

# ICES ACOM REPORT 2008

ICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ICES CM 2008/ACOM:56

## REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ACOM)

4-8 FEBRUARY 2008

ICES HEADQUARTERS, 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](http://www.ices.dk)  
[info@ices.dk](mailto:info@ices.dk)

Recommended format for purposes of citation:

ICES. 2008. Report of the Advisory Committee (ACOM), 4-8 February 2008, ICES  
Headquarters, Copenhagen. Diane. 34 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.

© 2008 International Council for the Exploration of the Sea

## Contents

---

<b>Contents</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>1 Preface</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2 Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>1</b>
2.1 Summary.....	1
<b>3 Action List</b> .....	<b>2</b>
3.1 ACOM Recommendations.....	2
<b>4 Opening and Welcome</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>5 Adoption of Agenda (Doc 1) and review of list of documents (Doc 2)</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>6 Tour-de-table: Presentation of members (Doc 3)</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>7 Presentation of the reform and the role of ACOM (Doc 11)</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>8 Organisation of the Science work</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>9 Assisting Council to Select a New ACOM Chair</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>10 Review of the performance of the Advisory Programme in 2007. (Doc 10)</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>11 Measuring Client Satisfaction</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>12 Meetings of relevance for ACOM since ASC 2007 (Doc 6)</b> .....	<b>9</b>
12.1 MIRAC.....	9
12.2 PECMAS .....	9
<b>13 Review of the Workplan for 2008 (Docs 5, 8, 9, and 21)</b> .....	<b>9</b>
13.1 <i>Pro bono publico</i> Advice.....	9
13.2 Linking scientific and advisory activities .....	10
13.3 Workplan 2008 (Doc 8).....	10
13.4 OSPAR Request on changes in distributions of environmental changes.....	11
13.5 Table of Content for 2008 (Doc 7) .....	12
<b>14 Strategic and Action Plans for the ICES Advisory Services (Doc 19a-c, Background documents 24-26)</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>15 ICES Science Plan</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>16 Ecosystem Integration in Advice</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>17 Working procedures and Guidelines for formulating advice in 2008 (Docs 12-18)</b> .....	<b>15</b>
17.1 Doc 12/13 Guidelines Data Compilation Workshops (DCWK).....	15
17.2 Doc 18: Benchmark Workshops (WKBENCH) .....	15
17.2.1 Reference points .....	15
17.3 Doc 14: Expert Group Guidelines: .....	16
17.4 Doc 15: Review Group Guidelines.....	16
17.4.1 Guidelines for Advice Drafting Groups.....	16
17.4.2 Participation of Advice Drafting Groups .....	17

<b>18</b>	<b>ACOM Working Procedure (Doc 17)</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>19</b>	<b>Research needs (Doc 20)</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>20</b>	<b>Upcoming meetings</b> .....	<b>20</b>
	20.1 WGRED ToRs.....	20
	20.2 MICC agenda.....	20
<b>21</b>	<b>Demonstration of the Webex system (Video Conferencing)</b> . ....	<b>20</b>
<b>22</b>	<b>Adoption of Minutes</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>23</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b> .....	<b>21</b>
	23.1 IUCN request from Norway .....	21
	23.2 Workshop on fisheries management in MPA's .....	21
<b>24</b>	<b>Closing the meeting</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>25</b>	<b>Annex I - List of Participants</b> .....	<b>22</b>
<b>26</b>	<b>Annex II - Agenda</b> .....	<b>25</b>
<b>27</b>	<b>Annex III - List of Documents</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<b>28</b>	<b>Annex IV - ACOMsubreview</b> .....	<b>29</b>
<b>29</b>	<b>Annex V - ACOMsubclient</b> .....	<b>29</b>
<b>30</b>	<b>Annex VI - ACOMsubformat</b> .....	<b>30</b>

## 1 Preface

---

On 19-20 February 2008 the International Council for Exploration of the Sea adopted resolutions reforming ICES advisory programme to form ICES Advisory Services. ACOM was established to lead the Advisory Service and to be responsible for the content of advice. This document reports on a meeting of ACOM that occurred prior to the 19-20 February Council resolutions. The meeting was necessary so that advice needs during the transition to the new Advisory Service would not be disrupted. In this regard, the meeting fulfilled its purpose. The meeting also addressed some issues without the benefit of subsequent decisions by the Council. Also, it was not possible to thoroughly analyze some issues in advance of the meeting. Therefore, this report should be considered indicative, rather than prescriptive, with respect to future ACOM activities.

The meeting was chaired by Paul Connolly (Ireland) on an interim basis since the Council had not yet selected an ACOM chair. The Council and the current chair thank Paul for unselfishly agreeing to serve as interim chair. They also thank Paul and all of the participants in the meeting for the fine job they did under unusual situation where the nature of ACOM was still evolving in the eyes of the Council. As a result of the Council's decisions, ACOM is now empowered, and it will be in a position to act decisively in the future on behalf of the Council and scientific community, in order to serve users of scientific advice, stakeholders and society in general.

Michael Sissenwine

Chair, ICES Advisory Committee

## 2 Executive Summary

---

### 2.1 Summary

ACOM considers ACFM, ACE, and ACME dissolved.

Guidelines for Data Compilation Workshops, Benchmark Workshops, Expert groups, Review groups and Advice drafting groups were adopted and are found in Annexes VII-XII.

A set of working procedures for ACOM itself was adopted.

These guidelines and working procedures shall be reviewed at ASC 2008 and at the next ACOM meeting in the light of the experience that will have been gained.

ACOM discussed the job description of the ACOM chair

ACOM established subgroups to work intersessionally with 1) the strategic plan, 2) the format of advice, 3) with a survey to measure client satisfaction, and 4) the internal auditing procedure of the performance of the Advisory Services.

### 3 Action List

---

#### 3.1 ACOM Recommendations

1. that Council consider using the job description and qualifications in its selection process for the ACOM Chair. Based on this description the position will require a commitment of 6 months per year.
2. that Council considers the role of Stakeholders at Benchmark Workshops
3. that ConC membership should include an ACOM member.

#### Immediate Action

1. Mark Tasker was asked to take the lead in contacting FAO, IUCN, HELCOM and OSPAR with the aim to set up a joint workshop to handle this request. Jake Rice was considered a suitable chair should he be available. Target timeline will be for ASC 2008 having a workshop dealing with the request during summer 2008.
2. Appoint member for ConC subgroup to define the scope and function of each level in the new science structure and to define key programmes and ToRs for new Committees/Programmes.

#### Subgroups (All to report back to the ASC 2008)

1. ACOM decided to develop this further at a **subgroup ACOMsubreview**. Annex IV presents ToRs for this group
2. ACOM established a **Subgroup to develop Questionnaire for ICES relations with Clients and Stakeholders on its advisory function**. The TORs are given in Annex V
3. ACOM established a **Subgroup on the drafting of ICES ACOM Strategic Plan**. ToRs will be developed by the ACOM Chair. The Subgroup should also, between now and the ConC meeting in May 2008, consider the research needs for ACOM. ConC should be represented by 2 persons in this subgroup. Furthermore, consider the definitions of ecoregions.
4. ACOM established a **Subgroup on the format of the ICES advice** [ACOMsubformat] ToR in Annex VI.

### **For ACOM agenda at ASC 2008**

1. Adopt a plan on how to implement integration in the long run based on discussion paper from ACOM (Vice)Chairs
2. Plan for reviewing WGRED and other relevant expert groups (e.g. integrated assessments; multispecies assessments) that have a direct input into an advisory product
3. The positions and structure of the current Vice Chairs in 2009/2010 needs to be decided on by ACOM at the ASC 2008 meeting.
4. The efficiency of the organisation of Expert Groups in relation to Review Groups and Advice Drafting Groups.
5. Guidelines for the (re)setting of ICES biological reference points (both for fisheries and environmental/ecological standards) are to be drafted for the use of any groups that deal with changing reference points
6. In connection with the 2009 planning, review the new process of the Advisory Services based on experience from the first half of 2008.
7. For 2009 review at the ASC ACOM meeting the option to have the ACOM meeting in late November or early December instead of a meeting in February

### **For ACOM general**

1. Keep review of the performance of the ICES Advisory Services on the standard ACOM agenda.
2. The Chair and vice Chairs can select the core group members. It was agreed that the vice Chairs will develop a proposal in the work plan in the coming week for the ACOM to consider and adopt.
3. ACOM endorses the Council resolution on the reform of the Advisory Services (October 2007) that stakeholder observers should be allowed access to all ACOM elements in the work line of ACOM groups, except at Expert Groups.
4. **MIRAC 2009:** ICES shall present a more integrated approach to advice to MIRAC 2009.
5. The ConC chair and the ACOM leadership will identify a process or forum by which information from Expert reports can be found and used as potential *Pro bono publico* advice. The ConC chair informed that this item will be on the agenda for the ConC meeting in May 2008.

### **For Secretariat Action**

1. Extended summaries of the reports must be made available when uploading reports to the ICES website.
2. The status of the STGQAB report to be taken up at the MICC meeting in April.
3. Maintain a list of national member/alternate responsible per request/advice
4. Act on a number of action points in relation to the MICC meeting.
  - a. a presentation of the ICES science strategic plan be added to the agenda.
  - b. agenda should include an item to attract HELCOM and DG Environment, e.g. a review of the advisory needs from the Marine strategy directive or the use of MPAs.
  - c. to contact the client commissions to propose to invite stakeholder observers to MICC in order to increase transparency of the advisory process.

- d. Delegates are not all directly involved with the ICES advice. In order to get more involvement of national management authorities in the MICC meeting, the secretariat should raise with the Delegates if they could be represented at MICC by national management authorities.
- e. Clients should be asked if the currently defined ecoregions fit their needs.
- f. In the absence of approval of the client commissions to invite stakeholder observers to the 2008 MICC meeting, the item of observers should be added to the agenda with the consent of Clients.

## 4 Opening and Welcome

---

The Chair, Paul Connolly opened the meeting and informed the meeting that he is only chairing this first meeting. Gerd Hubold, General Secretary, welcomed the Advisory Committee (ACOM) to its first meeting and wished the new Committee a good meeting.

The participants list is annexed to this report (Annex XX). The Committee was informed that the Belgian member and the Faroese member would join the meeting later in the week. Greenland, Iceland, Poland and USA were not presented at the meeting. Greenland, Poland and USA had sent their regrets.

The Chair in his introduction noted that a lot of changes have occurred in ICES during the past few years and that the planning of changing the advisory system has been going on for the past two years. A lot of work has gone into the process of getting the new ACOM established. The vice-chairs were thanked for all their hard work during this process.

Paul Connolly finished his introduction with a quote from the 1930s: *“The difficulty lies not so much in developing new ideas as in escaping from old ones”* by John Maynard Keynes.

## 5 Adoption of Agenda (Doc 1) and review of list of documents (Doc 2)

---

The agenda was adopted with no additional points added. The agenda and list of documents are in Annexes II-III. Concerning the role of the ACOM, the Chair quoted two decisions made by the Council when establishing the ACOM:

*“The Council establishes its Advisory Services to be led by an Advisory Committee authorized to give advice on behalf of the Council.”*

and:

a ) *“The main tasks of the Advisory Committee are in the governance and oversight of the Advisory Services, i.e. points ii) and iii) above. This includes establishing and implementing procedures to deliver the advice. The Council therefore delegates to the Committee the ability to establish the mechanisms necessary to prepare and disseminate advice subject to a protocol satisfying the following criteria:*

- i ) *Objectivity and integrity;*
- ii ) *Openness and transparency;*
- iii ) *Quality assurance and peer review;*
- iv ) *Integrated advice – based on an ecosystem approach;*
- v ) *Efficiency and flexibility;*
- vi ) *National consensus”*



## 6 Tour-de-table: Presentation of members (Doc 3)

---

The participants each used 2 minutes to present themselves. There were in total 22 participants among whom a total of 13 persons had fisheries background while 9 had environment and/or ecosystem background. The “ACFM” take-over of ACOM had not materialised and the background diversity of ACOM members was noted.

## 7 Presentation of the reform and the role of ACOM (Doc 11)

---

This agenda point was based on reports from the Bureau meeting 15 January 2008, CWG report December 2007 and Council resolution October 2007.

The key drivers for the changes have been 1) a need to move to integrated advice, 2) the advisory mechanism has been seen as inflexible and closed, and 3) a need for a better link between science and advice.

The General Secretary informed the Committee that the Council has assigned a budget for the advisory services and the General Secretary is responsible for this budget. The ACOM will be asked to look into the cost efficiency of the adopted annual workplan. Council expects this reform to be cost neutral in the long term. The Bureau had proposed to provide additional funding to the advisory system during the initial starting phase.

As in previous years it should be sought to have a balance of workload between countries regarding human resources in the review groups and advice drafting groups. The resources of the national laboratories should of course also be cost effectively used and it is recognised that the number of meetings days for expert groups has a limit.

The ACOM was informed that there will be a thorough communication to the ICES community, Commissions and other bodies on the new structure after the Council meeting later this February.

The presentation was followed by a number of questions from the Committee on the working procedures of the advisory system and the role and tasks of ACOM. Paul Connolly will present these comments to Council as part of his report on the ACOM work. Below a summary of issues that were taken up:

### 1. How independent will ACOM be of the Council?

The Council has delegated to ACOM authority for running the advisory process, and there will be no interference from the Council on the advice given by the ACOM. Quoting from the CWG report: *“The content of scientific advice should be solely ACOM’s responsibility not subject to modification by any other ICES entity.”*

### 2. How to maintain the high quality in the advice?

ACOM will be ‘thinner’ in term of competence compared to the former advisory committees. The underlying system of workshops, expert and review group should vouch for the scientific quality while the Advice drafting Group should form a sound basis for high quality advice. During the process of moving towards one Committee it has been stressed many times that it is important for ICES to speak with one voice, but it has also been recognised that one person cannot be an expert of all fields. Where the vice-chairs do not have expert knowledge they can designate experts for advice presentation.

### 3. How to ensure consistency over areas with the new ACOM system?

The vice-chairs are to ensure the consistency in the advice by having a role in all of the advice drafting groups. In continuation of this, the role of ACOM to nominate experts for each review and advice drafting group followed. Advice drafting groups are to consist of experts involved with the topic and also with

independent experts who are not politically involved (from countries not effected by the advice) with the stock or issue. The procedure of handling special requests will continue along the same lines as previously.

4. Discussions about the profile of an ACOM member had taken place in several countries prior to the meeting, and in continuation the profile of an advice drafting group member was also raised at the meeting. It was considered important that the person in an advice drafting group has skills to translate the information into a language that the managers can understand, rather than being a purely technical expert.
5. Mark Tasker informed on the experience with advice given in the end of January 2008 to OSPAR concerning the MPA and threatened species requests. The national ACOM members had in some cases delegated the responsibility to adopt the advice to a particular alternate without informing the Secretariat. It was considered very useful to have a list at the end of the ACOM meeting of who will cover each request from each country (Workplan, Annex VI).

The meeting agreed that ACOM is not only an advice generating body but also includes advice planning and overseeing the advisory process and expansion of the task compared to the old advisory committees.

## 8 Organisation of the Science work

---

The ConC Chair, Harald Loeng, presented an outline for the new science structure. The Council has not yet made a decision on the proposal from ConC. A ConC subgroup will be established and meet to define the scope and function of each level in the new science structure and to define key programmes and ToRs for new Committees/Programmes. An ACOM member will participate in this group. The outcome from this group shall go to the Council to hopefully be adopted in autumn 2008 for implementation in 2009.

## 9 Assisting Council to Select a New ACOM Chair

---

Paul Connolly informed the Committee that Council will appoint the first chair of the Advisory Committee at a special meeting in two weeks time. In order to assist Council, ACOM should present additional candidate names for a Chair of ACOM. The Chair encouraged ACOM members to discuss this in the margins of the reception during the evening.

ACOM discussed and developed some important considerations in relation to a job description, qualifications and time commitment for the new ACOM Chair.. This was to enable potential candidates to reflect on the demands of the job and the time commitment required.

**Job description:** The Chair must be a strategic thinker and have strong leadership skills. The ACOM chair will be the general ICES representative with Client Commissions and ICES internally; the 3 Vice Chairs will be the presenters of the specific advice to Clients and other stakeholders. The indications are that the job will require about 75 days (3 months) for meetings and travel time. However ACOM would point out that ‘strategic thinking and networking time’ is an important element of the job. Overall, the whole job needs certain flexibility in time. The position would last for the transitional first 3 year period (possibly extended with one year). Afterwards ACOM will decide on the division of labour and a number of Vice Chairs needed.

**Qualifications:** The Chair needs to be a professional leader with very good communications skills and an ability to listen to clients, the ACOM, secretariat, and other stakeholders. The position requires knowledge of regional policy, research and science issues. The Chair is a socially talented manager that can achieve consensus from a broad range of diverse views. The Chair will lead ACOM as a strategic body, not an executive body digging into technical

issues. A generalist is needed to cover the broad range of advisory issues that will be requested (e.g. climate, chemistry, mammals, fish). The issue of the quality of advice is also critical. The ACOM chair should be a broad minded and experienced person who is a strategic thinker, a good listener and who can set direction and lead. Resource allocation from national laboratories is an important subtask. Desirable candidates will have a good knowledge of ICES.

The group discussed different scenarios for time commitment.

**12 Month per year position:** This is the option that is laid down in the Council Resolution October 2007. Council made this proposal to be able to get a dedicated professional Chair in close cooperation with the Secretariat. Parts of the tasks dealt with by the Head of the Advisory programme may be merged into this position. A full time commitment will make this position part of the Secretariat but imbedding this position in the Secretariat may give governance problems on responsibilities. On the positive side experience tells us that it can be easier to work with a person fully involved with no other distractions. The multitude of advice will make it difficult to find one person qualified and available for presentations at the same time.

**Part-time position:** The job asks for the coverage of a broad scope, lead by a generalist that can represent ACOM and bring together the different subjects. Diversity of network and knowledge, also on a technical basis, can only be covered with a strategic Chair with support of vice chairs. The vice chairs and their consecutive networks have so far proved to be an added value even at this short period. One chair and one vice chair on a full time basis are believed to work less efficient. A position between 3 – 6 months is thought to be sufficient for this, with a minimum of 6 months is thought most suitable.

**ACOM recommends** that Council consider using the components of the job description and qualifications in its selection process for the ACOM Chair. ACOM considers that the position will initially require a commitment of 6 months per year but flexibility will be required. ACOM provided Council with an additional candidate list to help in the selection process for a new chair. .

Vice Chairs are only employed for 2008. The new chair will need support by the vice Chairs and ACOM suggests that the vice chairs appointed by Council should not all be replaced within one year. This is accordance with the proposal from the Council Working Group (December 2007).

**Action:** The positions and structure of the current Vice Chairs in 2009/2010 needs to be decided on by ACOM at the ASC 2008 meeting.

## 10 Review of the performance of the Advisory Programme in 2007. (Doc 10)

---

Reviewing performance of the Advisory Services is an important task for ACOM. Doc 10 is a first attempt to audit the ICES Advisory Programme's performance in 2007.

Examples of problematic issues in 2007:

1. ACE received a complex climate change request from OSPAR that was tackled by setting up an intricate system of Expert Groups, but this integrated approach has not succeeded yet. A subgroup is set up to deal with this during ACOM.
2. In ACME guidelines for biological measurements have been an issue for a number of years, for which two joint steering groups are responsible. Lack of attendance at these groups made it difficult to answer the requests.

3. Both ACE and ACME were challenged with a continuous stream of requests with deadlines throughout the year for which many face-to-face and correspondence meetings were organised.
4. Examples of issues in ACFM that came up after ACFM meetings include assessments and advice on two contentious herring stocks. Doc 10 concludes that procedures and responsibilities were not clear which created problems. This was shown for Norwegian spring spawning herring where an undocumented methodology change led to unexpected forecast results and a consecutive change in the advice. For North Sea herring an additional request from the EU Commission was provided as a technical function, but not via the ACFM procedure. This created confusion as to the actual ICES advice. This led to the conclusion that procedures within the expert group need to be better documented, and that responsibility of Expert, Review, Advice Drafting Groups, ACOM and secretariat needs to be clear.

The Advice report itself was reviewed. There are examples of repeated texts (general introduction) and the place for integrated and multi species advice is not clear and needs to be reconsidered. A first stab at classification of the types of advice per stock and region was presented and this task will be concluded.

ACOM found that Doc 10 was useful but that the document should be further developed and established a subgroup to look at the review of the advice 2007 (ACOMsubreview).

ACOM shall provide lists of stocks for which advice is needed in 2008 as input to the Fisheries Expert Groups (Generic ToR) and AMAWGC (meets 25-29 February) needs that input for the detailed planning of activities in 2008. ACOM asked ACOMsubreview also to propose these lists, thereby identifying stocks for which no advice will be given in 2008. The subgroup should also consider whether there are stocks where ICES has not given advice before but where advice should now be given.

ACOM considered the review useful. ACOM will consider such reviews in the coming years.

ACOM decided to develop this further at a **subgroup ACOMsubreview**. Annex IV presents ToRs for this group

## 11 Measuring Client Satisfaction

ACOM needs to come to grips with measuring Client satisfaction (content/format/transparency) and decided to develop a questionnaire/interview directed at clients including member states, NGOs and RACs/stakeholders. ACOM considered that information and quality assurance questionnaires from national institutes could serve as a basis. Doug Wilson quoted experience written surveys: 5% response, and concluded that telephone, or even better, interviewing works better. ACOM will press on with the development of surveys of Client satisfaction and will draw upon experience from these national surveys on how best to commence, e.g. develop a standard list of questions based on national questionnaires. ACOM established a subgroup on the development of questionnaires. This subgroup would report by mid-May 2008. This might allow the survey to be conducted in connection with the advisory report developed in 2008. ACOM foresaw a discussion at the ASC, where representatives from the different user groups could be present. This may possibly be in 2009. ACOM should be proactive in inviting specific people from national governments and stakeholders to such a session

ACOM established a **Subgroup to develop Questionnaire for ICES relations with Clients and Stakeholders on its advisory function**. The TORs are given in Annex V

## 12 Meetings of relevance for ACOM since ASC 2007 (Doc 6)

---

### 12.1 MIRAC

Martin Pastoors presented the summary of discussions held with the RACs. The document presents his conclusions as the final report is not yet available.

The meeting considered the RAC experience during the last year working with ICES. There were 67 RAC meetings and ICES were invited to 30 meetings where scientific input was sought. ICES participated in 21 of these 30 meetings. The RACs were satisfied with the presentation of ICES advice but there seems to be a need for better coordination between the RACs and ICES about important meetings and input needed.

Other issues highlighted was how the RACs and ICES can work together to improve the quality of the data used for fish stock assessments. Some RACs repeated their wish to directly (and not via the Commission) to submit requests regarding research and advisory needs to ICES.

Hans Lassen commented that Martin Pastoors presentations of the advice at RAC meetings were very well received by RAC members.

The overall conclusion was that it was a useful meeting with exchange views. Overlaps between RACs activities were shown. Concrete improvements about quality of fisheries advice were not agreed. The main concern was about stocks with little information. There was no consensus on e.g. catch information, discards etc. and how to address that. Actually not many concrete results emerged.

Mark Tasker reminded the meeting that the RACs consist of 2/3 the industry and 1/3 other interests. These NGO organisations are very interested in topics such as protected areas. ICES already provided some advice on MPAs. Four RACs are arranging a meeting on 5-6/3 where e.g. the EMPAS project will be presented and the EU will inform about EU requirements. Information about the MPA meeting was placed on the SharePoint site. Mark Tasker also mentioned that this year only DG FISH was present at MIRAC and that there was nobody from Environment which is not a good signal for the integrated process.

ACOM agreed with this view and found that MIRAC needs to be broadened to more than fisheries alone.

**MIRAC 2009:** ICES shall present a more integrated approach to advice to MIRAC 2009.

### 12.2 PECMAS

Hans Lassen informed ACOM about the NEAFC PECMAS meeting in London 19-20 October 2007. OSPAR had at the PECMAS meeting made a presentation on topics where OSPAR finds that NEAFC and OSPAR should work closely together to the point of formulating joint OSPAR / NEAFC requests. There seems to be a parallel thinking of the two organisations towards an integrated management approach.

## 13 Review of the Workplan for 2008 (Docs 5, 8, 9, and 21)

---

### 13.1 *Pro bono publico* Advice

Paul Keizer presented a paper on *Pro bono publico* Advice (Doc. 5). To ensure full value of Expert Group work it was considered that important information and advice from such reports should be collected even when not requested by Clients. E.g. the REGNS report was not

published as an advisory document while the WGPDMO work on an indicator to ecosystem health was presented to OSPAR. The presentation of the ecosystem health indicator report caused OSPAR to come back with a request as a follow up. Providing this kind of *Pro bono* advice to client commissions is a strategic decision of the ACOM. The meeting noted that information might only be sought in the work of ICES expert group there may also be relevant information from national studies. The paper outlines some elements to a solution of the problem.

### 13.2 Linking scientific and advisory activities

The question is how best link scientific and advisory activities. ACOM recognised the obligation of the ICES Advisory Services to be more proactive, find the relevant science and link it to advice. As shown by the ecosystem health indicator example: raising awareness by clients by providing this kind of information/advice may spark future requests. Regarding the cooperation with ConC it was agreed that ACOM should ask for at least one seat in Conc.

**ACOM recommends** that ConC membership should include an ACOM member.

The paper recognised that ConC and the Science Committees have no forum where science could draw the advisory committee's attention to material that might be useful and repeated the often made statement that this communication problem should be addressed in the Science reform process. ACOM needs also to be proactive in obtaining the information from the science groups and not only the other way around as the present formulation in the draft report indicates. The point ACOM wants to make is that the summary of the science reports should be easily available for down loading and not only as a part of an often very large report.

**Action:** Extended summaries of the reports must be made available when uploading reports to the ICES website.

**Action:** The ConC chair and the ACOM leadership will identify a process or forum by which information from Expert reports can be found and used as potential *Pro bono publico* advice. The ConC chair informed that this item will be on the agenda for the ConC meeting in May 2008

### 13.3 Workplan 2008 (Doc 8)

Three Subgroups each chaired by a vice chair were established to scrutinise the timing of meetings, resource and names proposed as reviewers and participants in advice drafting groups. Furthermore, the Table of Contents of the 2008 report was commented upon.

The chairs presented the outcome of the subgroups which had identified some generic issues:

1. ACOM will have access to all documents related to advice. SharePoint sites for advice items have been established for this purpose.
2. Integration between disciplines to provide 'Integrated advice' is missing in the plan.

**Action:** ACOM is to come up with a plan on how to implement integration in the long run

**Responsible:** ACOM (Vice)Chairs

**By:** ASC a proposal will be finalised

3. A review process for the regional ecosystem descriptions is missing. More in general, there are a number of expert groups under the science committees that provide useful input to regional overviews (e.g. WGIAB) and the species interactions (e.g. multispecies working groups)

**Action:** ACOM to develop a plan for reviewing WGRED and other relevant expert groups (e.g. integrated assessments; multispecies assessments) that have a direct input into an advisory product

**Responsible:** ACOM vice-chairs

**By:** ASC 2008

4. HELCOM has not requested advice from ICES in 2008. However, the ICES Steering group on quality assurance for biological measurements (STGQAB) STGQAB ToRs include topics related to the HELCOM monitoring and assessment scheme (ToRs c)-d) and on harmonisation of HELCOM and OSPAR monitoring schemes with QA/AQC requirements of European Water Framework Directive, ToRs e)-f). As there is no requested advice there is no review established for the HELCOM related topics leaving the quality assurance of this 'advice' unverified. This should be taken up with HELCOM and in general ACOM needs to work on improving the link with HELCOM.

**Action:** The status of the STGQAB report to be taken up at the MICC meeting in April.

**By:** Hans Lassen

5. When reports from several Expert Groups are reviewed by the same Review Group, all EG chairs should participate or be available for information for the Review Group.

**Action:** The ACOM meeting in September will address the efficiency of the organisation of Expert Groups in relation to Review Groups and Advice Drafting Groups.

There were several specific comments. The workplan was updated at the instruction of the Chair by the Vice Chairs and the Secretariat. The updated workplan is found as Annex VI.

### 13.4 OSPAR Request on changes in distributions f environmental changes

ICES has been asked for an *assessment of changes in the distribution and abundance of marine species in the OSPAR maritime area in relation to changes in hydrodynamics and sea temperature*. This was a two-year request, ending by June 2008.

A particular problem on the arrangements for how to answer the OSPAR request on changes in distributions from environmental changes was addressed in a special subgroup chaired by Mark Tasker and with Eric Jagtman, Fritz Köster, Reidar Toresen, and Bill Turell as participants. The Group revised the workplan for how this request could be addressed but maintained that the integration of the contributions be done in WGECO. Furthermore the review of the request was left unchanged.

The original plan for this second year was to have established four ad-hoc groups:

1. *Ad hoc* Group on Hydrographic Attributes to produce files of recommended timeseries;
2. *Ad hoc* Group on Analytical Methods to provide recommended analysis methods and pointers to suitable software;
3. *Ad hoc* Group on Hypotheses to provide a suite of hypotheses and guidance for their use in specific applications and for interpretation of results;
4. *Ad hoc* Group on Species to provide a list of species for intensive study, and pointers to best data sources.

In the event, it proved very difficult to establish the second and fourth of these groups but the first and third group has provided reports (the third on 5 February 2008). The four reports of these groups were due to be passed to all relevant expert groups in order to enable them to then carry out further work and analyses; the first of these expert groups (WGMME) meets on 25-29 February.

It is apparent that at present the expert groups will not have enough expert guidance to meet their needs and ensure a relatively even product is made available for WGECO to assemble into a draft final report at their meeting in mid May 2008 (in time for processing through the ICES review and advisory systems).

The Advisory Committee devised an emergency procedure using individual experts to provide input instead of Groups 1 and 4. These experts would need to provide input by 23 February. The subgroup identified such experts.

It is apparent that WGECO has a very heavy workload at its meeting in May. It would seem wise to attempt to augment WGECO's ranks for its meetings this year; this could be through asking expert groups for experts to join WGECO, or Advisory Committee members shall find suitable experts.

### **13.5 Table of Content for 2008 (Doc 7)**

The Subgroups dealing with the Work Plan also considered the TOC. Only minor comments were presented. This was finalised by the Secretariat and Vice Chairs.

## **14 Strategic and Action Plans for the ICES Advisory Services (Doc 19a–c, Background documents 24–26)**

---

The Agenda suggested that the Advisory Strategic Plan and the Action Plan might be two separate documents. However, The Council considered that the time horizon for the Strategic plan might be 3-5 years which could suggest that the strategic and action plan might be one document only. The issues were therefore discussed together.

Doc 19a describes the structure for updating the ICES Strategic Plan and Council has adopted this structure. The structure includes an overall ICES Strategic Plan supplemented by at least three sector plans: one for ACOM, one for science and one for the Secretariat. In addition there might be plans for ICES Database work and for ICES publication tasks. There are four core values: objectivity, highest quality, being responsive, and openness. GH mentioned points discussed at the Council which include: the mandate to develop the Advisory Strategic Plan is with ACOM, the Plan should contain immediate and achievable goals, it should not repeat general issues, the report should be short and the time horizon is about 5 years.

Doc 19b is a draft Advisory Strategic Plan developed as a first draft. The presentation focused on the headlines the plan could contain. It was specifically mentioned that ACOM shall be proactive "...advocating that decision makers consider the ecosystem as an integrated system".

The discussion noted that ICES might want to cooperate with not only be marine science organisation but for instance also fresh-water organisations might be relevant. In the text of doc 19b "marine" should be replaced with "relevant" organisations.

The ACOM chair stressed the importance that the plan as proposed includes performance indicators.

Documents 24 – 26 were briefly noted as background for the discussion on what a Strategic/Action plan might include

**Doc 24: The 2007 ACE Workplan.** Much of it relates to the ecosystem approach and integration. There is still a need for managers to develop a useful structure that can be used in ecosystem advice, although there are a few success stories. The improvement of the ecosystem approach and integration is fitting well into the ICES Science Plan focus issues as they were presented by Harald Loeng. Also spatial planning was a high priority issue for ACE. ACE



probably was more tactic than strategic in its Workplan, and hopefully ACOM will be more strategic

Doc 25: The 2007 ACFM Workplan contains 5 main items:

- i. Fisheries based advice. E.g. SGMIXMAN in January 2008.
- ii. Target based management. Johannesburg 2002 the inspiration. E.g. WGBREF in 2008.
- iii. Long Term Management. E.g. SGMAN November 2008. Dialogue with stakeholders and managers is suggested.
- iv. Ecosystem approach. Not a lot of progress yet. Hopefully this can be improved.
- v. Responsiveness and transparency of advice. Fast track advice and observers has worked quite well.

**Doc 26: The 2007 ACME Workplan.** The development from OSPAR requests on background concentrations has been a challenge for ICES. Biological and chemical measurements and quality assurance has been an issue. *Pro bono publico* advice: about 40 reports have been referred to ACME and element in many of these can be extracted and are potentially suitable to put forward as ICES advice. This work could be improved much in the future.

ACOM considers that MPAs is a very important issue and standardisation of the approaches across the ICES areas.

It was also mentioned that ICES should try to influence the external funding agencies to support these selected focus points for research.

The overall ICES Strategy Plan states that ICES should deliver "...what managers need..." and not what they "ask" for. This fits in with the aim of ACOM to be proactive.

Council will at its October 2008 meeting consider the updated ICES Strategic Plan including an Advisory Service Strategic Plan. ACOM should before September 2008 to develop its Strategic Plan

ACOM established a **Subgroup** on the drafting of ICES ACOM Strategic Plan

Chaired by the ACOM Chair

Members are: the Vice Chairs, Reidar Toresen, Chris Zimmerman, Paul Connally, Johan Modin, ConC representative.

ToR to be drafted by the new Chair,

Deadline ASC 2008.

The subgroup will work intersessionally to develop a draft for consideration at the ACOM Consultations in September.

## 15 ICES Science Plan

Harald Loeng (CONC Chair) presented the ICES Science Plan developed at a Council Working Group (CWGISS) meeting in January 2008. There were 21 participants from 13 countries, including several Delegates. The report was not yet available but presents a Science Plan for ICES. [This Science Plan refers to two goals from the ICES Strategic Plan](#), client's needs and cooperation with other organisations. As for the Advisory Plan the time horizon should be about 5 years. He mentioned the High Priority Research Themes (HPRT) of which several have a direct link to the Advisory Service research needs. Four main areas were

considered: 1) Understanding ecosystem functioning, 2) Understanding of Human impact, 3) Development of Options for sustainable use of ecosystem, and 4) Operational issues. Among issues of high relevance was mentioned impact on climate changes, spatial planning, operational ecosystem modelling, and integration of surveys and technology. In total 17 topics was highlighted. CWGISS also discussed candidate committees and programmes for the new science structure.

The focus is on issues most important for the advice services.

## **16 Ecosystem Integration in Advice.**

---

A Round Table session was conducted on ACOM member's thoughts on ecosystem integration in advice. The Chair wrapped up the Round Table inputs on "integration" in the following headlines:

- Integration is a continuum and we must move along this continuum taking small steps. It is an evolution not a revolution;
- We have a new structure in place that allows us to move forward with integration;
- Vice Chairs have built up a strong working team and broken down old barriers. This is an important part of the integration process;
- Socio economic aspects: the Council have several times struggled with this issue and turned it down;
- ICES needs to broaden the expert base of advisory Expert Groups;
- Receiving culture of the advice – the client needs to ask the right questions.

It was mentioned that ACOM should carefully work out the ToRs for relevant Expert Groups in 2009 before and at the ASC 2008, and make sure that for instance a broader expert base at Expert Groups is planned for.

## 17 Working procedures and Guidelines for formulating advice in 2008 (Docs 12–18)

---

ACOM adopted a set of guidelines that shall be used for the development of the advice in 2008. ACOM will review these guidelines in the light of the experiences that will be gained during the first half year of 2008 in September 2008 with a view to amend the guidelines. The guidelines will be further developed in the course of the implementation of the ICES Advisory Services. These guidelines will be kept updated on the Advice SHAREPOINT site <http://groupnet.ices.dk/advice2008/default.aspx> and are not considered final as a result of this meeting.

Rules for access to advisory groups by stakeholder as participants and as observers are dealt with under ACOM Working Procedures. Likewise payment for travel and subsistence to participants in the various types of groups are also found under the ACOM working procedures and are not discussed separately under the guidelines for the individual types of groups.

The Committee was split into 3 subgroups that discussed the different documents. What follows is the report back to the plenary session.

### 17.1 Doc 12/13 Guidelines Data Compilation Workshops (DCWK)

ACOM accepted the approach to apply DCWKs only to Benchmark Workshops in 2008. For 2009 the scope of this type of Workshops will be widened and other possible Expert Groups will be considered such as update assessment and environmental Expert Groups. Stakeholders are invited as members. Quality criteria were set up in a general fashion.

### 17.2 Doc 18: Benchmark Workshops (WKBENCH)

This type of workshop is intended to reduce the workload of fisheries assessment Expert Groups. ACOM agrees with this for 2008 but for 2009 a wider remit for benchmarking (environment/multi species) should be considered. Criteria for acceptance of new methodologies must be taken up in the text.

ACOM considered the presence of stakeholders during Benchmark Workshops. This issue was whether stakeholders would be allowed as observers or as participants or whether they would not be allowed at all. The discussion was not resolved and ACOM brings this to the attention of the Council to consider in its discussion of observer participation in ICES groups.

**Action:** Council to consider the role of Stakeholders at Benchmark Workshops

#### 17.2.1 Reference points

ACOM shall guide on (re)setting of biological reference points. This can occur in connection with benchmarks or at special meetings organised to review reference points. Reference points are required both in fish stock assessments and as environmental reference point. Guidelines for fish stock reference points were established by ACFM in 1997-1998.

**Action:** Guidelines for the (re)setting of ICES biological reference points (both for fisheries and environmental/ecological standards) are to be drafted for the use of any groups that deal with changing reference points

By: Mark Tasker and Martin Pastoors before ASC 2008.

### 17.3 Doc 14: Expert Group Guidelines:

A separate subheading for ‘update assessment groups’ is added, the rest of the text is compatible for all Expert Groups.

Only in 2008, some fisheries assessment Expert Group’s will work on both updates and benchmarks.

### 17.4 Doc 15: Review Group Guidelines

The Review Groups should check the scientific correctness of the technical text (usually an Expert Group report), while the advice drafting group should draft the advice text. When the advice is virtually the Expert Group report (e.g. when advising on methodological issues), then it is inevitable that the Review Group will look at the draft advice but it should focus on checking the original text for exactness and science. The Advice Drafting Group should focus on the textual aspects of advisory text.

ACOM members that might participate in the Review or Advice Drafting Groups must respect independence of the review and advice drafting process from the finalisation of the advice. This point was referred to the ACOM working procedures

The particular points that were raise include:

1. Stability of reviewing of recurrent advice (by maintaining people in the group for several years) is needed to ensure efficiency and follow up on recommendations by the Expert Groups in future.
2. when dealing with several requests, there should always be at least 2 reviewers dealing with one piece of advice.

***Pro bono publico advice in Review Groups:*** where an Expert Group generates information that might be useful in an advisory context but without this information being asked for by ACOM, e.g. based on a Client request, the Chair in consultation with the vice chairs will decide on whether this information shall be taken forward in the review process.

#### 17.4.1 Guidelines for Advice Drafting Groups

This discussion was divided into two: 1) The guidelines for Advice Drafting Groups and 2) Participation in Advice Drafting Groups.

ACOM decided to include a reference to integration since this is an important issue for the final advice.

ACOM noted that there is often very little time for the process which takes place through Expert, Review and Advice Drafting Groups. Should the review find errors in an Expert Group results, the procedure is to refer this issue back to the Expert Group for updating. Such updating may make it impossible to meet tight deadlines. ACOM considered how to proceed with the advice drafting also in case the Expert Group has not had time yet to correct errors and found that it is the Chair of ACOM to make such a judgement call whether to proceed or wait. However, as a guiding principle the soundness of the scientific advice will benefit the Clients more, even if ICES cannot uphold the Client’s deadlines.

The subgroup of ACOM on the format of the ICES advice [ACOMsubformat] (Chair: Martin Pastoors) will work by correspondence to:

1. Evaluate strength and weaknesses of the setup and templates for the ICES advisory report, taking into account the evaluation of the ICES advice 2007 and the initial results of the client satisfaction measurements.

2. Explore alternative ways of presenting the ICES advisory products, including web-based presentation tools
3. Develop a proposal for a new setup and templates for the ICES advice from 2009 onwards and outline the resource requirements needed for implementation

The subgroup will consist of Paul Keizer, Mark Tasker and additional ACOM members (to be confirmed).

The subgroup to deliver a final report by 15 September 2008.

#### 17.4.2 Participation of Advice Drafting Groups

Membership and payment structure of the Review and Advice Drafting Groups was discussed at length. Attendance of Observers in the Advice Drafting Groups will be decided by Council.

ACOM emphasised the importance of expertise, competence, integration and objectivity of independent Review and Advice Drafting Group members to ensure objective ICES advice. ACOM concluded that by definition, it will be difficult to get external Reviewers and Advice Drafters from 'non interested countries' to participate if they are not paid. Where the Review Groups should focus on objective knowledge, advice drafting requires a good balance between external (the Review Group members) and local knowledge to write relevant advice.

The size of an Advice Drafting Group was considered since the first workplan proposal shows groups up to around 13 participants. This is considered too large for efficient drafting. ACOM realised that working in smaller drafting groups (that would be less costly) could put pressure on the input of ACOM, giving rise to more detailed e-mail discussions on ACOM level in the time between conclusion of the Advice Drafting Group and the Video Conference.

ACOM therefore revised the workplan remarking that:

- An Advice Drafting Group 'core group' consisting of the Review Group Chair and members plus max 2 local members invited by ACOM will be responsible for drafting the advice.
- A group of extra delegate nominees (one per country) may participate in the Advice Drafting Group drafting regional management advice, but they will not be part of the 'core group'
- Core group (ACOM nominated) has ultimate responsibility for drafting
- Delegates nominees can contribute but consensus on the draft advice shall be established in the Core group.
- Participation in Review groups and, for Core group members, in Advice Drafting Groups will be at ICES expense, Delegate nominees will be at national expense.

The Chair and vice Chairs can select the core group members. It was agreed that the vice Chairs will develop a proposal in the work plan in the coming week for the ACOM to consider and adopt.

## 18 ACOM Working Procedure (Doc 17)

One issue which sparked some detailed discussion was the role of the ACOM members involved in Review or Advice Drafting Group. Should they be active observer and at least not lead the review? The Vice chairs play a central role in the process but they need some support or back up. The question raises a valid point about the role of ACOM members in the process and will be revisited when discussing the ACOM working procedures (agenda item 12, doc 17).

There was general confusion over the rules or lack of rules for how many alternates a country can have on the ACOM. Currently there are no limits to alternates that one country may have but this will be resolved in the Rules of Procedure to be adopted by Council 19-20 February 2008.

In relation to Mark Tasker's experience with the OSPAR advice in January 2008 (see section 8 above) it was emphasised that the person to finalise the advice must either be a member or an alternate of ACOM and that it is the ACOM member who through an explicit delegation process can have an alternate member to sign-off the advice on a particular issue. This delegation is for one video conference/meeting only. It is not accepted to designate a non-member/alternate expert for this part of the process.

Several of the generic questions will be discussed when the ACOM discuss the Guidelines. It was agreed to come back to the work plan later.

ACOM split into 3 subgroups each chaired by a vice-chair to deal with ACOM procedures and guidelines. The subgroups reported back to plenary for a general discussion of the major and generic issues that had arisen in the subgroups.

The subgroups had many suggestions for improvements to the text, reshuffling the order of topics in the document and changing the language.

The working procedures should stress the importance of the Committee being independent of national interests and the procedures should emphasise that ACOM in finalising the advice must work free of influence by all interests.

The list of bullet points on the finalisation of the advice should emphasise that ACOM has a significant role in all of these steps.

Some of the major issues were taken up in the discussion.

- The ACOM working procedures should be expanded also to include
  - i. The role of the ACOM concerning advisory strategy
  - ii. How ACOM handles incoming requests is missing in the document and should be included.
  - iii. How the Video Conferences will operate needed to be included.
  - iv. Guidelines on interactions between science and ACOM
- Correspondence in relation to advice and requests should also go through the ACOM members, and the Secretariat should be informed who is involved with each separate request or advice from each country.
- There needs to be a review on the applicability and relevance of the annexes attached to the document;
- It was suggested to use the alert system on the Sharepoint instead of having sent e-mails from the Secretariat to all ACOM members when a report has been finalised. By using the alert function in Sharepoint each member can ask to be alerted when a report they are interested in is released;
- It was considered necessary to have a longer ACOM meeting at ASC than the proposed 1.5 days. Overlap with ConC at ASC is not considered a problem ;
- General work schedule. The annual meeting might better be held in November – post Council - to provide guidance for the next year rather than

have the meeting in February. The Committee saw little gain in waiting until after Christmas accepting that this would mean that the fisheries special requests from EC would not be available.

**Action:** ACOM will, at the ASC in connection with the 2009 planning, review the new process of the Advisory Services based on experience from the first half of 2008.

For 2009 review at the ASC ACOM meeting the option to have the ACOM meeting in late November or early December instead of a meeting in February

Comment on the Council proposal for Observer status (with Annex 3 as the basis for 'Guidelines for Observers').

Secretariat to maintain a list of national member/alternate responsible per request/advice

ACOM endorses the Council resolution on the reform of the Advisory Services (October 2007) that stakeholder observers should be allowed access to all ACOM elements in the work line of ACOM groups, except at Expert Groups.

ACOM flagged for the Council the need for having rules for stakeholder involvement at the Benchmark workshops. ACOM did not agree on a policy this point.

**By:** Secretariat and ACOM Chairs

## 19 Research needs (Doc 20).

---

One of main drivers for the reform was to improve the link between science and advice.

ACOM has already identified several science issues of importance to the future ACOM work, e.g. trophic level indicators, tools to be used for integrated advice, and target of ecosystem approach to management.

The document to be produced by the sub group should be only a few (1-2) pages and feed into CONC for the May 2008 meeting. In order for ConC to get the input in due time a deadline of 25 April 2008 was agreed.

It was agreed that it should be the sub group on ACOM Strategic Plan that deals with the task as the science needs are related to the ACOM Strategic Plan.

It was also considered relevant to have 2 people from ConC to participate in this work.

**Action:** the Subgroup on the ACOM Strategic Plan should also, between now and the ConC meeting in May 2008, consider the research needs for ACOM. ConC should be represented by 2 persons in this subgroup.

**Deadline:** In order for ConC to consider this input the deadline is 25 of April 2008.

## 20 Upcoming meetings

---

### 20.1 WGRED ToRs.

Mark Tasker introduced this item. He emphasised a need to review the appropriateness of the ecoregions as they are currently defined. MICC could raise this issue with Clients (see section 18.2)

**Action:** The ACOM subgroup set up to deal with long term strategy should also be asked to look at the definitions of ecoregions.

### 20.2 MICC agenda.

Hans Lassen presented the draft agenda for MICC meeting. This is an annual meeting between the Secretariats of DG Fish, DG Env, OSPAR, HELCOM, Joint Norwegian-Russian Fisheries Commission and NEAFC. ICES Delegates are invited to participate.

**Action:** ACOM proposed that a presentation of the ICES science strategic plan be added to the agenda.

ACOM proposed that the agenda should include an item to attract HELCOM and DG Environment, e.g. a review of the advisory needs from the Marine strategy directive or the use of MPAs.

ACOM asked the Secretariat to contact the client commissions to propose to invite stakeholder observers to MICC in order to increase transparency of the advisory process.

Delegates are not all directly involved with the ICES advice. In order to get more involvement of national management authorities in the MICC meeting, the secretariat should raise with the Delegates if they could be represented at MICC by national management authorities.

Clients should be asked if the currently defined ecoregions fit their needs.

In the absence of approval of the client commissions to invite stakeholder observers to the 2008 MICC meeting, the item of observers should be added to the agenda with the consent of Clients.

## 21 Demonstration of the Webex system (Video Conferencing).

---

Michala Ovens demonstrated the Webex system planned to be used for the video conferences. The system was demonstrated from 4 locations in the ICES Secretariat building. One room was set up to show meeting facilities with projector, camera, and microphone. The other demonstration places were set up as individual workplaces with camera and headset connected to a PC. The demonstration was followed by ACOM member.

The group concluded that not all computers were able to connect to the meeting.

WEBEX should be tested with up to 20 participants. A back up system should be ready, a plan B. It was suggested that a physical meeting of those interested and most involved could be decided

**Action:** an ACOM WebEx test-meeting will be organized on Friday 15<sup>th</sup> of February (14:00)

**By:** Martin Pastoors.



## 22 Adoption of Minutes

---

The Secretariat and (Vice) Chairs will finalise this document at Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> of February.

ACOM considers ACFM, ACE, and ACME as dissolved.

## 23 Any Other Business

---

### 23.1 IUCN request from Norway

Mark Tasker introduced this agenda item. The request came from Norway during ASC 2007. WGFE has done some work on this already and one of the conclusions drawn was a high complexity on criteria (also with criteria from other organisations, i.e. Texel criteria).

**Action:** Mark Tasker was asked to take the lead in contacting FAO, IUCN, HELCOM and OSPAR with the aim to set up a joint workshop to handle this request. Jake Rice was considered a suitable chair should he be available. Target timeline will be for ASC 2008 having a workshop dealing with the request during summer 2008.

### 23.2 Workshop on fisheries management in MPA's

It was suggested to hold a Workshop on fisheries management in MPAs. This might be a quite important advisory issue. The German project is coming to a conclusion soon. The expectation is that it might be fairly ground breaking. A review of this should be done, but it should not be a “blank card”. The problem is that it might easily be regarded as ICES advice to the German government. Thus should the ICES report be reviewed by ACOM before it is sent out? The Vice Chairs should find out the precise process to do this.

Communication within ACOM

The Secretariat will maintain a list of ACOM members' mobile numbers and Skype addresses on the ACOM Sharepoint site.

## 24 Closing the meeting

---

In closing the meeting the Chair encouraged ACOM members not to forget about the job when an ACOM meeting is over. This is a continuous process and ACOM needs to constantly think about how to progress its work for the good of the new Advisory Services. The key for 2008 is to “break in the new advisory services and build trust”.

He wished the ACOM and the new ACOM chair all the best for the future.

Concluding with a quote from Henry Ford, he wished everyone a safe journey home.

*“ Coming together is a beginning,  
staying together is progress,  
and working together is success “*  
(Henry Ford, 1863-1947)

## 25 Annex I – List of Participants

---

### List of participants

#### ACOM

4–8 February 2008

NAME	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE/FAX	EMAIL
Paul Connolly (Chair)	The Marine Institute Rinville Co. Galway Oranmore Ireland	Phone +353 876 470 979 / +353 91 387 200	paul.connolly@marine.ie
Alain Biseau	IFREMER Lorient Station 8 rue François Toullec F-56100 Lorient France	Phone +33 297 87 38 20 Fax +33 297 87 38 01	abiseau@ifremer.fr
Fátima Cardador	IPIMAR Avenida de Brasilia PT-1449-006 Lisbon Portugal		cardador@ipimar.pt
Ghislain Chouinard	Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans DFO Moncton PO Box 5030 Moncton NB E1C 9B6 Canada		ChouinardG@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Steven Degraer	University of Ghent Marine Biology Section Krijgslaan 281-S8 B-9000 Ghent Belgium		Steven.Degraer@ugent.be
Yuri Efimov	Russian Federal Research Institute of Fisheries & Oceanography 17 Verkhne Krasnoselskaya RU-107140 Moscow Russian Federation	Phone +7 499 264 9129 Fax +7 499 264 9129	efimov@vniro.ru
Erkki Ikonen	Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute POBox 2 FI-00791 Helsinki Finland	Phone +358 205 751 348 Fax +358 205 751 201	Erkki.Ikonen@rktl.fi
Eric Jagtman	IMARES, Wageningen UR PO Box 68 NL-1970 AB IJmuiden Netherlands		Eric.Jagtman@wur.nl
Fritz W. Köster	The National Institute of Aquatic Resources Department of Sea Fisheries Charlottenlund Slot, Jægersborg Alle 1 DK-2920 Charlottenlund Denmark	Phone 45 33963350 Fax 45 33963333	fwk@difres.dk

Harald Loeng (ConC Chair)	Institute of Marine Research PO Box 1870 N-5817 Bergen Norway	Phone +47 55 238466 Fax +47 55 238687	harald.loeng@imr.no
Paul D. Keizer Vicechair	Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans Bedford Institute of Oceanography PO Box 1006 Dartmouth NS B2Y 4A2 Canada	Phone +1 902 426 6138 Fax +1 902 426 6695	keizerp@mar.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Johan Modin	Swedish Board of Fisheries Institute of Coastal Research PO Box 109 SE-74071 Öregrund Sweden	Phone +46 173 46463 Fax +46 173- 46490	johan.modin@fiskeriverket.se
Eugene Nixon	The Marine Institute Rinville Co. Galway Oranmore Ireland		eugene.nixon@marine.ie
Henn Ojaveer	Estonian Marine Institute 10a Mäealuse Street EE-126 18 Tallinn Estonia	Phone +372 44 33800 - mobile: +372 5158328 Fax +372 6718 900	henn.ojaveer@ut.ee
Martin Pastoors Vicechair	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 DK-1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	Phone +45 33 38 67 48	martin@ices.dk
Javier Pereiro	Instituto Español de Oceanografía Centro Oceanográfico de Vigo PO Box 1552 E-36200 Vigo (Pontevedra) Spain.	Phone +34 986492111	javier.pereiro@vi.ieo.es.
Maris Plikshs	Latvian Fish Resources Agency 8 Daugavgrivas Str. LV-1048 Riga Latvia	Phone +371 67610766 Fax +371 67616946	Maris.Plikss@lzra.gov.lv
Jákup Reinert	Faroese Fisheries Laboratory PO Box 3051 FO-110 Tórshavn Faroe Islands	Phone +298 35 3900 Fax +298 353901	JakupR@frs.fo
Mark Tasker Vicechair	Joint Nature Conservation Committee JNCC Dunnet House 7 Thistle Place AB10 1UZ Aberdeen United Kingdom	Phone + 44 1 224 655 701 Fax + 44 1 224 621 488	mark.tasker@jncc.gov.uk
Sarunas Toliusis	Lithuanian State Pisciculture and Fisheries Research Centre Fisheries Research Laboratory Smiltynes pl 1 LT-91001 Klaipeda Lithuania	Phone +370 46 391122 Fax +370 46 391104	ztl@is.lt

Reidar Toresen	Institute of Marine Research PO Box 1870 N-5817 Bergen Norway	Phone +47 55 238500 Fax +47 55 238531	reidar@imr.no
Bill Turrell	Fisheries Research Services FRS Marine Laboratory PO Box 101 AB11 9DB Aberdeen United Kingdom	Phone +44 1224 876544 Fax +44 1224 295511	turrellb@marlab.ac.uk
Morten Vinther	The National Institute of Aquatic Resources Department of Sea Fisheries Charlottenlund Slot, Jægersborg Alle 1 DK-2920 Charlottenlund Denmark	Phone +45 33 96 33 53 Fax +45 33 96 33 33	mv@difres.dk
Douglas Wilson (Observer)	Innovative Fisheries Management PO Box 104 DK-9850 Hirtshals Denmark	Phone +45 96 25 87 39 ex 272	dw@ifm.dk
Chris Zimmermann	Johann Heinrich von Thünen-Institute, Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries Institute for Baltic Sea Fisheries Alter Hafen Süd 2 D-18069 Rostock Germany	Phone (0) 381 8116-115 Fax (0) 381 8116-199	christopher.zimmermann@vti.bund.de
Mette Bertelsen ICES Secretariat		+ 45 33386726	mette@ices.dk
Claus Hagebro ICES Secretariat		+45 33386754	claus@ices.dk
Hans Lassen ICES Secretariat		+45 33386722	hans@ices.dk
Michala Ovens ICES Secretariat		+45 33386738	michala@ices.dk
Barbara Schoute ICES Secretariat		+45 33386756	Barbara@ices.dk
Henrik Sparholt ICES Secretariat		+45 33386723	Henriks@ices.dk

## 26 Annex II – Agenda

---

### ACOM

Chair: Paul Connolly

### ICES HQ

4 (1 pm) –8 February (1 pm) 2008

1. Opening and Welcome
2. Adoption of Agenda (Doc 1) and review of list of documents (Doc 2)
3. Tour-de-table: Presentation of members (Doc 3)

Annotation: This is the first meeting of ACOM. ACOM members shall work closely together and need to know each other well. The tour-de-table should be a little more extensive. Each participant should be prepared to present him/herself in 2-3 minutes.

4. Presentation of the reform and the role of ACOM (Doc 11)

Annotation: The agenda point is in response to ToR iii). The agenda point is based on: Bureau meeting 15 January, CWG report December 2007, Council resolution October 2007. The presentation is to be followed by a discussion with a view to solicit ACOM comments for feed-back to the Council for their consideration 19-20 February. The chair Paul Connolly will present these comments to Council as part of his report on the ACOM work.

The tasks of ACOM and the roles of the vice chairs will be further discussed under agenda points 9 and 12 (see below) and there may be additional comments for Council to pick up at these items.

5. Presentation of how organisation of the Science work will be arranged (By Harald Loeng)
6. Assistance to Council on Appointing a New ACOM Chair

Annotation: The ACOM chair will be appointed by Council. ACOM is invited to make proposals for Council's consideration. This agenda item may not be concluded at this point in time and may be kept open for conclusion on Friday.

7. Review of the performance of the Advisory Programme in 2007. (Doc 10)

Annotation: This is in response to ToR iv). ACOM is invited to consider the report and to note points where the advisory system has not functioned optimally and to suggest remedial action for inclusion in the working procedures to be adopted under agenda item 13

8. MIRAC and other meetings of relevance for ACOM since ASC 2007 (Doc 6)

Annotation: The report will be presented and relevant points noted for possible inclusion in the workplan for 2008. The timetable for presentation of advice to the RACs shall considered and presenters shall be proposed

9. Review of the Workplan for 2008 (Docs 5, 8, 9, and 21)

Annotation: This is in response to ToRs ii), v) and viii). As part of this agenda point we shall consider ToR ii) and have a paper by Paul Keizer (Doc 5) on *pro bono*

*publico* advice. In this context we may also cover ToR viii). Another particular point required is how to deal with the Benchmark groups under the fisheries advice. Finally we need to agree staffing the groups at this point, i.e. nomination of reviewers and members of the advice drafting groups. There will be a proposal to discuss.

10. Table of Content for 2008 (Doc 7)

Annotation: The table of content for the advisory report 2008 shall be briefly reviewed. ACOM members are invited to comment on the report for 2007 and propose amendments and changes.

Decision: The Council is invited to approve the Table of Content for the advisory report for 2008.

11. Strategy for the for the ICES Advisory services (Doc 19 and 23, Background documents 24-26)

- a. Integrated advice
- b. Development of a Strategy plan Content
- c. Development of a Strategy plan Procedure

Annotation: The Council have approved the structure for the update of the ICES Strategic plan. This structure includes an overall plan supplemented with specific plans for the science and advisory branches of ICES. In addition there shall be a strategic plan the Secretariat.

Decision: ACOM is discuss how the strategy plan should reflect the aim of integrated advice and advice on how this best be incorporated in the strategic plan for the ICES Advisory services, ACOM is invited to approve the procedure for the development of such a plan and assign members of ACOM to develop a draft for consideration at the Consultations in September.

12. Working procedures and Guidelines for formulating advice in 2008 for ACOM, VC, ADG, RG, EG, DCWK (Docs 12-18)

Annotation: This agenda point is in response to Tor vi).

Decision: ACOM will adopt guidelines for the advice formulation. ACOM will adopt working procedures for the Advisory Services.

13. Research needs (Doc 20).

Annotation: In response to ToR vii). This point is a kick-off on the discussion of the advisory research needs and will consider the mandate that to be given to the chair when meeting in ConC in May.

14. Action plan for the ICES Advisory Services (Docs 24-26).

Annotation: ACE, ACFM and ACME have each developed action plans that should be reviewed in preparation for the development of an ACOM Action Plan.

Decision: ACOM is invited to consider these action plans and to develop a procedure through which these plans are reviewed and a joint action plan is drafted for ACOM's consideration September 2008

15. Upcoming meetings

- a. MICC agenda (Doc 27)
- b. Review of WGRED ToR

Annotation: ACOM is invited to comment on the ToRs for WGRED. However, in line with the general approach at this meeting the comments should concentrate on how the process is structured. This agenda item is not intended to

address ToR i) which would be based on input from WGRED and which does not meet until late February; therefore there will be nothing to consider. The input from WGRED (ToR (d)) will go to AMAWGC which meets in parallel with WGRED as in previous years.

16. Demonstration of the Webex system (Video Conferencing).

17. Adoption of Report

18. AOB

19. Closure at 1pm

## 27 Annex III – List of Documents

---

### List of Documents

No.	TITLE
1	Agenda
2	List of documents
3	List of participants
4	List of requests
5	<i>Pro bono publico</i> advice
6	Summary of MIRAC meeting 29-20 January 2008, Vigo, Spain
7	Table of Content for the Advisory report 2008
8	Workplan 2008 Schedule of Data Compilation, Expert, Review, Advice drafting and ACOM (Web conferences)
9	Workplan presentation
10	2007 Review
11	Presentation of reform
12	List of Data compilation workshops
13	Guidelines for data compilation workshops
14	Guidelines for Expert Groups
15	Guidelines for Review Groups
16	Guidelines for Advice Drafting Groups
17	Working procedure for ACOM
18	Guidelines and Working procedure for Benchmark Groups
19a	Report of the Bureau Working group on the Update of the ICES Strategic Plan
19b	Draft Advisory Strategy Plan
19c	Developing an Advisory Strategy Plan
20	Research needs for Advice
21	Workload on groups
22	No document
23	No document
24	Action plan for ACE
25	Action plan for ACFM
26	Action plan for ACME
27	Draft Agenda for MICC
28	ToRs for ACOM meeting 4-8 February 2008
29	ToRs for WGRED meeting 25-29 February 2008
30	Report of the Council Working Group on the Advisory reform. December 2007
31	Council Resolution on the Advisory Reform October 2007
32	ToRs for AMAWGC meeting 25-29 Feb 2008
33	Benchmark and update assessments 2006-2009
34	List of ACOM members
35	ICES Science Programme
36	Presentation on Norwegian IUCN request.ppt
37	Joint RACS MPA meeting programme.pdf
38	Meeting Pack RAC MPAs.pdf
39	ICES Science Plan (2009-2014).ppt



## 28 Annex IV – ACOMsubreview

---

The subgroup of ACOM on the review of the 2007 advisory services [ACOMsubreview] (Chair: Martin Pastoors) will work by correspondence to:

1. Develop general guidelines and set benchmarks for the annual review of the ICES advisory services
2. Develop a template of the information to be collected annually from the advice by the secretariat
3. Finalize the review of the procedures and products of the Advisory services in 2007
4. Recommend stocks for which multi-annual approaches would be appropriate and based on that develop a workplan for stocks to be included in the 2008 advice
5. Recommend actions to improve the information-base for stocks which have so far not been included in the advice

The members of the subgroup are: Chris Zimmermann (Germany), Reidar Toresen (Norway), Fritz Köster or a replacement (Denmark) and Fatima Cardador (Portugal). The subgroup will be assisted by Mark Tasker and Paul Keizer and the secretariat.

The subgroup will deliver a final report by 22 February 2008.

## 29 Annex V – ACOMsubclient

---

A **subgroup of ACOM on client satisfaction** [ACOMsubclient] (Chair: Eric Jagtman, the Netherlands) will work by correspondence to:

- a) Collect information on methods such as questionnaires and opinion surveys that are used by research and advisory bodies to evaluate satisfaction of clients, stakeholders and members in relation to products delivered,
- b) Based on a), evaluate the usefulness of these methods for use in reviewing client and stakeholder satisfaction in relation to ICES products (advice) delivered
- c) Propose to ACOM one or a suite of methods than would be most appropriate in monitoring client satisfaction
- d) Make recommendations to ACOM on how and when this monitoring process should be started
- e) Examine potential funding sources for these activities
- f) Propose to ACOM how monitoring results can be properly assessed and reported, as an input to the transition process.
- g) Use these results for discussion with clients at the annual MICC meeting or in other meetings with Clients, stakeholders or members held during the year.

ACOMsubclient will report to ACOM by 15 May 2008.

**Justification:** ACOM will lead the way in directing a transition process that is aiming to better serve ICES clients, stakeholders and members<sup>1</sup> with intExpert Group-rated, transparent and objective advice, using the ecosystem approach as a starting point for the analyses. In the upcoming years, ACOM is expected to implement changes that aim to improve the existing advisory process. In order to monitor the dExpert Group's level of client satisfaction and to provide a forum for clients to provide feedback ACOM will design a method to properly assess client satisfaction

---

<sup>1</sup> Hereafter collectively referred to as clients

**Members:** Alain Biseau, Ghislain Chouinard, Martin Pastoors, Eugene Nixon and Johan Modin. The secretariat will be actively involved in this.

### **30 Annex VI – ACOMsubformat**

---

A subgroup of ACOM on the format of the ICES advice [ACOMsubformat] (Chair: Martin Pastoors) will work by correspondence to:

4. Evaluate strength and weaknesses of the setup and templates for the ICES advisory report, taking into account the evaluation of the ICES advice 2007 and the initial results of the client satisfaction measurements.
5. Explore alternative ways of presenting the ICES advisory products, including web-based presentation tools
6. Develop a proposal for a new setup and templates for the ICES advice from 2009 onwards and outline the resource requirements needed for implementation

The subgroup will consist of Paul Keizer, Mark Tasker and additional ACOM members (to be confirmed).

The subgroup will report to ACOM by 15 September 2008.