Mark Dickey-Collas (Netherlands)	Wageningen IMARES PO Box 68 NL-1970 AB IJmuiden Netherlands	Phone +31 255 56 46 85 Fax +31 255 56 46 44 mark.dickeycollas@wur.nl
Einar Svendsen (Norway)	Institute of Marine Research PO Box 1870 N-5817 Bergen Norway	Phone +47 55 238458 Fax +47 55 238687 einar.svendsen@imr.no
Dariusz Fey (Poland)	Sea Fisheries Institute in Gdynia ul. Kollataja 1 PL-81-332 Gdynia Poland	Phone +48 58 735 61 30 dfey@mir.gdynia.pl
Oleg M. Lapshin (Russian Federation)	Russian Federal Research Institute of Fisheries & Oceanography 17 Verkhne Krasnoselskaya RU-107140 Moscow Russian Federation	Phone +7 4992649721 Mobile +7 495 722 3436 lapshin@vniro.ru
Mårten Åström (Sweden)	Department of Research and Development, Swedish Board of Fisheries, Box 423, SE-401 26 Göteborg, Sweden	Phone: +46-(0)70-799 54 15 marten.astrom@fiskeriverket.se
Simon Jennings (UK)	Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science Lowestoft Laboratory Pakefield Road NR33 0HT Lowestoft Suffolk UK	Phone +44 1502 562244 Fax +44 1502 513865 simon.jennings@cefas.co.uk
ICES Staff:(will attend relevant agenda items)		
Bill Anthony, Executive Editor	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	bill@ices.dk
Bodil Chemnitz, ICES Webmaster	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	bodil@ices.dk
Neil Holdsworth, Head of Data Centre	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	neil.holdsworth@ices.dk

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX/E-MAIL
Søren Anker Pedersen	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	Sørenap@ices.dk
Adi Kellermann, Head of Science Programme	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	adi@ices.dk
Görel Kjeldsen, Meeting & Conference Coordinator	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	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
Claire Welling, Science Programme Assisting Secretary	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	claire@ices.dk
Wojciech Wawrzynski, Professional Secretary for Scientific Cooperation	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	wojciech.wawrzynski@ices.dk
Jan Thulin, Senior Advisor	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	jan.thulin@ices.dk

Annex 2: Action list

Section	Action	Responsible
4.1 SCICOM Modus Operandi	Decision: SSG Chairs will continue to bring matters of substance regarding their portfolio of EGs to the attention of SCICOM at annual or intercessional meetings. SSG Chairs, in consultation with the Chair of SCICOM and other SSG Chairs, can make decisions on operational issues (e.g. venue, Chairs, meeting dates). SCICOM will however continue to be responsible for the final approval of resolutions, by correspondence if possible, or through WebEx if required.	SSGs, SCICOM
4.2 EG Evaluation	A subgroup consisting of SCICOM Chair, Daniel Duplisea, Christian Möllmann, Bill Karp, Niall Ó Maoiléidigh and Erik Olsen was appointed to develop a strategy based on the above principles, with adequate detail and procedures. This strategy will be shared with EG Chairs to ensure such a significant change in modus operandi is implemented with participation and buy into from EGs. It is intended to complete the strategy before the 2011 ASC, for discussion and consideration by SCICOM.	SCICOM Chair, Daniel Duplisea, Christian Möllmann, Bill Karp, Niall Ó Maoiléidigh and Erik Olsen
4.3 EG Coding	Question of whether ACOM should be involved in EG coding to be brought forward to ACOM at the forthcoming joint meeting of the ACOM Leadership/SCICOM Business Group.	SCICOM and ACOM Chairs
4.3 EG Coding	SCICOM agreed to map EG ToRs against the Science Plan 2009-2013. This should be done in conjunction with the Annual SCICOM Progress Report to SCICOM and the mapping would be carried out by SSG Chairs to ensure consistency. A shared dialogue with EG Chairs would be useful.	SSG Chairs
4.3 EG Coding	The SCICOM Chair will consult the Bureau on whether ICES expects SCICOM will revise/update the Science Plan when it ends in 2013.	SCICOM Chair
5.2 SSGHIE	SSG Chairs agreed that the Monday morning SSG session at the 2011 ASC will be focused on EG reporting while the Wednesday afternoon slot will be focused on a number of cross-cutting topics to be discussed in workshop style. SSG Chairs will discuss potential topics by correspondence.	SSG Chairs
5.2 SSGHIE	SSG Chair will act on outstanding issues (integration of ecosystem uses through SIASM and restructuring of aquaculture EGs)	SSGHIE Chair
5.3 SSGRSP	The ACOM Chair had attended WGINOSE and WGIAB and had suggested establishing an advice drafting group in the autumn, involving people from these groups, tasked to define what Integrated Assessment (IA) means and to provide a strawman proposal for how this can be done. SSGRSP to follow up.	SSGRSP Chair
5.3 SSGRSP	SSGRSP Chair to work with the Secretariat Head of Advice and ACOM Chair to update and develop the ecosystem descriptions in the advice documents.	SSGRSP Chair

Section	Action	Responsible
5.4 SSGESST	With a view to facilitate streamlining and overview, the SCICOM Chair suggested producing a brief position paper explaining how the different Survey EGs contribute to a single strategy for the SSG. Perhaps a “herringbone” illustration to visualize the structure of the survey groups, similar to the one used to map SSGRSP EGs would be useful. The SSGESST Chair agreed that this would be useful and this task could be completed before the ASC.	SSGESST Chair
5.5 SSGSUE	Regarding WGQAF - proposal for a joint workshop with ACOM to be raised at the joint meeting of the ACOM leadership/SCICOM business group	SSGSUE Chair
5.5 SSGSUE	WGMARS ToR to be discussed at the SCICOM/ACOM meeting on 5 May for decision.	SSGSUE Chair
5 SSG Chairmanship	A call for proposals will be opened to identify a new SSGEF Chair. SCICOM members were welcomed to approach Pierre Petitgas or the SCICOM Chair directly with suggestions. Current members of the SSGEF family would also be considered as candidates.	SCICOM Chair
6.1 WGDIM	A subgroup consisting of the SCICOM Chair, Mark Dickey-Collas and Einar Svendsen volunteered to take part in a WebEx meeting with the WGDIM Chairs to set up implementation plans for the data strategy.	WGDIM Chair, Mark Dickey-Collas and Einar Svendsen
6.2 PUBCOM – ICES Position Paper	PUBCOM Chair to continue engaging with the production of the CRR. SCICOM Chair and Brian MacKenzie to engage with Alheit in the development of the Position Paper	SCICOM Chair, PUBCOM Chair, Brian MacKenzie.
6.2 Empowerment of PUBCOM	SCICOM agreed to empower PUBCOM to make decisions on non-strategic issues.	PUBCOM
6.2.1 PUBCOM – Review process for TIMES and CRR	SSG Chairs to familiarise themselves with the process of approval / review of TIMES and CRR publications	SSG Chairs
6.3 TRAINING	SCICOM asked the Training Group to prepare two business models, one focused on ICES outreach, and one focusing on training as an internal strategic tool. The business models should cover all aspects, i.e. if a “no increase in fees” is recommended by Training Group, there has to be a solution where to find that money.	TRAINING Group to present the business model to SCICOM in September 2011
6.3 TRAINING	SCICOM members were urged to advertise courses more widely at their institutes. In two cases there had been too few participants for a course, and SCICOM, ACOM and Council members would be informed in such cases.	SCICOM
6.3 TRAINING	As a continuous request, SCICOM member were informed to send new and preferably detailed proposals for training courses to the Secretariat (sorenap@ices.dk) for consideration by the Training Group.	SCICOM

Section	Action	Responsible
7 ICES website	The Head of IT was asked to organize a WebEx meeting with participation of Pierre Pepin, Yvonne Walther, Einar Svendsen and Erik Olsen within the next two weeks to set up a workplan, timeline, objectives and strategies for the ICES website. ACOM should be represented with participation of Bill Turrell, UK.	Head of IT
8.1 Operational oceanography	The SCICOM Chair will respond to Jon Hare along the lines expressed above. It is suggested that a group be appointed to continue developing plans to respond to needs. From SCICOM, this group will include the SCICOM Chair, Einar Svendsen, Mark Dickey-Collas and Pierre Pepin. Additional members may include Barbara Berx (ICES rep in the Integrated Framework for Sustained Ocean Observation task team, IFSOO-TT), and ICES scientists involved in the EMODNET Marine Observations and Data Expert Group (Glenn Nola, Antonio Bode, Christopher Zimmermann and Neil Holdsworth). The group would work by correspondence and possibly meet at the forthcoming ASC.	SCICOM Chair
8.2 Ecosystem modelling	The SCICOM Chair was asked to convey this message to the incoming Chairs of WGPBI and the proposers of WGE2E, and encourage them to develop new ToR for a combined EG.	SCICOM Chair
8.2 RCM workshop	SCICOM supported this proposal. The SCICOM Chair will contact Myron Peck to ascertain his availability.	SCICOM Chair
8.3 BASIN	SCICOM Chair will approach Mike St John to convey the positive comments from SCICOM, and the message that SCICOM would like to await the development in the US and Canada before planning further steps.	SCICOM Chair
8.4 UN Regular Process	The first stage would be for the Secretariat to respond in a positive way, saying that we are prepared to organize the workshop. At a later stage Member Countries need to establish their commitment and appoint scientific leaders.	HoS
8.4 UN Regular Process	The next preparatory meeting takes place in June 2011. SCICOM agreed that an ICES representative needed to be found. The Chairs of ACOM and SCICOM agreed to discuss participation with the Secretariat.	SCICOM Chair, ACOM Chair, Secretariat.
8.4 UN Regular Process	SCICOM Chair asked the Secretariat to get in contact with the other regional conventions and with CIESM. ACOM and SCICOM chairs were very supportive of this and would be willing to attend the meeting to send a signal that ICES takes this seriously.	HoS
8.4 UN Regular Process	ICES HoS to communicate ICES approach to PICES	HoS
8.5 WFC	SCICOM members were requested to send their proposals for chair candidates by e-mail within the next two weeks to the SCICOM Chair. The short deadline would give the chairs a chance to take ownership for the proposals and propose speakers themselves. After the deadline, the SCICOM Chair would engage with the business group again to try to find a balanced group of Chairs. Once identified the Secretariat would invite them to become session Chairs.	SCICOM members SCICOM Chair Secretariat

Section	Action	Responsible
8.5 WFC	SCICOM agreed to co-sponsor the WFC in May 2012 with £ 1000 as a contribution to the travel grant fund. Formally, this will require a resolution.	HoS / Secretariat
8.6 MARCOM	A subgroup, consisting of SCICOM Chair, Erik Olsen, Henn Ojaveer, Kris Cooreman and Simon Jennings, were tasked to do an analysis of political implications and consequences for ICES becoming a part of the future Forum and to assist the HoS in detailing the topic 1 (aquatic living resources). The Hos will prepare an overview of the MARCOM+ Forum functionality as a draft once available which is likely to be in fall, perhaps even in September. HoS thanked SCICOM members for their comments and welcomed more ownership by SCICOM in MARCOM+ activities.	HoS / SCICOM Chair
9.2 Other cooperation – PICES	The ICES/PICES subgroup for strategic cooperation will produce a report for the consideration of SCICOM/PICES Science Board in September 2011	SCICOM Chair, HoS, Mark Dickey Collas, Begona Santos
10.1 ASC conference programme	The final draft programme will be submitted to SCICOM for approval by correspondence in mid May.	Secretariat
10.1 Plenary Lectures, Invited speakers	The following SCICOM representatives were appointed to assist and welcome keynote speakers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jan Weslawski: SCICOM Chair and HoS • Ragnar Elmgren: Daniel Duplisea, Canada, and Dariusz Fey, Poland • James E. Cloern: Antonio Bode, Spain 	SCICOM Chair, HoS, Daniel Duplisea, Dariusz Fey, Antonio Bode.
10.1 Evening course	SCICOM supported the initiative and agreed to make a room available on Wednesday evening. Good announcement would be important to attract participation in the evening. The Secretariat will convey this message to the course instructors.	Secretariat
10.1 Format of the ASC Handbook	1) Reduced printed handbook with welcome pages, agendas and timetables only. Book of abstracts to go on USB stick. Programme folder as always. DVD on USB. Decision: SCICOM agreed to go for option 1 as a trial.	Secretariat
10.1 Accommodation	The allocation of hotel rooms on the conference website offered to conference participants should run from the first Friday to the second Saturday to Sunday during the ASC.	Secretariat
10.2 ASC Award Selection Group	SCICOM appointed the 2011 ASC Award Selection Group consisting of Olafur Astthórsson (Chair), Niall O Maoiléidigh, Georgs Kornilovs, and Atso Romakkaniemi. After the meeting a nomination for Max Cardinale from ACOM was received. An additional ACOM member is expected. As all abstracts have been received and eligible candidates are known the group is asked to consider their work as soon as it is feasible. The group is to identify three award winners at the ASC. A list of eligible candidates will be provided by the Secretariat.	ASC Award Selection Group Secretariat

Section	Action	Responsible
10.3 ASC 2012 Theme Session Group	SCICOM appointed a subcommittee to propose the ASC 2012 Theme Sessions, based on SCICOM ratings and the need to provide a balanced programme. The group is to be chaired by the SCICOM host of the ASC (Einar Svendsen), and includes Mark Dickey-Collas, Bill Karp, Christian Möllmann, Niall O Maoiléidigh, and Dariusz Fey. The group will make a pre-selection of theme sessions for consideration and final approval of SCICOM in September 2011.	ASC 2012 TS Group
10.4 ASC 2012 Keynote	SCICOM agreed to invite Carl Folke, Sweden, as a keynote / invited speaker for the ASC 2012. The Secretariat will proceed with the invitation. The remaining keynotes would be decided in connection with, or shortly after, the ASC 2011.	Secretariat
11.1 SCICOM plenary session	The SCICOM Chair will send a 'call for contributions' for EG / ICES highlights to be presented at the SCICOM Plenary. Examples of science taken up in advice should be particularly highlighted.	SCICOM Chair
11.1 SCICOM plenary session	The Secretariat will distribute an announcement of the SCICOM plenary to all ASC participants by the end of June, before the summer break, to attract good participation. The note must clarify that the Monday and Wednesday sessions are open to all ASC attendees.	Secretariat
11.2 SSG meetings	A WebEx meeting is to be scheduled for all SSG Chairs to start planning the ASC SSG meetings, and in particular the topics(s) of the topic session.	SSG Chairs
11.3 ASC joint ACOM/SCICOM leadership	Pending the final ASC programme, the SCICOM Chair will consult the ACOM Chair with a view to scheduling the SCICOM-ACOM business group/leadership meeting during the ASC. Most likely the meeting would have to be held in parallel with theme sessions.	SCICOM Chair
12.1 SIASM	Linking SIASM to US activities. SSGESST and SIASM Chairs to communicate on this after the meeting.	SSGESST and SIASM Chairs
12.2 SIBAS	A review of WKMARBIO recommendations will be discussed at the SCICOM-ACOM meeting, 5 May.	Simon Jennings
12.2 SIBAS CBD	SCICOM recommended strong engagement with CBD and that this recommendation should be taken to the Bureau.	SCICOM Chair
12.2 SIBAS CBD	SIBAS members will draft a short rationale for initiating discussions on a CBD link, to be reviewed by SCICOM and ACOM Chairs and then to go to Bureau	SIBAS members SCICOM Chair ACOM Chair
12.2 SIBAS CBD	ICES is currently revisiting links with FAO, and it was agreed that ICES linkages with FAO may be expanded to cover biodiversity issues.	SCICOM Chairs / Secretariat
12.2 SIBAS leadership	The continuation of SIBAS was discussed offline. Simon Jennings and Mark Tasker were asked to remain involved in the leadership of SIBAS despite rotating off committees, and the both kindly accepted. The possibility of including Henn Ojaveer to the leadership group was considered, and this will be discussed with the Estonian national delegate to SCICOM.	Simon Jennings, Mark Tasker, SCICOM Chair
12.2 SIBAS, ICES linked session at World Biodiversity Conference	The SCICOM Chair will send an official e-mail to Jake Rice to confirm that he has the mandate of SCICOM to organize such Form with IUCN on behalf of ICES.	SCICOM Chair

Section	Action	Responsible
12.2 SIBAS, Life in a changing ocean	Henn Ojaveer will maintain contact with Paul Snelgrove to keep SCICOM aware of progress with the Consortium.	Henn Ojaveer
12.2 SIBAS	Erik Olsen and Simon Jennings to discuss commonalities in the work of these Initiatives and identify any action that may be required to facilitate each other's work.	Erik Olsen, Simon Jennings
12.3 SSICC	SCICOM members agreed to continue the process of developing the ICES-PICES Strategic Initiative on Climate Change effects on Marine Ecosystems.	-
12.3 SSICC	A draft implementation plan will be drafted by the leaders of the initiative for final approval by SCICOM at the September 2011 meeting. The implementation plan will be submitted to PICES for approval at their annual Science Board meeting in October.	SSICCME leaders
12.4 SISAM	Stronger ACOM involvement will be requested at the joint meeting of the ACOM Leadership/SCICOM Business Group.	SCICOM and ACOM Chair
14 Symposia	Follow up on SCICOM decisions regarding requests for ICES co-sponsorship of symposia.	Secretariat
15 Resolutions	Follow up on SCICOM decisions regarding EG Resolutions.	Secretariat
15 WGISDAA	WGISDAA should also report to ACOM. Approved.	SSGESST Chair and Secretariat
15 WGISUR and WKIEFS	Since WGISUR and WKIEFS will be meeting back to back in January 2012, this should be specified. With this comments the ToRs for both groups were approved. Furthermore, it was recommended that the language in WGISUR ToRs be tightened to become more focused.	SSGESST Chair and Secretariat
15 WGIPS / WGNAPES	Approved.	SSGESST and Secretariat
15 WGMARS	WGMARS ToRs need to be addressed together with ACOM. Approval of WGMARS ToRs postponed for joint meeting of the ACOM Leadership/SCICOM Business Group.	SSGSUE Chair
15 WGE2E	Approval of WGE2E ToR is pending discussion with WGPBI on whether they wish merge their activities. SCICOM Chair to take the lead in communicating with the leaders. The resultant EG to recommend to SCICOM to what SSG they would like to report to.	SCICOM Chair
16 Dates for 2012 SCICOM May meeting:	The final dates for the SCICOM midterm in 2012 will be decided by correspondence. The Secretariat will send a doodle request asking SCICOM members to indicate their preferred meeting dates in March.	Secretariat

Annex 3: Minutes from the Joint Meeting of ACOM Leadership and SCICOM Business Group

ICES Secretariat, 5 May 2011, 14:30–18:00

Participants:

SCICOM: Manuel Barange (SCICOM Chair), Daniel Duplisea (SSGSUE Chair), Simon Jennings (SIBAS/WKMARBIO Chair), Mark Dickey-Collas (SISAM), Bill Karp (SSGESST Chair), Erik Olsen (SSGHIE Chair), Pierre Petitgas (SSGEF Chair), Yvonne Walther (SSGRSP Chair)

ACOM: Jean-Jacques Maguire (ACOM Chair), Han Lindeboom (ACOM Vice-Chair), Eugene Nixon (ACOM Vice-Chair), Carl O'Brien (ACOM Vice-Chair).

Secretariat: Poul Degnbol (Head of Advisory Programme- HoA), Gerd Hubold (General Secretary), Adi Kellermann (Head of Science Programme - HoS), Michala Ovens (Departmental Secretary, Advisory Programme), Vivian Piil (Departmental Secretary, Science Programme).

The meeting started with a tour de table introduction of all participants.

It was felt that the joint ACOM/SCICOM meeting held in September 2010 had been useful, but a less formal setup with a smaller number of participants would facilitate a more interactive conversation on key issues of common interest. In addition to the agreed agenda items, a number of issues were added during the SCICOM midterm meeting:

- Integrated advice for the Baltic;
- WGMARS, ecosystem overviews;
- WGITMO relationship with PICES and SISAM (also not entirely obvious why this group is parented under Advice);
- ICES participation in UN meeting on biodiversity from 31 May–3 June 2011;
- Working Group on Quantifying Fishing Mortality (WGQAF);
- Benchmarking, new models;

1 ACOM/ SCICOM activities: Updates

1.1 SCICOM/ACOM Strategic Initiative on area-based science and management (SIASM)

A short update was given by the SIASM Co-Chairs, Erik Olsen and Eugene Nixon. Countries see MSP as something within their own competence, but from the science point of view, sharing information is very useful. Another STIG-MSP meeting will be held in June and will be open to fresh participation. It will be discussed whether to have a new workshop in the autumn, and a joint workshop with HELCOM and OSPAR is also under consideration. Invitations will be extended to include the Black Sea and Mediterranean regions. STIG-MSP has already seen that some of the work was taken seriously by WGMPCZM, which has delivered a very good report, taking up some of the requests from STIG-MSP. As a concrete output from SIASM, an ICES Inside Out scientific article is in the pipeline, due to be finalised this year. The remaining challenge is to get input from the EGs, and this will be followed up on before the June meeting.

How long should this SI continue and how should it be followed up? The SI leaders were encouraged to start looking at an exit strategy.

Action: The SGMPAN ToR requests to other Expert Groups should be coordinated with SIASM/STIG-MSP.

1.2 SCICOM/ACOM strategic initiative on Biodiversity (SIBAS)

A short update was given by SIBAS Co-Chair, Simon Jennings. On the tactical side, SIBAS is aiming to support the political drivers, and on the strategic side to provide a forum to address biodiversity issues. An ICES funded workshop (WKMARBIO) was held in February with excellent input from outside ICES and clients, and also from a range of groups that are new to ICES. Positive feedback was received as they were quite impressed by ICES' capacity. WKMARBIO recommends a number of actions and the question now is how to follow up the opportunities from the workshop. SCICOM/ACOM agreed to review the WKMARBIO recommendations.

Action: Han Lindeboom agreed to lead the review of these actions.

WKMARBIO will help develop the science capacity on delivering advice on biodiversity. Building up the science base to prepare for the day when the advice is requested.

SCICOM recommended strong engagement with the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and it was agreed that ACOM and SCICOM will ask Bureau and Council whether there are political sensitivities preventing us from having stronger links with CBD. The issue about CBD was foreseen to be politically sensitive. It was mentioned that ICES could also link to FAO on this matter.

SIBAS leadership. Mark Tasker's term as ACOM vice-chair has already ended and Simon Jennings will rotate off SCICOM by the end of this year.

Action: New SIBAS leaders to be appointed by ACOM and SCICOM to start acting after the ASC 2011; SCICOM Chair to bring the possible MoU with CBD to Bureau.

1.3 SCICOM Strategic Initiative on Climate Change (SSICC)

The SCICOM Chair informed the meeting that this is a new SCICOM-driven Strategic Initiative that is closely linked with PICES, with value added of each organisation. The joint ICES/PICES WGFICCSFS will end its term this year and the idea is to formalise the activities of this group by identifying theme sessions for the ASC, ICES/PICES climate change symposia every three years, workshops, etc.). A draft implementation plan will be prepared by the leaders of the initiative for approval by SCICOM in September and approval by PICES Science Board at their annual meeting in October.

Although no direct ACOM involvement is needed at this point it was agreed that it would be appropriate to have an ACOM representative in the strategic initiative. Demands for advice may arise under the MSFD and a mechanism will be needed for advice to be fed through.

Decision: Han Lindeboom will represent ACOM on the ICES-PICES Strategic Initiative on Climate Change effects on Marine Ecosystems.

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

Mark Dickey-Collas gave an update on SISAM, which had not progressed well. SCICOM had questioned whether 1) the proposed way forward was innovative; 2) why they would not use existing data sets, and 3) why explicitly exclude multispecies models. In conclusion, SCICOM had agreed that with an issue so close to ACOM's responsibility, more ACOM involvement would be needed to move forward this initiative. ACOM Leadership agreed to this conclusion.

Action: ACOM leadership will appoint an ACOM representative to join this strategic initiative and provide guidance from the advisory side.

When this initiative was put to the table, the idea was to look at the global state of the art in stock assessment methods and to bring ICES to the fore in this field. The initial idea was a good one and Council was very keen on seeing this. Strategically it was agreed that dropping this initiative would send the wrong message. It was also agreed that SISAM's suggestion to hire consultants to do some of the preliminary work would not be appropriate.

While recognizing that there are many situations when single stock methods are needed some consideration of the state of the art in multispecies modelling should also be part of the remit. Closer link with the Methods WG would also be useful.

Action: The ACOM Chair will participate in the next SISAM WebEx and will follow the activities of SISAM more closely.

World Fisheries Congress

SCICOM has been asked to provide Chairs and suggest speakers for 8 sessions. Perhaps attendance of ACOM people should be invited.

Action: HoA and ACOM Chair to look at the ICES sessions and propose names.

1.5 SCICOM/ACOM Steering Group on the EC Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD)

There had been mixed reactions following the allocation of ToRs to EGs and given how it was received, it would be important that the EGs see that we make use of the data. A few EG reports have come back already with interesting input to the process.

ICES will take a lead in developing Descriptor 3 on Commercial Fisheries and Shellfish, but should also provide relevant information on other Descriptors. Some reservations from member states that ICES would be too fisheries-oriented and that this is an area (GES and targets) of national competence. A core group chaired by Gerjan Piet will produce a report in the autumn 2011, capturing relevant information from other working groups, which will be included.

There had not been a formal request for ICES to be involved in D3 and the question was raised why ICES is taking the lead on D3 and not the other descriptors (in particular D4, D8)? The core group will request information on any descriptor; but will be focusing on D3. HoA clarified that the ToRs will pick up on issues where ICES has relative strength and that this will not be provided as advice in the formal sense; this is unsolicited advice. ICES will offer a science report which can be used by anyone who wishes to do so.

There had been a recent suggestion to make an EG for each descriptor, but that should have been done a year ago. ICES has data for 11 descriptors, but not sufficiently structured.

It had been suggested by the EC that the core group will provide advice to the commission. The General Secretary commented that it should be made clear at the forthcoming MICC meeting that this is a scientific initiative. If the clients want advice they should come up with requests. There might be a future request on monitoring from OSPAR (and HELCOM). It was also mentioned that strategic funding has been used for the initiative and that this kind of funding will not be available in the future.

2 ACOM/ SCICOM Business: developing synergy

2.1 Integrated Ecosystem Assessments: The Baltic Commitment

Yvonne Walther reported that this was a product that came out of integrated assessments (IA). Claus Hagebro is the contact person in the Secretariat. A schedule has been developed and cooperation with HELCOM has started. This is an ICES contribution to the Baltic action plan and it may become part of the MSFD initiative. The basic idea was to bring ICES into the Baltic. We have now reactivated a good cooperation with HELCOM, although they have not been fully open with their data. As a result the IA people have struggled to get adequate data and are working with grey data.

It was noted that with the demise of the ICES GOOS group there is currently a lack of ICES leadership in developing coordination / observation systems. There is a need for the right framework and it could be connected to the Baltic.

It was noted that the "Taking the pulse of the Baltic Sea" initiative was adopted from the US "Ocean Pulse". The US side can help us develop the commitment further, for example through the SGEEST Chair, Bill Karp.

Finally, it was noted that the report commissioned to Chris Hopkins is also available as a background compilation of monitoring activities in the Baltic.

2.2 Survey issues: Ecosystem Approach, DCF, etc.

How can SCICOM/ACOM linkages and coordination be improved on survey issues and what can be done to improve science and advancing capabilities in surveys? Some EG ToR clearly require a closer relationship with the work under ACOM. WGSDAA is a new group which should report also to ACOM.

SCICOM and ACOM should coordinate more closely on input to the STECF periodic review of current surveys.

The idea of developing surveys to address the needs of the ecosystem approach, without losing the primary role of these surveys to support data for single stock assessments, may be pursued.

ICES provides input to the selection of surveys under the DCF and an extended perspective could be relevant under a revised DCF. The message from Paul Connolly was that data users will be involved in the next process. What would ICES suggest for the next DCF to make it more useful in a wider sense? We need to set up a process for a joint SCICOM/ACOM approach.

In the future it will be necessary to make priorities for the most important surveys. It has become evident that some countries are looking at reducing ship's time with implications for multinational survey programmes. Erik Olsen noted that Norway's prioritisation has a focus on data users and needs.

3 ACOM/ SCICOM business meetings at ASC 2011

Pending the final ASC programme, the HoS and HoA were asked to schedule the next joint meeting of the ACOM business group/SCICOM leadership. A meeting of 2–3 hours would be appropriate. It will be inevitable to have this meeting in parallel with theme sessions.

4 AOB

Integrated assessments/advice for the Baltic

The ACOM Chair had attended WGIAB and WGBFAS, which met back to back and that participants in both groups agreed that it would be possible to attempt to draft integrated advice for the Baltic Sea. An advice drafting group will be tasked to define what Integrated Assessment (IA) means and provide a straw proposal for how this can be done in the Baltic. There was agreement that this would be a useful exercise, the advice drafting group will be scheduled for November 2011.

Action: ToRs will be drafted/circulated by the ACOM Chair for agreement by all.

The Workshop on Benchmarking Integrated Ecosystem Assessments (WKBEMIA) will meet in November 2011. Last year a few challenges arose in relation to the Baltic benchmarks and these will have to be addressed. The process needs to be revitalised to attract the attendance of ecologists in the benchmark workshops.

Ecosystem overviews

Simon Jennings raised his concern that the ecosystem advice has been diluted / become fragmented over time. There were linkages to previous years and inconsistencies with comments in the ecosystem overview. At the outset the intention was that most of the material in the ecosystem overview should have a consequence in terms of the messages appearing in the advice. If you drew attention to an environmental signal, that would be followed up by a consequence.

Another issue is to get ecologists attending the Benchmark Workshops, which so far did not succeed.

Action: A subgroup consisting of Han Lindeboom, Carl O'Brien, Simon Jennings, and Yvonne Walther were asked to prepare a proposal for an improved structure and process for the ecosystem advice and report back to SCICOM and ACOM.

Working Group on Maritime Systems (WGMARS)

SCICOM had looked at the draft terms of reference for WGMARS. It was unfortunate that the draft resolution had been developed in isolation from ACOM. Since this would involve a big amount of work, it should be reviewed by ACOM. Maybe the debate should be moved into ACOM to reflect on own work. Doug Wilson's book was mentioned as inspiration to a debate on how science and policy interact.

Furthermore, it would be useful to have ACOM participation in the group (from the more reflective side). It was suggested that WGMARS could be linked to Theme Ses-

sion P at the ASC 2011 in Gdansk on “Interface between management and science - moving forward” convened by Kjartan Hoydal (NEAFC), Ásmundur Guðjonsson (NMC), and Hans Lassen (Denmark).

Action: Wider participation, and in particular by social scientists, would be welcomed. Encourage ACOM members and social scientists to participate in the WGMARS.

Working Group on Introduction and transfers of Marine Organisms (WGITMO) – relationship with PICES and SISAM

WGITMO has tried to establish cooperation with PICES and also had a ToR to expand their network to include the Mediterranean Science Commission (CIESM). PICES WG 21 had limited duration and was dissolved two years ago. For PICES to join forces with WGITMO they would have to create a new group. Perhaps they could be asked to create a long-term structure to facilitate cooperation with other organisations.

Currently WGITMO does not provide advice, but there is expectancy from clients that ICES is up to date in this field and able to provide advice. The groups (WGITMO and WGBOSV) have expressed a wish for closer linkages with the science side of ICES. It was agreed that the group(s) should also report to SCICOM.

Action: Secretariat to get in touch with the relevant parties to investigate the options for future cooperation on the matter.

ICES participation in UN meeting in NY on biodiversity, May 31–June 3

The Secretariat had been contacted in December 2010 by the UN with an invitation to participate in the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole on the Regular Process for Global Reporting and Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment, including Socio-economic Aspects (AHWG) scheduled to meet in New York, 14–17 February 2011. ICES was represented at this meeting by the Chair of the Study Group on Integration of Economics, Stock Assessment and Fisheries Management (SGIMM), Jörn Schmidt. There was strong support from SCICOM to get involved in the integrated assessments and the AHWG. The question of who should represent ICES at future meetings was raised and whether it would be appropriate to lift the representation?

Action: SCICOM to contact Jake Rice and ask if he is willing/able to participate as one of the co-leaders of the SIBAS initiative.

Coding of ToRs in relation to the ICES Science Plan

A simple procedure/performance tool has been established in SCICOM to monitor whether the High Priority Research Topics (HPRT) of the ICES Science Plan have been addressed and at the same time will highlight the gaps and overlaps

ACOM was invited to consider linking the ToRs of the advisory expert groups to the ICES Science Plan to see if advisory groups are responding to the ICES Science Plan. In the Supporting Information of Draft resolutions the groups could be asked to produce the linkage themselves, but in the first instance it will be the SSG chairs doing it.

The exercise will not show how well we are delivering but will show how we respond to the Science Plan!

ACOM agreed to link to the ICES Science Plan for 2012 to see how the advisory expert groups match HPRT. It was questioned if linkages could also be made to the Advisory Plan.

Action: Pierre Petitgas to provide ACOM with information on procedure/performance tool and experience.

Working Group on Quantifying All Fishing mortality (WGQAF)

The meeting was informed that the annual meeting of WGQAF was cancelled last year, as they had problems with participation and in particular attracting participation of assessment scientists. This was seen by SCICOM as an important topic and ICES would be missing out without this group. ACOM was asked whether it would be useful to try to rebuild the group, or whether it would be better to establish a joint (ACOM/SCICOM) workshop?

The perspective is quantifying mortality that is not normally quantified. More science is available that could be brought into the group. It needs to be brought into shape again. The group needs help to be engaged with the advisory process. Why is this not part of fish behaviour?

The ACOM Chair felt that there was no need for a working group to look at this every year. It would be more appropriate to have a workshop.

Action: SSGSUE Chair, Daniel Duplisea was asked to draft ToRs for a workshop with Norman Graham and Phil McMullen as Chairs (Steven Degraer was suggested as 3rd Chair).

Benchmarking and new models

The advisory toolbox needs to be increased to address various topics. Guidance from ACOM is requested on the outputs needed.

It was discussed whether process models such as larval drift, which are difficult to test and evaluate, could be considered in the benchmarking process. Is ACOM interested in this type of model? How can we operationalize these models and conduct sensitivity analysis that would satisfy ACOM?

It was noted that a) SCICOM has to be advised about benchmark workshops, and possibly engaged more proactively (e.g. by being asked to consider relevant EG/ scientists that could provide relevant information); b) whoever developed a model is welcome to benchmark workshops to present it, but it must be clear that when new models are introduced the benchmarks work has to be done beforehand.

It was noted that some models are not used because experts are not aware of them or do not know how to bring these to the attention of ACOM. The ICES Training Programme was envisaged to provide links between the science and advisory needs. A suggestion was made to consider this need in future ICES Stock Assessment courses.

Action: ACOM to ensure that benchmarking workshops are advertised to DL SCICOM. Proactive invitations to benchmarking workshops should be considered.

Closing of the meeting

ACOM and SCICOM Chairs thanked the attendees for their participation. All participants expressed the view that this had been a very valuable meeting. ACOM Leadership and SCICOM Business Groups should try to meet twice a year in the future.

The meeting was adjourned at 17:45.