

ICES CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

ICES CM 2005/A:01

Ref. Bureau

REPORT OF THE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE (CONC)

9–11 MAY 2005

ICES HEADQUARTERS, COPENHAGEN



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

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

H.C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46

DK-1553 Copenhagen V

Denmark

Telephone (+45) 33 38 67 00

Telefax (+45) 33 93 42 15

www.ices.dk

info@ices.dk

Contents

1	Opening	1
2	Adoption of agenda and timetable	1
3	Minutes of September 2004 meeting	1
4	Annual Science Conference 2005 – Aberdeen, Scotland	1
	4.1 Meeting arrangements	1
	4.2 Schedule of Scientific Sessions	2
	4.3 Schedule of other meetings and activities.....	2
	4.4 Planning for review (at ASC) of resolutions not currently available.....	2
	4.5 Travel support.....	3
5	Annual Science Conference 2006 – Maastricht, The Netherlands	3
	5.1 Meeting arrangements	3
	5.2 Review of proposed Theme Sessions for 2006.....	3
	5.3 Invited lectures and other special events 2006	4
6	Annual Science Conference 2007– Helsinki, finland	5
	6.1 Meeting arrangements	5
	6.2 Review of proposed Theme Sessions	5
	6.3 Invited lectures and other special events	5
7	Review of plans for symposia, including YSC.....	6
8	2005 resolutions.....	6
	8.1 Review of resolutions currently available	6
	8.2 Progress Review of Committees and Expert Groups 2004 (in relation to the ICES Action Plan)	6
9	ICES audit process	7
10	Review of ICES activities and Expert Group structure	8
	10.1 Review of activities under BSRP	8
	10.2 Review of activities under REGNS	9
	10.3 Review of activities under Advisory Committees	9
	10.4 Review of activities under Science Committees.....	11
	10.4.1 Role and effectiveness of Science Committees	11
	10.4.2 Do we have the right Expert Group structure?	11
	10.4.3 How to make ICES Science more visible?	12
11	Consider working practises necessary to further integrate environmental information into ICES fisheries advice (WGRED).....	14

12	Strategies to deal with increased need for ecosystem scale advice (European Marine Strategy)	15
13	Dialogue with Client Commissions	16
	13.1 OSPAR Long-Term Work Programme for ICES	16
	13.2 HELCOM Long-Term Work Programme for ICES	16
	13.3 Input from MCAP-MICC	16
14	Data management issues	16
	14.1 Report from BWGDDP	16
	14.2 User survey for ICES data and data products	17
15	Update on Study Group on Publication Practices regarding Ethical Concerns on the Use of Animals in Scientific Research (SGPPE)	17
16	Nomination of Vice-Chair	18
17	Update on MCAP and Bureau meetings	18
18	Any other business	19
19	Close	20
	Annex 1: List of participants	21
	Annex 2: Agenda	24
	Annex 3: ASC programme 2005	26
	Annex 4: ICES Travel Financial Support	31
	Annex 5: Theme Sessions proposed for ASC 2006	32
	Annex 6: Revolving list of Symposia	33
	Annex 7: Symposium Publication schedule	37
	Annex 8: Proposed guidelines for membership for all ICES Expert Groups	38
	Annex 9: Example ToRs for Expert Groups in support of WGRED	39
	Annex 10: Recommendations from WGRED (2005) report	41
	Annex 11: User survey for ICES data and data products	43
	Annex 12: Recommendations and action list	48

1 Opening

The meeting was opened at 10.00 hrs on 9 May 2005. The Chair welcomed the ConC members, and suggested a presentation round of all members. A list of participants is attached. (**Annex 1**). The General Secretary extended a welcome and an invitation for a dinner at the ICES Secretariat. The Secretariat informed about a few housekeeping details.

2 Adoption of agenda and timetable

The agenda (**Annex 2**) was adopted with no comments.

3 Minutes of September 2004 meeting

The Chair identified several points from the ConC minutes of the 2004 September meeting that needed to be followed up:

- 1) Parentages of WGs and SGs to be reviewed in the light of the change of the rule on nomination of membership, and the need for a more explicit overall policy should be discussed.
- 2) Existence of Science Committees (Document ConC 0505-13), why do they exist, bottom-up driven science management?
- 3) Real-time oceanographic information to be used in the stock assessments
- 4) Quality assurance peer review and auditing of SG and WG reports by Science Committees.
- 5) Identification of areas of low participation in Expert Groups and at the ASC, and discuss strategies to address.
- 6) Vice-Chair of ConC to be discussed – and to be elected if needed.

The different items were allocated to the relevant agenda items of this meeting.

The minutes of the Consultative Committee meeting at the Annual Science Conference in Vigo, September 2004, were then adopted.

4 Annual Science Conference 2005 – Aberdeen, Scotland

The Secretariat presented the meeting arrangements and programme for the first ‘standalone’ ASC, including the schedule of Scientific Theme Sessions and Science and Advisory Committee meetings.

4.1 Meeting arrangements

Document ConC0505-5 was presented by the ICES Secretariat. The conference has been advertised quite broadly, e.g., via Google. It was pointed out that 2005 will be the first year of the new format for the Annual Science Conference, meaning that the Council will not meet immediately after the conference. The Council will meet in October 2005 at ICES Headquarters, Copenhagen.

The Conference will be held at the Aberdeen Exhibition and Conference Center (AECC), situated a little outside (15 min) the city centre. There will be a shuttle bus service between downtown hotels and the meeting venue. A time schedule for the shuttle service has not been fixed yet.

Hotel booking can be made through the ICES website, but ICES has also made a list of the hotels for participants to contact the places themselves. The Secretariat has set up a disclaimer on the ICES website saying that “participants may be able to find lower room rates through the Internet”. The registration fee includes a bus card and lunch. Information about the social events is available on the conference website together with the tour programme.

The Opening Reception will be held on Tuesday 20 September at the AECC. The concept for the Conference Dinner will be less formal and less expensive than in previous years. This was much welcomed.

Although the conference centre equipment is very state-of-the-art, ICES will bring its own server and laptops as audio visual support to theme sessions. There will be an Internet café.

Action: It was felt that the price for accessing the wireless system (6£ per hour or £39 per day) was too expensive. The Secretariat will try to negotiate a better price.

4.2 Schedule of Scientific Sessions

The preliminary draft programme (Conc0505-4) was presented and discussed. The starting point had been more than 490 papers and posters submitted, leaving us with a total number of 376 papers for oral presentations, each to be allotted at least 15 minutes, including discussion.

All daily sessions are to start at 09.00, except for Thursday where the sessions will begin at 08.30. A visit by the EU Commissioner of Fisheries and Maritime Affairs to the ASC has been proposed (to be confirmed).

The Secretariat will remind conveners that they are responsible to push people to provide the manuscript for publication on the CD from the ASC. All conveners should try to confirm in advance that someone will be present at the ASC to present each of the oral presentations. This to try and avoid “no shows” and unoccupied slots in the schedule.

4.3 Schedule of other meetings and activities

A number of committees expressed the wish to have two time slots for their committee meetings. Adjustments to the initial schedule were made and a schedule accommodating all the desired features was developed during the meeting.

ConC recommends the 2005 ASC programme (**Annex 3**) to the Bureau for adoption.

4.4 Planning for review (at ASC) of resolutions not currently available

The Chair strongly urged Committee chairs to review all ToRs for their groups prior to the September meeting, so that during the ASC, ConC will only need to address the problems and

significant changes/highlights. This way there will be no need for ConC to deal with routine ToRs, and this will allow more time for discussion of any problematic ToRs.

The ACME Chair stressed the importance of coordination between Expert Groups in order to establish joint Terms of Reference to improve cooperation. So far, this has not been very successful. The only efficient way to ensure that Expert Groups work together is to have Science Committee chairs pushing the process. Science Committee chairs should be better informed of the 'drivers' in ICES. For instance, there is a need to be more vigilant as to the understanding of the requests from our Client Commissions. These requests are expected to be available before the ConC September meeting for inclusion of ToRs as distributed by the Secretariat and Advisory Committee chairs.

4.5 Travel support

Following a request for funding from a Canadian scientist to attend the 2005 ASC the question was asked whether travel support should be limited to young scientists or should also be extended to others. A small subgroup was established to review comparable PICES principles/criteria for travel support. The group drafted a document on ICES Travel Financial Support which was approved. (Annex 4).

ConC recommends these guidelines to the Bureau for adoption.

5 Annual Science Conference 2006 – Maastricht, The Netherlands

5.1 Meeting arrangements

The meeting arrangements for the Annual Science Conference 2006, to be held in Maastricht, The Netherlands, were summarised.

Maastricht is a very old city near the Belgian and German borders. Maastricht has enough hotels in all categories, mostly within walking distance of the Maastricht Exposition and Congress Centre (MECC) (www.mecc.nl), a modern conference centre often used by the EC.

A block booking of meeting rooms has been made from 17 to 26 September to cover all ASC Business Sessions. The proposed dates for the Annual Science Conference are 19–23 September 2006.

There had been a suggestion to move the last two-day session of the ConC meeting to IJmuiden, but this idea was unacceptable for practical reasons.

5.2 Review of proposed Theme Sessions for 2006

The General Secretary raised his concern about the increasing number of theme sessions introduced at the ASC each year. ConC discussed how many parallel sessions were desirable and agreed to keep the number of (up to) four parallel sessions.

ConC reviewed the proposed Theme Sessions and accepted a total of 16 themes; leaving a few spaces open for new proposals during the 2005 Annual Science Conference. The sessions have been classified into four main topics according to the four ICES main pillars of science. (An-

nex 5). The Secretariat will in the future elaborate the list of proposed Theme Sessions to add information on responsible Committee/Expert Group, Year of suggestion, Progress, etc.

ConC had a discussion regarding criteria for keeping, merging, and postponing Theme Sessions. The Chair suggested that the FTC Chair should write down some criteria for ConC to review at the September meeting. In summary the discussion touched on:

- Broad and open versus narrow and specific Theme Sessions – there is a need for both. A theme-focused ASC was suggested, for instance in 2007 in Helsinki, on the ecosystem approach in addition to themes related to the Baltic.
- More attention should be paid in ConC to the continuity of Theme Sessions in relation to other ICES events, such as back-to-back meetings of Expert Groups and ICES Symposia that would pick up results from Theme Sessions. ConC will follow up on this during the September meeting.
- The most important aspect of the ASC is to have good communication. There should be scope for finished work to be presented, but also for presenting and discussing progress made in various fields.
- Some aspects of the previous practice of having Committee-centred Theme Sessions are missed by member scientists. The motivation for having these ‘open’ Theme Sessions (e.g., LRC session in Belgium set up as a general biology session) is to avoid important subject areas being overlooked that could be further developed outside ICES. Another advantage is the synergy and cross-fertilisation provided by more open topics.
- A suggestion was made by the Chair of the Publication Committee concerning the practice of handling presentations at the ASC. During the first day of the ASC or at the latest the day before the theme session, presenters should contact their conveners to assure that people will turn up. If they fail to do so, the schedule of presentations will be reshuffled. This way participation is better safeguarded and last-minute hand-ins are precluded.

The General Secretary will be asked to announce this new procedure during the Opening Ceremony.

5.3 Invited lectures and other special events 2006

Only two Plenary Speakers have been scheduled for Aberdeen 2005, but no decision is taken on future practice. If there is an opportunity to get a good speaker, it was suggested that we should not restrict the number of plenary speakers. There had been disappointment last year that some speakers did not address the themes they were supposed to address.

ConC agreed to ask Carlo Heip (Centre for Estuarine and Coastal Ecology, Netherlands) to give the Open Lecture and to relate his talk to Theme Sessions 4, 5, and 6). (Head of Science Programme).

Four names were suggested for Plenary Lectures:

- Sven Sundby, Norway – link to relation between climate, environment and impact on the ecosystem (Chair of OCC) (relevant for Theme Sessions 3, 13, and 14);
- Mike Heath, FRS Aberdeen, Scotland, UK, link to ecosystem approach. (Chair of LRC) (relevant to Theme Sessions 13 and 14);
- Kees Zwanenberg, The Netherlands. (Chairs of ACME/MCC);
- Lesley Richards, England, UK (BODC) (related to Theme sessions 6 and 10) (Chair of ConC).

Action: The persons given in brackets were asked to establish contact with the potential speakers and inquire about willingness and availability. This slate of names is to be brought forward to the Bureau for feedback, and formalised at the Annual Science Conference in Aberdeen.

6 Annual Science Conference 2007– Helsinki, finland

6.1 Meeting arrangements

Document Conc0505-6 was presented by the Secretariat.

Preliminary dates for the 2007 Annual Science Conference had just been received by fax from Ero Aaro, Finland:

Whole period, including ASC and Business Sessions: Sunday 16 September to Tuesday 25 September. ASC: Tuesday 18 September to Saturday 22 September.

A preliminary reservation for the 2007 ASC has been made at the Marine Congress Center in Helsinki, which was also the venue for the ICES History Symposium in 2000.

6.2 Review of proposed Theme Sessions

This will be dealt with during the ASC in Aberdeen, when final packages with names of conveners and complete justifications should be available. It was agreed to ask HELCOM to sponsor a theme session in Helsinki. There is a need to have a session with emphasis on the Baltic.

The Chair asked the ConC members to contact their Expert Group chairs and ask for proposals for Theme Sessions in 2007. We should be clear in our guidelines as to what we want to attract, i.e., 1) the Baltic Sea, and 2) the Ecosystem Approach should be central topics.

6.3 Invited lectures and other special events

This will be readdressed during the ASC in Aberdeen, when there is a more complete list of possible Theme Sessions, so invited lecturers can be matched with the Scientific Program as it develops.

The following speakers were proposed for the 2007:

- Ana Parma, Argentina (good speaker to bring in from outside the ICES community, on stock assessment).
- Fritz Koester, Denmark, (Baltic topics).
- Bengt Ove Jansson, Sweden (Baltic ecosystem research).
- Ragnar Elmgren, Stockholm University, Sweden (Baltic ecosystem research).

7 Review of plans for symposia, including YSC

ConC reviewed the plans for symposia and noted that all symposia planned for 2006 and 2007 are well on track. Details are included in **Annex 6**. ConC discussed the problem of the high number of symposia in 2007, causing a bottleneck for the publication in the ICES JMS in 2008 and 2009. In future, to avoid similar problems, a routine procedure should be set up involving ConC, the Publications Committee, and the ICES Secretariat.

ConC discussed various solutions to prevent any reoccurrence of this bottleneck. As a result, the Chair of the Publications Committee (PUB) will have PUB establish a procedure for the evaluation of Symposia submissions and subsequent publication in the *ICES Journal of Marine Science* (JMS) and report back to ConC. On the last day of the meeting, the Chair of the Publications Committee presented a schedule accommodating publication of all envisaged ICES Symposia Proceedings (**Annex 7**). A key requirement is that the symposium on Fishing Technology should be scheduled for publication in 2007; otherwise the schedule will not work. The current turnaround time for symposia is approximately 11–15 months from the meeting until final publication. This includes submission, review, assessment, revision and final preparation of the manuscripts through the ICES Secretariat and the Publisher. Symposium organisers will be required to adhere strictly to the deadlines imposed by the tight schedule.

The Head of Science Programme, in consultation with the Chair of the Publications Committee and Editor-in-chief (Andy Payne), will prepare a letter for the organisers of the various Symposia to inform them of the planned publication schedule.

The Chair of Publications Committee noted that the current schedule imposes limitations on ICES' capability to accept sponsorship of new symposia which require publication in the JMS prior to the end of 2010.

ConC noted that it was in the interest of ICES that all major ICES-sponsored symposia also be published in ICES JMS

8 2005 resolutions

8.1 Review of resolutions currently available

ConC did not review the small number of draft resolutions currently available arising from proposals prepared to this point by the Science Committee Expert Groups. ConC also discussed the phraseology for the terms of reference. Last year ConC agreed that resolutions need to be result-oriented. Words like “discuss”, “continue to”, “review” are too vague, while “report on” and “finalize” indicate a more active attitude. Science and Advisory Committee chairs are to review their Expert Group ToRs and modify together with their Expert Group chairs. This way, at the ASC we can focus on crosscutting issues, instead of spending time on the wording.

8.2 Progress Review of Committees and Expert Groups 2004 (in relation to the ICES Action Plan)

This item was closely linked to Agenda Item 9, under which ConC established that a Progress Review was not feasible without the planned database.

9 ICES audit process

ConC recalled previous decisions on plans for producing an Action Plan database to facilitate the review process. The Head of Science Programme informed ConC about the restructuring of the ICES Data Centre which had left no resources to be allocated to this task so far. The Action Plan database had received lower priority due to more urgent issues related to client commissions, for instance DOME and Intercatch. A programmer is about to be employed to develop internal administrative databases. Interviews will take place at the end of May for possible employment in July. ConC reiterated the point that the database is vital and indispensable to create the required overview and to facilitate the review process. ConC will not be able to carry out the Progress Review unless the database has been established. Due to the complexity of the science and advisory structure of ICES, the database is essential if ConC is to be able to track progress against the Action Plan.

Peer Review of Expert Group reports / Improved Executive Summary

In addition to the Action Plan review process, the Chair suggested that improved peer review should be implemented for the Science Committees. The Head of Science Programme pointed to the fact that ConC has a consultative function for the Secretariat. It is the advisory committee for the ICES Science and since the ICES Science is produced in the Expert Groups, it should in the first instance be reviewed by a group designated by the Committee chairs. The Secretariat is mostly charged with checking and safeguarding the formal consistency while the scientific quality can only be spot checked due to the sheer abundance of reports and the sometimes very specialized topics. It may be sufficient to review a few selected reports in detail every year in a way that completes the review for all groups within the Chair's term. The results of the review are to be communicated back to the Expert Group by the Committee chair.

Reviewers should be appointed by Science Committee chairs and they should report back to the Committee and the Expert Group chair. Ideally one of the reviewers should present a resume of the report at the ASC, and the Expert Group chair should respond.

The points/review criteria previously decided by ConC in 1999 should be used again:

1. Were the Terms of Reference properly addressed and completed?
2. Is the report clear and understandable?
3. Is the science quality adequate?
4. Are the conclusions well supported and acceptable?
5. Linkages to other topics, or work elsewhere in ICES?
6. Is the work suitable for an ICES publication?
7. How should the work be continued?
8. Other points to note or query?
9. Was attendance adequate?
10. Was the range of expertise appropriate or adequate?

However, there was still some doubt among the Committee Chairs whether this review procedure is feasible with the current level of Committee participation by members and Expert Group chairs. It is often the case that Expert Group chairs are not able to attend the ASC or to delegate to an informed deputy. This makes it difficult to discuss the work of the group sensibly or to provide useful feedback to the Expert Group. ConC agreed that in general it should be a principle of taking on the role of an Expert Group chair that the individual should, if at all possible, attend the committee session at the ASC to present and discuss the report. It was considered

that it would be useful to have an annual meeting of all Expert Group Chairs similar to the one held under the ACFM.

ConC decided that the Ten Review Points should be a point for discussion in the autumn. With reference to 2004 ConC minutes, BCC was especially asked to do a pilot project using the ten review points (as guidelines for the review), and report back to ConC. All the other Committee Chairs also agreed to carry out the review process and report back to ConC in September.

ConC appealed to the Bureau and the Delegates for support with a view to ensuring that Expert Group Chairs are funded to participate in the ASC, because the Annual Science Conference is a forum for exchanging experience and opinions between Expert Group Chairs, within and between Committees.

Several ways to improve the Expert Group reports were discussed: An executive summary is very helpful, but it should also include important highlights of the meeting. For instance, observed anomalies and other phenomena that may be of relevance to other groups or disciplines. The important message should be flagged and extracted to a few very simple lines. It has to be considered that many Expert Groups under the Science Programme are also reviewed by Advisory Committees. So the message should be clear and easily recognizable for communication to others. The proposed format for the new executive summary layout is presented below.

Guidelines for Improved Executive Summary to go in the Chairman's Handbook

Each Expert Group should produce at the very start of their report a bullet point list of highlights related to a wider audience:

- Major anomalies or changes to the state of the ecosystem;
- Important new methodologies and findings;
- Emergent issues, challenges and problems.

With page/chapter references and other expert groups that should be notified.

In addition, there should be a summary of the Terms of Reference. This summary should indicate whether the ToR has been met, and if not, why, and how the Expert Group suggest to solve that problem. This summary should just be a few sentences following the format of the "Action Plan Progress Review", and if necessary, refer to sections in the report where the question has been addressed in detail.

10 Review of ICES activities and Expert Group structure

10.1 Review of activities under BSRP

The Head of Science Programme reported on the most recent development and implementation of the Baltic Sea Regional Project's (BSRP) Component 1 'Large Marine Ecosystem Activities'. As a spin-off of the BSRP, the BONUS (BONUS for the Baltic Sea Science – Network of Funding Agencies) project had developed to increase the scope and to make use of the new instruments for research projects that had been forwarded by the EU Commission. The BONUS project may now be a candidate to qualify for the most recent Article 169 (of European Treaty) initiative of the Commission. The Article 169 programme goes far beyond purely coordinating projects and will aim at integrating research plans and initiatives. ICES is involved in this development and will also safeguard appropriate participation of the BCC Chair.

ConC noted the information given by the Head of Science Programme.

10.2 Review of activities under REGNS

The REGNS Integrated Proof of concept workshop was held simultaneously with ConC. The latest developments were presented to ConC by the REGNS Chair; Andy Kenny, UK. This was the third meeting of REGNS. REGNS has sufficient data to go ahead. Deliberations will be presented at the ASC2005. A full assessment carried out for September 2006.

The REGNS Chair reported on the background and results of the current REGNS workshop. He addressed the question “Why was there a need for the REGNS process?” REGNS is seen as complementary to WGRED but focussing more on the procedural aspects of integrated advice. The May 2005 workshop investigated the feasibility of using data from a broad range of disciplines for integrated assessments. The background was the implementation of the Ecosystem Approach for effective marine management with the overall objective to create a link between science and advice to underpin adaptive management as recognized in ICES Strategic Action Plan. Specifically, REGNS has the following objectives:

- To look at ways in which the existing ICES structure (data centre & working groups) can input into the periodic production of regional IA - (organisational).
- To deliver a pilot Integrated Assessment (not advice) of the North Sea Ecosystem by 2006 - (the product/workshop).

Nineteen Expert Groups had been given common ToR to address in 2004 and 2005 and to start preparations to summarise data for the period 2000–2004, and any trends over recent decades, and to compile data and present at the scale of ICES rectangle for the North Sea and submit to REGNS web site. Fifteen responses have been received. Data included plankton and primary production data, oceanography, fish landings and fish assessment output, spanning time periods between 1948 and 2004. Work done so far comprised compilation and synthesis of the material from working groups, identification of parameters for the ecosystem overview, production of summary material and description of temporal trends in data. The workshop was successful, for instance, in displaying patterns such as the 1977–1988 regime shift in the North Sea. In conclusion, the proof-of-concept is likely to be confirmed. Next will be the review of the initial draft integrated assessment at the 2005 ASC which will be achieved during the REGNS intersessional work.

The question was raised concerning the comparability of the assessments produced by REGNS to the ones used currently for the fisheries advice. Will there be a common language? The current REGNS process is clearly data-driven and results governed by the information available. The product will be an ecosystem health overview which then may be specified according to the available scales of regionalization. The primary client for these products will be ICES to begin with. The exchange of information, especially the feedback to and from the contributing expert groups will result in continuously or stepwise refined advisory products. It will be crucial to translate these to be usable by environmental and fisheries managers.

The report was much appreciated and ConC expressed a positive view about the REGNS process and progress.

10.3 Review of activities under Advisory Committees

Open Recruitment

Based on the ASC 2004 minutes, the Chair recalled the issue to be readdressed by ConC on open recruitment for Expert Groups reporting to the Advisory Committees. The context was

that membership of Expert Groups reporting to a Science Committee is now open, whereas those reporting to an Advisory Committee are restricted to Delegates' nomination. Currently, some Expert Groups with Advisory Committee parentage are being transferred to Science Committee parentage to allow open recruitment. This development is not perceived as desirable by ConC.

The following points were made in discussion:

- In general, the motivation for including external experts is to provide expertise lacking in the Expert Groups. We should proceed with a pilot project under the Advisory Committees to build on experience.
- Expert Group chairs have the option of contacting the relevant Delegate and ask for a person to be nominated.
- ICES has been accused of being a closed community. If opened, we would avoid these perceptions.
- Recruitment should be partly by direct appointment, partly by invitation by chair. However, anyone invited to participate should have a valuable contribution, either expertise or data or both. The primary goal is to improve, where necessary the expertise and creditability of the Expert Groups.

Overall, there was a positive attitude in ConC towards further opening of recruitment. ConC recalled the earlier decisions made by the Council. In 2002 the Council (agenda item 17) agreed to “open ICES Expert Groups to relevant stakeholder representatives who can contribute to the work of those groups. Procedures will be developed over the next year which will ensure the independence and credibility of ICES activity”. In 2003 the Council (agenda item 11) Delegates expressed a preference to move away from the idea of inviting stakeholders to the working sessions of Expert Groups. This view was influenced by the concern expressed by the client Fishery Commissions. In 2004 under the discussion of the report from ConC, the Delegates agreed to open up the possibility to have open membership in Expert Groups established under the Science Committees. The present recommendation from ConC is to have open membership also in Expert Groups established under Advisory Committees, but not as open as the 2002 decision made by the Council.

ConC recommends the guidelines for open recruitment in all ICES Expert Groups as outlined in **Annex 8** for adoption by the Bureau.

Term of office for Committee chairs

This item was brought forward by the Chair based on earlier discussions with the Advisory Committee chairs. It was suggested to prolong the actual term of office for Committee chairs from three to four years. The point was made that a three-year period is too short for chairs to become fully operative. A four-year period is preferable – both for Advisory and Science Committee chairs – in order to respond to the changing world. Furthermore, it was stated that this would be consistent with the ICES staff policy for Professional Secretaries.

ConC proposed the Bureau to prolong the term of office for Committee chairs from three to four years.

10.4 Review of activities under Science Committees

10.4.1 Role and effectiveness of Science Committees

Do the Science Committees serve indispensable functions or is there another way of reviewing and guiding the work of the Expert Groups? It depends on the chairs to make the committees work effectively. The more active chairs may obtain more activity in their committees and facilitate more communication and exchange, thus better serving implementation of the ecosystem approach? The General Secretary pointed out that the main pillars of ICES are the science and the science-based advice. Consequently, there is no advice without good science and having pure science without feeding it into the advice would not be sustainable. Thus, leading-edge science is fundamental to ICES.

It was pointed out during the discussion that the work going on at the Expert Group level is not a problem, except for a few groups that still meet because of pure tradition or perhaps there are simply more groups than needed. That can be easily solved by the group itself or the Committee Chair. The problem is at the level of the Science Committees which have transformed into pure administrative units while the science is going on in the Expert Groups only.

Lack of participation of Committee members and Expert Group chairs at the ASC is a recurrent issue of major concern as seen again at the 2004 ASC. Two proposals emerged: 1) Reform the committee structure and task the Expert Group chairs with the oversight task. 2) Replace the elected Science Committee chairs by Science Committee Coordinators selected by the Council. Coordinators would work thematically with 5–8 Expert Group chairs and report to ConC.

It was agreed that discussion of the role of Science Committees should be broad and involve the Expert Groups and their chairs. At the ASC in Aberdeen it will be announced at the Opening Session that there will be a discussion of the structure of ICES Expert Groups and Committees, and ASC participants should be encouraged to take part in the process. It would be desirable to have annual meetings of the Expert Group chairs but this would increase their workload as well as add some additional financial burden to ICES. One solution would be to have an extra day at the ASC for Expert Groups chairs to meet and discuss scientific problems.

10.4.2 Do we have the right Expert Group structure?

The Chair pointed out that this should be viewed in the context of a still ongoing re-structuring and reforming of the Secretariat and the ICES advisory process. ICES is changing, has moved into a new building, will see more integration of environmental data into the advice, but we still have the old Committee/Expert Group structure.

This issue had been previously raised in MCAP and the Bureau meetings and they agreed that it would be a healthy exercise to review the existing structure. If we agree the structure we have is fine, we do not have to do anything. If change is needed, the ideas should be brought up in the committees during the ASC2005 and the work continued in ConC. This is likely to be a three-year process.

The view was expressed that we should be cautious about repairing something that was not broken. There may be some Expert Groups that have become redundant, or that do not attract sufficient participation, and these could be closed down. Such issues should be addressed by the Science and Advisory Committees.

The Chair suggested that maybe we should focus more on Study Groups with a short lifetime. This would lead to a more dynamic system. In addition, short-term tasks can be dealt with in workshops. Ad hoc advise is becoming increasingly popular – short-term requests come in more frequently. All Expert Groups with variable life-span are pre-scheduled at the time of formation. This would lead to increased flexibility. Some meet for one week only while others may meet over a ten-year period. Firm timetables may be set for delivery of products. Groups that are involved in monitoring should not have a short life though.

The Chair urged the Committee Chairs to set enough time aside to discuss a potential new structure of the ICES Expert Group and Committee structure. ConC will make a suggestion based on the feedback from committees which will be taken to the Delegates. It was felt that more commitment is needed by the Delegates to allow for an active involvement of experts, especially the Expert Group chairs at the ASC.

Together with the Secretariat, the Chair will draft a discussion paper that will be sent to ConC before the end of May. Based on this letter, Committee chairs will write to their Committee members and Expert Group chairs to inform them about the review process. The review process will be the main agenda item for the ConC meeting at the ASC in September 2005.

10.4.3 How to make ICES Science more visible?

ConC agrees this is a valid question that needs more attention. We should try to make ICES more and more easily perceivable to a wider community. The PUB Chair (with his committee) was asked to go through the ICES products and report back with suggestions on how to make ICES more visible. Target groups are other scientists as well as the non-scientific community such as administrators and decision-makers.

Discussion on ASC proceedings

ConC agreed that the pdf format for abstracts and papers is fine, once available on the web. It should be made more obvious on the web site that a pdf copy of a paper is available. The ASC is still the major event for presentation of new scientific achievements, new ideas and new avenues of transdisciplinary cooperation. So the pdf is the right vehicle to multiply the news in the scientific community. What is more, a “CM publication” is still a prominent milestone in one’s CV.

For the wider public, however, we might need a brochure, where we flag the stories/highlights of ICES work. Good examples of successful products are the “German” QSR and the ICES Newsletter.

ICES has been trying to move towards an entirely paperless ASC, including the publication of the Annual Report. Only approx. 300 copies are being produced. If parts of it or the entire Annual Report could be published electronically resources can be saved and used elsewhere.

Should Theme Sessions be published in a separate volume?

The Chair of the Publication Committee pointed out that the quality of Theme Sessions and reports may be highly variable. Theme Session reports should also pull out more highlights and focus on the actual achievements rather than listing individual papers. It would be preferable to have a one–two page summary in the front, highlighting the main results. Last year’s feedback on a request for attractive graphs in the Committee and Theme Session Reports was rather slow and limited: Good quality illustrations are highly desirable to make the Annual Report more attractive! The Committee Chairs should work on providing a much better guide to Theme Session conveners.

Some, but not all, conveners have a discussion period at the end of their session. Perhaps rather than having a rapporteur, noting down all the talks, we should ask/demand short precis’ from the presenters. Then change the role of the rapporteur to a provocateur who logs questions and issues raised during presentations and pushes these back to the audience at the end. The report would then encompass these comments and a synthesis from the chair, plus the precis’ from the authors.

ICES involvement in Research Programmes

The SEMIEA (“Supporting European Marine Integrated Ecosystem Assessment”) project was the first ICES initiative to potentially qualify for EU funding under the “Global Change in Ecosystems” call. The proposal was developed in order to support the REGNS process. Unfortunately, the significance and scope of the project went unnoticed by the reviewers and the proposal was turned down, but will be resubmitted. It was the first attempt of ICES to work with DG-RESEARCH. Resubmission was recommended when EC officials learnt more about the REGNS process.

The decision process on what ideas or initiatives qualify for ICES to be involved in facilitating, developing and submitting a proposal should be linked to ConC. ConC, and especially relevant Cttee. Chairs, should be informed of interesting projects with potential ICES involvement but this communication should also work vice versa, i.e. the Science Programme to be informed about research initiatives in the ICES community. ConC thought that involvement in Research Programmes should be determined in accordance with the Strategic Plan.

The Head of Science Programme informed ConC about a position paper that is currently being developed upon approval of the 2005 workplan by the bureau. The position paper will identify the future issues for the science programme taking into account the framework set by relevant conventions and directives as well as the “mainstream” science and technological development. Before exposure to the ICES community and executives, the paper will be discussed by ConC and the Advisory Committees.

ConC agreed to postpone further discussion on this item till September. It is primarily the responsibility of the Head of Science Programme to raise the profile of ICES by taking part in appropriate/suitable EU or other projects, although this should be in consultation with ConC.

11 Consider working practises necessary to further integrate environmental information into ICES fisheries advice (WGRED)

The meeting documents, Conc0505-14 and -20, were introduced as background information.

ConC recognised that the annual updates of the WGRED report should involve a number of expert groups and would be expected to influence the work conducted in assessment groups. As such, it is important that the timing of WGRED, expert group meetings and assessment group meetings are co-ordinated. It was felt that the WGRED report should be sent to all Expert Groups with requests for additions and updates according to meeting results and to the best of their knowledge. The goal is to make the integration operational!

WGRED has two principal roles:

1. To report on important environmental signals that need to be taken into consideration by the assessment groups. These must be reported on to the AMAWGC meeting in February and in advance of the assessment group meetings for uptake into the stock assessment process.
2. To ensure that the ecosystem overviews provide reliable and up to date descriptions of ecosystem components and properties. These overviews must be completed before Advisory Committees meet. The overviews require input from numerous expert groups.

In relation to (1), representatives of WGOH and WGZE should be invited to the WGRED meeting to ensure that relevant operational information on environmental signals is available at the WGRED meeting and is interpreted correctly. WGRED can then ensure that relevant information is included in the WGRED text and drawn to the attention of the assessment groups through AMAWGC. WGRED should prepare a specific request for WGOH and WGZE to ensure that the WGOH and WGZE representatives provide WGRED with the appropriate diagnostic information.

ConC recommends that the following ToRs are set for 2006:

For WGRED. To identify and report on the most effective approach for transferring relevant, accurate and timely operational information on environmental signals to stock assessment working groups. To prepare a protocol and timetable for such transfer of information. (Chairs of WGOH, WGZE and AMAWGC should be invited to participate in the 2006 meeting of WGRED).

For WGOH and WGZE. Working in consultation with the Chairs of WGRED and AMAWG, identify the sources of operational information on environmental signals that are most relevant to the work of WGRED and the assessment working groups, and provide a written report on how to access these sources of operational information on environmental signals.

In relation to (2), ConC recognised that the text produced by WGRED would need to be updated annually, based on a mechanism that drew on the best available scientific expertise within ICES. ConC recommends that Terms of Reference are set for relevant Expert Groups to review, update and improve the text for each ecosystem overview that is produced by WGRED. This would be achieved by setting ToR for relevant expert groups to review the WGRED text from the preceding year at their annual meetings. The expert groups would be encouraged to make specific amendments to the texts, within the structural constraints (length, etc) outlined by WGRED. Revised texts would be passed to the Chair of WGRED at least 4

weeks in advance of the Advisory Committee meetings. These texts would be compiled by WGRED (by correspondence) to form the text for review at the Advisory Committee meetings.

When several expert groups have to comment on one section then it would be necessary to ensure that the relevant draft text is passed from one group to another

ConC proposed a set example ToRs given in **Annex 9**.

ConC also supports the recommendations listed in the WGRED (2005) report (**Annex 10**). In relation to these recommendations, ConC proposes the following actions in addition to those described above:

SGMAS and WGECO should meet concurrently in 2006 to work on the development of management strategies that take account of ecosystem considerations

1. Environmental WGs (WGOH, WGZE and others) should be asked to provide WGRED with key diagnostic indicators that could be consulted at the time of the WGRED meeting in February. Ideally these indicators would be specific to eco-regions and substantiated by previous research. They would be augmented by any additional ecosystem or environmental signals which the Expert Groups considered to have particular significance in the relevant year. ToR to be drafted at the ConC meeting in autumn 2006.
2. Terms of reference should be set for WGECO, WGZE, WGPE, WGBE, WGFE, WGSE and WGMME in 2006, asking them to review the outputs of the Paris Symposium on Quantitative Ecosystem Indicators in Fisheries Management, and other relevant sources, with the objective of selecting a tractably small but ecologically meaningful set of ecosystem indicators whose values could be prepared routinely for each ecosystem, for inclusion by WGRED in the annual updates of the Ecosystem Overviews.

12 Strategies to deal with increased need for ecosystem scale advice (European Marine Strategy)

The meeting document ConC0505-15 provides a brief overview of activities carried out in the context of the development of the 'Thematic strategy to protect and conserve the European marine environment' (the marine strategy). All further background information and meeting documents are made available on the Marine Strategy CIRCA site: (<http://forum.europa.eu.int/Public/irc/env/marine/home>). In brief, there are three working groups charged with a coordinated development of the strategy: SGO (Strategic Goals and Objectives), EAM (Ecosystem Approach to Management of Human Activities) and EMMA (European Marine Monitoring and Assessment). ICES has been involved in the work of EMMA since 2004. EMMA is still in the process to develop a roadmap for future activities regarding assessment and monitoring. For this purpose, EMMA established three *ad hoc* working groups with the task to prepare contributions for this roadmap: Hazardous substances, eutrophication, and biodiversity. These groups met during the last EMMA meeting in February 2005. Overall progress is slow though. ICES had previously produced an advice paper on the identification of eco-regions which had been circulated to regional marine and fisheries conventions with a request to provide comments.

During the February meeting, the Commission indicated that work was on track to publish the 'Marine Strategy' by July 2005. It was envisaged that the total package would have the following parts:

- a background document describing present situation;
- a guidance document on the ecosystem approach;
- a ‘Communication’ on the actual ‘Marine Strategy’;
- most probably a proposal for a legal framework to implement the strategy within the EU;
- an assessment of the (economic) impact of the proposals.

ICES, together with the European Environment Agency (EEA) and the Joint Research Centre (JRC) in Ispra will be further involved in guiding the development and implementation of the European Marine Strategy.

ConC wishes to be updated on the progress

13 Dialogue with Client Commissions

Paul Connolly (MCAP chair) informed ConC on the development of the dialogue with Client Commissions.

13.1 OSPAR Long-Term Work Programme for ICES

ConC noted the meeting document.

13.2 HELCOM Long-Term Work Programme for ICES

ConC noted the meeting document.

13.3 Input from MCAP-MICC

ConC noted the report from the MCAP-MICC meeting. It was considered unfortunate that DG-Environment had not been able to accept the invitation to participate.

14 Data management issues

14.1 Report from BWGDDP

Julie Gillin (ICES Data Manager) summarised the report from BWGDDP (Bureau Working Group on Data Development). The main feature of the new ICES data policy is the change of approach from a more protective view of data suppliers that ICES has pursued for decades to the more open user-friendly policy better reflecting the requirements of the outside world. However, confidentiality is still maintained since the disaggregated data, e.g., at Expert Group level are not released or publicly available. The ACFM Chair stated that an unresolved issue is still the country-specific fishery data and their aggregation and evaluation (“manipulation”) procedure. ConC took note of the summary.

The BWGDDP also recognizes developments and requirements towards distributed databases. Where beneficial, ICES shall pursue this possibility in order to expedite and extend data accessibility, thereby maintaining its position as a hub of marine data in the North Atlantic.

14.2 User survey for ICES data and data products

Julie Gillin (ICES Data Manager) reported on the user survey planned by ICES and also on the feedback and comments by the relevant ICES Expert Groups. SGMID (Study Group on Management of Integrated Data) and WGMDM (Working Group on Marine Data Management) welcome the initiative to explore the needs and requirements of present and future users. They have made a number of concrete suggestions which are already implemented in the draft “skeleton” survey (**Annex 11**). In particular, WGMDM has suggested that ConC discusses how such a survey could best be arranged. Several points were raised and discussed by ConC. The question was raised of how to make the ICES Data Center more operational for fisheries. This does not mean real time availability of e.g. oceanography data, but like today’s weather is tomorrow’s climate data, operational availability of environmental data for integrated ecosystem advice is indispensable. The Data Manager pointed out that similar problems have emerged in other data bases, for instance in the MARBEF project or in CoML’s OBIS data base and that ICES aims at cooperating in finding adequate and perhaps similar solutions. It should also be noted that ICES is not the data owner.

ConC supported the idea of a questionnaire and recommends that professional assistance is consulted to ensure an unbiased, unambiguous survey with clear goals. ConC recommends for the BWGDDP to consider the need of having two versions of the questionnaire to be handed out to different user groups: The standard questionnaire for all real and potential users, as well as an extended standard questionnaire plus an extended set of questions for ICES Expert Groups. This should consider their more specific requirements.

15 Update on Study Group on Publication Practices regarding Ethical Concerns on the Use of Animals in Scientific Research (SGPPE)

Over the last decades, there has been an increasing awareness of the use of animals as part of scientific research. A key question in animal research has been to ensure that experiments are designed with ethical consideration to the well-being of the organisms used in manipulative studies. As a flagship publication of ICES, the *ICES Journal of Marine Science* should demonstrate a philosophy of societal responsibility when it comes to ensuring that ethical practices are part of the articles published under our auspices. The current guidelines for authors make no mention of the use of ethical guidelines for the use of animals in scientific research. As a result, there is no established procedure among the Editors to deal with ethical considerations about the use of animals in research manuscripts submitted to the journal. However, by requiring assurance from the researchers that their research has satisfied national or institutional ethical standards, the Journal would provide some protection for itself and ICES against certain types of legal action (should that ever occur).

Various ICES member countries have legislation or national ethical councils or boards which oversee the ethical use of animals in scientific research. Furthermore, the European Union’s “Convention for the Protection of Vertebrate Animals used for Experimental and Other Scientific Purposes” provides general guidelines for member states. Canada and United States also have requirements for the care and use of animals in scientific research through Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees which are governed by national organizations.

To deal with the issue, the Journal Editors propose to add to the instructions to authors for the ICES Journal of Marine Science is:

“Confirmation that the author has adhered to general guidelines for the ethical use of animals in research, the legal requirements of the country in which the work was car-

ried out, and any institutional guidelines. If ethical considerations arose in the course of the study, the author should describe in the manuscript how those considerations were addressed. In exceptional cases, where unresolved ethical questions remain, the manuscript may be sent to appropriate experts in the ethical use of animals in research for additional refereeing. In such cases, the decision as to whether the manuscript is accepted for publication remains with the Editor or, in the final instance, the Editor-in-chief.”

The intention of the section is to ensure proper reporting of procedures used in animal experimentation and ensure ethical treatment of the animals affected. The wording also establishes a procedure for adjudication of cases where concern is raised either by referees or the Editors. It is important to note that these requirements apply almost exclusively to manipulative studies where the animals are confined or released back into the environment. As such, population studies often do not require licensing or they easily satisfy the ethical requirements in terms of societal significance.

The SGPPE will conclude its discussion of the statement shortly and present the final wording for the Consultative Committee to endorse in September 2005, thus concluding the work of SGPPE.

16 Nomination of Vice-Chair

Dave Reid (Chair of LRC) was elected Vice-Chair of ConC with effect from this date (11 May 2005). The term of office of the Vice-Chair will not exceed his/her term of office as a member of ConC.

17 Update on MCAP and Bureau meetings

Paul Connolly (Chair of MCAP) presented the salient points from the MCAP reports from February 2005 and from the MCAP-MICC (Meeting with ICES Client Commissions) meeting in April 2005.

- **Regional Advisory Councils (RAC's).** At its meeting with the Client Commissions MCAP received a full update from the EU Commission on the evolving RAC's. MCAP will prepare a discussion document for the June Bureau meeting in relation to how ICES should interact with the new RAC's. There will be a clear need for ICES to input to the RAC's but there will be major resource implications for ICES.
- **Admission of observers to the advisory process.** There were concerns from a number of ICES Client Commissions on the admission of observers to the ICES advisory meetings. A pilot programme which covers October 2004 and May 2005 ACFM meetings will be evaluated by MCAP and the Bureau. The initial experience has been positive.
- **Review of progress in Advisory Process.** Clients have raised concerns regarding the new format of ICES advice. They believe that the advice format is too complicated. MCAP will review the advice format in 2005. The goal will be to simplify the presentation of the advice making it more 'user friendly'.
- **The Study Group on Quality Assurance (SGQUA)** has presented its report to MCAP. There is now a clear need for ICES to decide on the route it wishes to take in terms of quality (i.e., appoint a person in charge of QA full time). MCAP will prepare a discussion document for the June Bureau on quality assurance at ICES.

- **Communication between ICES and Client Commissions.** Communications between ICES and DG Fish need to be improved. MCAP will make special efforts to improve the communications channels in 2005 so that there are 'no surprises'.
- **Submission of data collected under the EU data directive to Expert Groups.** The EU Commission spend a considerable amount of money financing the collection of fisheries data each year under the Data Collection Regulation. They are very keen to see these data transmitted to ICES and used in assessments. However, there is considerable debate in ICES as to whether ICES should report on 'who sent what' to assessment Working Groups. There is a strong feeling that ICES should not become a policeman for the Commission in terms of reporting which countries have/have not supplied data? This year ICES will provide a list showing which data have been presented to assessment Working Groups. This will enable the Commission to get an overview of data delivery. The data collection regulation will be reviewed in 2005 and perhaps ICES and especially ConC should become involved and influence what kind of data are to be collected in a revised regulation.

The roles of the Scientific, Technical, and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF), the Joint Research Centre (JRC), and ICES need to be clarified to avoid duplication and improve synergies. The ICES Secretariat will visit the JRC to develop relations and discuss the future needs of the European Commission.

MCAP will have four key priorities for 2005:

- Improved communications with Client Commission;
- Develop a strategy for ICES interaction with RAC's;
- Further progress on the developments in integrated advice;
- Track progress on the various MOU's with Client Commissions.

Bureau

The General Secretary informed ConC of the decisions taken at the ICES Bureau Meeting in February 2005. ConC in particular noted that the Bureau had decided to increase the Conference fee for the 2005 ASC by Euro 25 to support the provision of bus passes and lunches for the participants. ConC also noted the new membership structure of PUB. In relation to symposia, the General Secretary informed ConC of the problems in relation to the Marine Bioinvasions Symposium which are meanwhile resolved.

18 Any other business

Timing of the next ConC mid-term meeting

ConC agreed that mid-May is too early to have the mid-term ConC meeting. More time is needed to prepare, for instance the ASC programme – at least two more weeks are needed. However, the ConC meeting should be close to the Advisory Committee meetings. One solution could be to have the ConC meeting right before ACME during the first half of June (8, 9, 10 June - Thursday, Friday, and Saturday).

Address database for Expert Groups and Committee members

ConC asked the Secretariat to invest in a simple address database of ICES committee members to go on the web.

One-day registration fee for the Annual Science Conference

ConC recommends that for future Annual Science Conferences a one-day registration fee should be introduced in order to allow for, e.g., stakeholders/industry representatives to participate in a specific session or lecture. The fee should be higher than 1/5 of the overall registration fee.

19 Close

The Chair closed the meeting at 15:00, and thanked the members for their active and constructive participation.

Annex 1: List of participants

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX	EMAIL
Paul Connolly (MCAP)	Marine Environment and Health Services Div. Marine Institute Galway Technology Park Galway Ireland		paul.connolly@marine.ie
Poul Degnbol (ACFM)	Institute for Fisheries Management (IFM) North Sea Centre P.O. Box 104 9850 Hirtshals Denmark	+45 98 97 82 82	pd@ifm.dk
François Gerlotto (Fisheries Technology Committee)	I.R.D. Rue Jean Monnet B.P. 171 34203 Sète France		francois.gerlotto@ird.fr
Cornelius Hammer (Baltic Committee)	Bundesforschungsanstalt f. Fischerei Institut für Ostseefischerei An der Jägerbäk 2 D-18069 Rostock-Marienehe Germany	+49 381 810 344 +49 381 810 445	cornelius.hammer@ior.bfa- fisch.de
Simon Jennings (ACE)	CEFAS Lowestoft Laboratory Lowestoft Suffolk NR33 0HT United Kingdom	+44 1502 562244 +44 1502 513865	s.jennings@cefass.co.uk
Paul Keizer (ACME)	Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans Bedford Institute of Oceanography P.O. Box 1006 Dartmouth, NS B2Y 4A2 Canada	+1 902 426 6138 +1 902 426 6695 (FAX)	keizerp@mar.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Harald Loeng (ConC Chair)	Institute of Marine Research P.O. Box 1870 Nordnes N-5817 Bergen Norway	+47 55 238466 +47 55 238687	harald.loeng@imr.no
Niall ÓMaoiléidigh (Diadromous Fish Committee)	The Marine Institute Abbotstown Dublin 15 Ireland	+353 1 822 8200 or 353 1 822 8209 +353 1 8205078 (fax)	niall.omaoleidigh@marine.i e

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX	EMAIL
Pierre Pepin (Publication Committee)	Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Centre P.O. Box 5667 St John's, Nfld A1C 5X1 Canada	+ 1 709 772 2081 +1 709 772 4105 (FAX)	pepin@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Dave G. Reid (Living Resources Committee)	Fisheries Research Services Marine Laboratory P.O. Box 101 375 Victoria Road Aberdeen AB11 9DB United Kingdom	+44 1224 295 363 +44 1224 295 511	reiddg@marlab.ac.uk
Heye Rumohr (Marine Habitat Committee)	Leibniz-Institute for Marine Sciences IFM-GEOMAR Düsternbrooker Weg 20 D-24105 Kiel Germany	+49 431 600 4524 +49 431 600 1671	hrumohr@ifm-geomar.de
Thomas W. Sephton (Mariculture Committee)	Department of Fisheries & Oceans Beford Institute of Oceanography P.O.Box 1006 Dartmouth, N.S. B2Y 4A2 Canada	+1 902 244 6080 + 1 902 426 6695 (FAX)	sephtont@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Dankert Skagen (Resource Management Committee)	Institute of Marine Research P.O. Box 1870 Nordnes N-5817 Bergen Norway	+47 55 238419 +47 55 238687	dankert.skagen@imr.no
Einar Svendsen (Oceanography Committee)	Institute of Marine Research P.O. Box 1870 Nordnes N-5817 Bergen Norway	+47 55 238458 +47 55 238687	einar.svendsen@imr.no
ICES Secretariat			
Julie Gillin (Data Centre Manager)	ICES HC Andersens Boulevard 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	+45 3338 6712 +45 3393 4215	julie@ices.dk
David Griffith (General Secretary)	ICES HC Andersens Boulevard 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	+45 3338 6701 +45 3393 4215	david@ices.dk
Görel Kjeldsen (Meetings & Conference Coordinator)	ICES HC Andersens Boulevard 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	+45 3338 6705 +45 3393 4215	gorel@ices.dk

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX	EMAIL
Adi Kellermann (Head of Science Programme)	ICES HC Andersens Boulevard 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	+45 3338 6714 +45 3393 4215	adi@ices.dk
Vivian Piil	ICES HC Andersens Boulevard 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	+45 3338 6709 +45 3393 4215	vivian@ices.dk
Claire Welling	ICES HC Andersens Boulevard 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	+45 3338 6707 +45 3393 4215	claire@ices.dk

Annex 2: Agenda

- 1 Opening and practical arrangements. The meeting will be opened at 10.00.
- 2 Adoption of agenda and timetable (conc0505-1)
- 3 Minutes of 2004 September meeting in Vigo – (conc0505-2)
- 4 Annual Science Conference 2005 – Aberdeen, Scotland (conc0505-4 and 5)
 - 4.1 Meeting arrangements
 - 4.2 Schedule of Scientific Sessions
 - 4.3 Schedule of Science Committee meetings and other activities
 - 4.4 Planning for review of resolutions not currently available
 - 4.5 Travel support
- 5 Annual Science Conference 2006 – Maastricht, The Netherlands (conc0505-6 and -7)
 - 5.1 Meeting arrangements
 - 5.2 Review of proposed Theme Sessions
 - 5.3 Invited lectures and other special events
- 6 Annual Science Conference 2007 – Helsinki, Finland (conc0505-6 and 8)
 - 6.1 Meeting arrangements
 - 6.2 Review of proposed Theme Sessions
 - 6.3 Invited lectures and other special events
- 7 Review of plans for Symposia, including Young Scientist Conference (conc0505-9)
- 8 2005 Resolutions
 - 8.1 Review of resolutions currently available (conc0505-10)
 - 8.2 Progress Review of Committees and Expert Groups 2004 (in relation to ICES Action Plan)
- 9 ICES Audit Process (conc0505-11 and -12)
- 10 Review of ICES activities and Expert Group structure
 - 10.1 Review of activities Baltic Sea Regional Project (BSRP) (Conc0505-23)
 - 10.2 Review of activities under Regional Ecosystem Study Group for the North Sea (REGNS)
 - 10.3 Review of activities under Advisory Committees
 - 10.4 Review of activities Science Committees (Role of Science in ICES) (conc0505-13)
 - 10.4.1 Roles and effectiveness of Science Committees – Bottom-up driven science management?
 - 10.4.2 Do we have the right WG-structure?
 - 10.4.3 How to make ICES Science more visible:
A new report series (ICES Science)?
Publication of ASC proceedings?
Theme Session reports in separate volume of Annual Report?
Format, structure, and scope of ASC?
ICES involvement in research programmes
- 11 Consider working practises necessary to further integrate environmental information into ICES Fisheries Advice (SJ) (conc0505-14 and -20)
- 12 Strategies to deal with increased need for ecosystem scale advice (European Marine Strategy) (conc0505-15)
- 13 Dialogue with Client Commissions on potential incorporation of their research needs in ICES science programmes (PC)
 - 13.1 OSPAR Long-term Work Programme for ICES (conc0505-16A)
 - 13.2 HELCOM Long-term Work Programme for ICES (conc0505-16B)
 - 13.3 Input from MCAP/MICC April 2005 (conc0505-18)
- 14 Data Management Issues
 - 14.1 User survey for ICES data and data products
 - 14.2 Report from Bureau Working Group on Data Development (Conc0505-21)
- 15 Update from Study Group on ICES Publication Practices regarding Ethical Concerns on the Use of Animals in Scientific Research [SGPPE]. (TS)
- 16 Nomination of Vice-Chair of CONC for the period 2005–2008 (for formal appointment by Delegates in September 2005)
- 17 Update on MCAP and Bureau meetings ((conc0505-17 and -19)
- 18 Any other business
- 19 Closing

Draft timetable

	MONDAY – 9 MAY	TUESDAY – 10 MAY	WEDNESDAY – 11 MAY
9:00-10:30	(we start at 1000) Introductory items (1–3) ASC 2005 (4.1)	2005 Resolutions (8) ICES audit process (9)	Vice-Chair for ConC (16) User Survey ICES data and data products (14)
10:30-11:00		Comfort Break	Comfort Break
11:00-13:00	ASC 2005(4.2)	Review of ICES activities and EG structure (10)	SGPPE (15) Update on MCAP, Bureau(17)
13:00-14:00	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
14:00-15:30	ASC 2005 (4.3–4.5)	Review of ICES activities and EG structure (10)	ConC Draft Report
15:30-16:00	Comfort Break	Comfort Break	Comfort Break
16:00-18:30	ASC 2006 (5.1) ASC 2006 (5.2–5.3) ASC 2007 (6.1–6.3) Review of plans for Symposia (7)	WGRED (11) European Marine Strategy (12) Dialogue with Client Commissions (13)	Any other business (18) Close

Meeting documents

Conc0505-1	Agenda and timetable
Conc0505-2	2004 Report of Consultative Committee
Conc0505-3	2004 Report of Consultative Committee (Mid-Term Meeting)
Conc0505-4	ASC Programme 2005 (will be presented at the meeting)
Conc0505-5	Arrangements for the 2005 ASC
Conc0505-6	Arrangements for the 2006 and 2007 ASC
Conc0505-7	Theme Sessions 2006
Conc0505-8	Theme Sessions 2007
Conc0505-9	ICES Symposia and YSC (revolving list)
Conc0505-10	Preliminary Draft Resolutions
Conc0505-11	On the matter of audits (Jake Rice), including excerpts on audit process from CONC04 and MCAP05 meetings
Conc0505-12	ICES Action Plan
Conc0505-13	Why still ICES Science Committees? (Heye Rumohr)
Conc0505-14	Progress with the Introduction of the Ecosystem Approach in the ICES Advisory function
Conc0505-15	European Marine Strategy – Overview of Consultation Process
Conc0505-16A	OSPAR Long-term Work Programme for ICES
Conc0505-16B	HELCOM Long-term Work Programme for ICES
Conc0505-17	Report of the Management Committee on the Advisory Process (MCAP)
Conc0505-18	Report on Meeting with ICES Client Commissions (MCAP-MICC)
Conc0505-19	Decisions taken at Bureau Meeting – February 2005
Conc0505-20	Draft WGRED Report 2005
Conc0505-21	Final Draft - Bureau Working Group Data Development Project
Conc0505-22	How to get physical oceanographers back to ICES / response from WGOH
Conc0505-23	Summary of the Report by BSRP COMPONENT 1 'Large Marine Ecosystem Activities'

Annex 3: ASC programme 2005

				Ground Floor									Floor 1		Floor 2		Floor 3		
	Day	Start	End	Orr	Boyd	Gordon A	Gordon B	Fleming	12/14	15	16	17	2	3	7	8	Forbes	9	10
				(Posters)	(750)	(270)	(294)	(428)	(30)	(15)	(15)	(30)	(35)	(66)	(1)	(1)	(240)	(51)	(68)
Sunday	18-Sep-05	9:00	10:00							ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS		MCAP		
		10:00	10:30							ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS		MCAP		
		10:30	11:00							ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS		MCAP		
		11:00	11:30							ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS		MCAP		
		11:30	12:30							ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS		MCAP		
		12:30	13:30							ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS		MCAP		
		13:30	14:00							ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS		MCAP		
		14:00	15:30							ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS		CONC		
		15:30	16:00							ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS		CONC		
		16:00	17:30							ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS		CONC		
		17:30	18:00							ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS		CONC		
		18:00	19:00							ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS				
		19:00	20:00																
				Ground Floor									Floor 1		Floor 2		Floor 3		
	Day	Start	End	Orr	Boyd	Gordon A	Gordon B	Fleming	12/14	15	16	17	2	3	7	8	Forbes	9	10
				(Posters)	(750)	(270)	(294)	(428)	(30)	(15)	(15)	(30)	(35)	(66)	(1)	(1)	(240)	(51)	(68)
Monday	19-Sep-05	9:00	10:00	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	ACME	ICES	Bureau	SEC	PUB		FRS	PRES	ACFM		
		10:00	10:30	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	ACME	ICES	Bureau	SEC	PUB		FRS	PRES	ACFM		
		10:30	11:00	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	ACME	ICES	Bureau	SEC	PUB		FRS	PRES	ACFM		
		11:00	11:30	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	ACME	ICES	Bureau	SEC	PUB		FRS	PRES	ACFM		
		11:30	12:30	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	ACME	ICES	Bureau	SEC	PUB		FRS	PRES	ACFM		
		12:30	13:30	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	ACME	ICES	Bureau	SEC	PUB		FRS	PRES	ACFM		
		13:30	14:00	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	ACME	ICES	Bureau	SEC	PUB		FRS	PRES	ACFM		
		14:00	15:30	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	ACE	ICES	Bureau	SEC	PUB		FRS	PRES	ACFM		
		15:30	16:00	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	ACE	ICES	Bureau	SEC	PUB		FRS	PRES	ACFM		
		16:00	17:30	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	ACE	ICES	Bureau	SEC	PUB		FRS	PRES	ACFM		
		17:30	18:00	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	ACE	ICES	Bureau	SEC	PUB		FRS	PRES	ACFM		
		18:00	19:00	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up		ICES		SEC			FRS	PRES			
		19:00	20:00	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up	set-up		ICES		SEC			FRS	PRES			

				Ground Floor									Floor 1		Floor 2		Floor 3		
	Day	Start	End	Orr	Boyd	Gordon A	Gordon B	Fleming	12/14	15	16	17	2	3	7	8	Forbes	9	10
				(Posters)	(750)	(270)	(294)	(428)	(30)	(15)	(15)	(30)	(35)	(66)	(1)	(1)	(240)	(51)	(68)
Tuesday	20-Sep-05	9:00	10:00		OPEN					ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES			
		10:00	10:30		OPEN					ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES			
		10:30	11:00		OPEN					ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES			
		11:00	11:30	coffee						ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES			
		11:30	12:30		BB	S	T	U		ICES	ICES	SEC		Availabl	FRS	PRES		OCC	LRC
		12:30	13:30	lunch						ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES			
		13:30	14:00		BB	S	T	U		ICES	ICES	SEC		BCC	FRS	PRES		OCC	LRC
		14:00	15:30		BB	S	T	U		ICES	ICES	SEC		BCC	FRS	PRES		OCC	LRC
		15:30	16:00	coffee						ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES		OCC	
		16:00	17:30		BB	S	W	U		ICES	ICES	SEC		BCC	FRS	PRES		OCC	LRC
		17:30	18:00		BB	S	W	U		ICES	ICES	SEC		BCC	FRS	PRES		OCC	LRC
		18:00	19:00							ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES		OCC	
		19:00	20:00																

				Ground Floor									Floor 1		Floor 2		Floor 3		
	Day	Start	End	Orr	Boyd	Gordon A	Gordon B	Fleming	12/14	15	16	17	2	3	7	8	Forbes	9	10
				(Posters)	(750)	(270)	(294)	(428)	(30)	(15)	(15)	(30)	(35)	(66)	(1)	(1)	(240)	(51)	(68)
Wednesday	21-Sep-05	9:00	10:00		W	S	Q	U		ICES	ICES	SEC		BCC	FRS	PRES		Availabl	MCC
		10:00	10:30	coffee						ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES		Availabl	MCC
		10:30	11:00		W	Y	Q	U		ICES	ICES	SEC		BCC	FRS	PRES		Availabl	MCC
		11:00	11:30		W	Y	Q	U		ICES	ICES	SEC		BCC	FRS	PRES		Availabl	MCC
		11:30	12:30		W	Y	Q	U		ICES	ICES	SEC		BCC	FRS	PRES		Availabl	MCC
		12:30	13:30	lunch						ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES			
		13:30	14:00		O	Y	Q	V		ICES	ICES	SEC		Availabl	FRS	PRES		Availabl	MHC
		14:00	15:30		O	Y	Q	V		ICES	ICES	SEC		Availabl	FRS	PRES		Availabl	MHC
		15:30	16:00	coffee						ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES			
		16:00	17:30		O	Y	Q	V		ICES	ICES	SEC		Availabl	FRS	PRES		Availabl	MHC
		17:30	18:00		O	Y	Q	V		ICES	ICES	SEC		Availabl	FRS	PRES		Availabl	MHC
		18:00	19:00	POSTER						ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES			

- Session O:** *Connecting Physical-Biological Interactions to Recruitment Variability, Ecosystem Dynamics, and the Management of Exploited Stocks*
- Session Q:** *Advances in Reproductive Biology: Methodology and Applications for Fisheries Science*
- Session S:** *Oil Spills in Marine Ecosystems: Impacts and Remediation*
- Session T:** *Integrating/Implicating Genetics into Fisheries Management*
- Session U:** *Acoustic Techniques for Three-dimensional Characterization and Classification of the Pelagic Ecosystem*
- Session V:** *Fishers' Perceptions and Responses in Management Implementation*
- Session W:** *Rebuilding Programmes for Threatened Fish Populations*
- Session Y:** *An Interactive Forum with the Fishing Industry*
- Session BB:** *Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management Worked Examples*

				Ground Floor									Floor 1		Floor 2		Floor 3			
	Day	Start	End	Orr	Boyd	Gordon A	Gordon B	Fleming	12/14	15	16	17	2	3	7	8	Forbes	9	10	
				(Posters)	(750)	(270)	(294)	(428)	(30)	(15)	(15)	(30)	(35)	(66)	(1)	(1)	(240)	(51)	(68)	
Thursday	22-Sep-05	8:30	9:30		Plenary Pascoe Comm. Borg															
		9:30	10:30							ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES				
		10:30	11:00	coffee						ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES				
		11:00	11:30		O	R	L	V		ICES	ICES	SEC		Availabl	FRS	PRES		Availabl	available	
		11:30	12:30		O	R	L	V		ICES	ICES	SEC		Availabl	FRS	PRES		Availabl	available	
		12:30	13:30	lunch						ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES				
		13:30	14:00		O	R	L	V		ICES	ICES	SEC			FTC	FRS	PRES		DFC	available
		14:00	15:30		O	R	L	V		ICES	ICES	SEC			FTC	FRS	PRES		DFC	available
		15:30	16:00	coffee						ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES				
		16:00	17:30		O	R	L	V		ICES	ICES	SEC			ACME	FRS	PRES		DFC	available
		17:30	18:00		O	R	L	V		ICES	ICES	SEC			ACME	FRS	PRES		DFC	available
		18:00	19:00							ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES				
		19:00	20:00																	
				Ground Floor									Floor 1		Floor 2		Floor 3			
	Day	Start	End	Orr	Boyd	Gordon A	Gordon B	Fleming	12/14	15	16	17	2	3	7	8	Forbes	9	10	
				(Posters)	(750)	(270)	(294)	(428)	(30)	(15)	(15)	(30)	(35)	(66)	(1)	(1)	(240)	(51)	(68)	
Friday	23-Sep-05	9:00	10:00		Plenary Shimmield					ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES				
		10:00	10:30	coffee						ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES				
		10:30	11:00		AA	X	L	Z		ICES	ICES	SEC			RMC	FRS	PRES		Availabl	MHC
		11:00	11:30		AA	X	L	Z		ICES	ICES	SEC			RMC	FRS	PRES		Availabl	MHC
		11:30	12:30		AA	X	L	Z		ICES	ICES	SEC			RMC	FRS	PRES		Availabl	MHC
		12:30	13:30	lunch						ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES				
		13:30	14:00		AA	X	O	Z		ICES	ICES	SEC			RMC/LR	FRS	PRES		MCC	DFC
		14:00	15:30		AA	X	O	Z		ICES	ICES	SEC			RMC/LR	FRS	PRES		MCC	DFC
		15:30	16:00	coffee						ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES				
		16:00	17:30		AA	X	M	N		ICES	ICES	SEC			RMC/LR	FRS	PRES		MCC	DFC
		17:30	18:00		AA	X	M	N		ICES	ICES	SEC			RMC/LR	FRS	PRES		MCC	DFC
		18:00	19:00							ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES				

- Session L:** *The Spatial Dimension of Ecosystem Structure and Dynamics*
Session M: *Impact of External Forcing on Flows in Marine Trophic Networks*
Session N: *Elasmobranch Fisheries Science*
Session O: *Connecting Physical-Biological Interactions to Recruitment Variability, Ecosystem Dynamics, and the Management of Exploited Stocks*
Session R: *Marine Mammals: Monitoring Techniques, Abundance Estimation, and Interactions with Fisheries*
Session V: *Fishers' Perceptions and Responses in Management Implementation*
Session X: *Mitigation Methods for Reduction of Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Bycatch in Fisheries*
Session Z: *How to Improve Environmental Monitoring and Biological Studies – Integrating Ecology and Statistics*
Session AA: *Cod in a Changing Climate*

				Ground Floor									Floor 1		Floor 2		Floor 3		
	Day	Start	End	Orr	Boyd	Gordon A	Gordon B	Fleming	12/14	15	16	17	2	3	7	8	Forbes	9	10
				(Posters)	(750)	(270)	(294)	(428)	(30)	(15)	(15)	(30)	(35)	(66)	(1)	(1)	(240)	(51)	(68)
		08:30	9:00																ACFM
Saturday	24-Sep-05	9:00	10:00		P	K	M	N		ICES	ICES	SEC	PUB	FTC	FRS	PRES		LRC	ACFM
		10:00	10:30	coffee						ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES			
		10:30	11:00		P	K	M	N		ICES	ICES	SEC	PUB	FTC	FRS	PRES		LRC	ACFM
		11:00	11:30		P	K	M	N		ICES	ICES	SEC	PUB	FTC	FRS	PRES		LRC	available
		11:30	12:30		P	K	M	N		ICES	ICES	SEC	PUB	FTC	FRS	PRES		LRC	available
		12:30	13:30	lunch						ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES			
		13:30	14:00		P	K	M	N		ICES	ICES	SEC	PUB	availab	FRS	PRES		RMC	ACE
		14:00	15:30		P	K	M	N		ICES	ICES	SEC	PUB	availab	FRS	PRES		RMC	ACE
		15:30	16:30		P	K	M	N		ICES	ICES	SEC	PUB	availab	FRS	PRES		RMC	ACE
		16:30	17:00	coffee						ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES			
		17:00	17:30		CLOSE					ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES			
		17:30	18:00							ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES			
		18:00	19:00							ICES	ICES	SEC			FRS	PRES			
		19:00	20:00																
Sunday	25-Sep-05	8:30	9:00							SEC									
		9:00	10:00							SEC									
		10:00	10:30							SEC									
		10:30	11:00							SEC									
		11:00	11:30							SEC									
		11:30	12:30							SEC									
		12:30	13:30							SEC									
		13:30	14:00							SEC									
		14:00	15:30							SEC									
		15:30	16:00							SEC									
		16:00	17:30							SEC									
		17:30	18:00							SEC									
		18:00	19:00							SEC									
		19:00	20:00																

- Session K:** *Multidisciplinary Approaches to the Identification of Stock Structure of Small Pelagics: Implications for Assessment and Sustainable Management Session*
- Session M:** *Impact of External Forcing on Flows in Marine Trophic Networks*
- Session N:** *Elasmobranch Fisheries Science*
- Session P:** *Regional Ecosystem Pilot Projects, Ecosystem Forecasting, and Operational Oceanography: Comparing and Contrasting Scientific Tools, Strategies, Outputs, and Applications*

Annex 4: ICES Travel Financial Support

Eligibility

- Young scientists – 35 years of age or younger;
- Scientists from countries with ‘economies in transition’.

Requirement

- Completed application for financial support;
- Abstract of presentation;
- Short version of resume.

Criteria for assessing applications

- Applications for partial support only:
 - Airfare + registration;
 - Accommodation/meals + registration
- Originality of work as shown in abstract
- Level of application and involvement to the Theme Session

Annex 5: Theme Sessions proposed for ASC 2006

Strategic Plan, Goal 1: Understand the physical, chemical, and biological functioning of marine ecosystems

- 1) Harmful Algae Bloom Dynamics; Validation of model predictions (possibilities and limitations) and status on coupled physical-biological process knowledge". *Conveners:* Patrick Gentien (France) and Tapani Stipa (Finland).
- 2) Large-scale changes in the migration of small pelagic fish and the factors modulating such changes (LRC). *Conveners:* Jürgen Alheit (Germany) and Dave Reid (UK).
- 3) Climatic variability in the ICES area – 2000–2005 in relation to previous decades: physical and biological consequences (OCC). *Conveners:* C. Reid and Alicia Lavin.
- 4) Marine Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functioning. *Co-Conveners:* Carlo Heip, Hermann Hummel (both at Netherlands Institute for Ecology, Yerseke) + NN (someone from North America).
- 5) Selected results from CoML (LRC). *Conveners:* M. Sinclair and M. Sibuet.
- 6) Operational Oceanography (OCC) *Conveners:* Y. Desaubies; Guoqi Han + NN.

Strategic Plan, Goal 2; Understand and quantify human impacts on marine ecosystems, including living marine resources

- 7) Human Health Risks and Marine Environmental Quality (MHC/OCC). *Conveners:* D. Vethaak, NL, and NN.
- 8) Evolutionary Effects of Exploitation on Marine Resources (RMC/LRC). *Conveners:* Mikko Heino (Institute of Marine Research, Norway; mikko@imr.no), Ulf Dieckmann (International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Austria; dieckmann@iiasa.ac.at), Jeffrey A. Hutchings (Dalhousie University, Nova Scotia, Canada; jhutch@mathstat.dal.ca)
- 9) Quantifying, summarizing and integrating total uncertainty in fisheries resource surveys (FTC/RMC). *Conveners:* David Demer, USA, Steve Smith, Canada.

Strategic Plan, Goal 3. Evaluate options for sustainable marine-related industries, particularly fishing and Mariculture

- 10) Environmental and Fisheries Data Management, Access, and Integration (ACE). *Conveners:* Christopher Zimmerman, Helge Sagen, and Peter H. Wiebe.
- 11) Technologies for monitoring fishing activities and observing catch. *Conveners:* Bill Karp (FTC), USA, and Kjell Nedreaas (RMC), Norway.

Strategic Plan, Goal 4. Advise on the sustainable use of living marine resources and protection of the marine environment

- 12) Spatio-temporal characteristics of fish populations and their environmental forcing functions as components of ecosystem-based assessments (Joint FTC-LRC – proposed ASC 2004). *Conveners:* François Gerlotto, France, (FTC), and ? (LRC). New title and description on its way).
- 13) Examples of integrated assessments in support of regional seas ecosystem advice - beyond quality status reporting. *Conveners:* Andrew Kenny, Bill Turrell, Keith Brander.
- 14) The ecosystem approach: what's the impact on marine science, science based advises and management of marine ecosystems (OCC/LRC/ACE). *Conveners:* Dave Reid, Simon Jennings and Einar Svendsen)
- 15) Use of data storage tags to reveal aspects of behaviour important for fisheries management (joint FTC/LRC – proposed ASC 2004). *Conveners:* David Somerton (USA) and Julian Metcalfe (UK).
- 16) ICES advice in a changing world! (RMC). *Conveners:* Either Jan Jaap Poos (The Netherlands) or Barbara Schoute (The Netherlands), either Carl O'Brien (UK) or Nick Bailey (UK).

Annex 6: Revolving list of Symposia

YEAR	DATE	TITLE	RESOLUTION NO	VENUE	CONVENERS	CO-SPONSORS	DEVELOPMENT/COMMENTS/EVALUATIONS	DECISIONS/ RESPONSIBLE/ACTIONS	PLANNED PUBLISHED (YEAR & PUBLICATI ON)
2005	18–21 October	Interactions between Cultivated and Wild Diadromous Fish Species	2002/ 2ISY01	Bergen, NO	Lars-Petter Hansen, NO Malcolm Windsor, NASCO	ICES-NASCO	First announcement in September. Preliminary announcement has been distributed. Flyer distributed during ASC.	(DFC) Preparations have been made, flyer on website and sent out. PP would like to receive dates re proceedings in order to verify that publication in 2006 is an option.	JMS, 2006
2005	28/11 – 2/12	3 rd International Symposium on Deep-Sea Corals	2004/ 2ACESY02	Miami, US		NOAA, US Geological Survey and the US Minerals Management Service. ICES added as a sponsor. There will be no financial implication for ICES.	A Scientific Steering Group has been established that includes representatives of appropriate co-sponsors and members of the ICES Study Group on cold-water corals (/Working Group on Deep-Water Ecology). ICES logo has now been added to website (12/1-05)	(ACE) No progress report. Would have been a good idea to have ICES represented in Steering Group, but it is probably too late...	ICES not involved
2006	June	Management Strategies: Case Studies of Innovation	2004/2ACFMS Y03	Galway, Ireland for four days in June 2006	Paul Connolly (IR) and Jake Rice (CA)	The General Secretary will solicit appropriate co- sponsorship	Flyer will be drafted for Bureau meeting in June. Draft for Scientific Programme received by e-mail from Jake Rice (11/5- 2005). Scientific Steering Committee: (Mike Armstrong (GB), Doug Wilson (DK), Peter Shelton, (Newfoundland), Kevin Stokes (New Zealand)	(ACFM – P. Degnbol)	JMS, 2007
2006	30 October– 3 November	Fishing Technology in the 21st Century	2003/ 2BSY01	Boston, US	Chris Glass, US, Bob van Marlen, NL Stephen Walsh, CA	Co-sponsorship offered by FAO	Symposium website has been linked to ICES Well underway. The Conveners met during April 2004 WGFTFB meeting in Poland. The conveners request that Canada be appointed as third convener. Boston will be the site of the symposium and the dates have now been set. The conveners have been active in establishing a steering committee. Five theme sessions are planned and will be finalized when the Steering Committee is in place.	(FTC – F. Gerlotto) Have the editors been assigned? FG will contact conveners.	JMS, 2007

YEAR	DATE	TITLE	RESOLUTION NO	VENUE	CONVENERS	CO-SPONSORS	DEVELOPMENT/COMMENTS/EVALUATIONS	DECISIONS/ RESPONSIBLE/ACTIONS	PLANNED PUBLISHED (YEAR & PUBLICATI ON)
2007	May	Marine Bioinvasions	2003/ 2ACMESY01	Washingt on DC, US	Judith Pederson, US, James Carlton, US Erkki Leppäkoski, FI Yasuwo Fukuyo, JP	ICES-PICES US Sea Grant Program	Communication difficulties between the conveners have caused delays in early planning. This symposium has now been transferred to 2007. No announcements have been sent out yet. Setting up of the SSC and settling the venue is now on the way. Lead person is Judith Pederson, MIT.	P. Keizer (ACME).: Will be held in conjunction with 5 th Int. Marine Bioinvasion Conference. Although PICES has expressed interest in publishing the proceedings, however, ICES and JMS keen to publish.	JMS, 2008
2007	28 May– 1 June (tentative)	“4th International Zooplankton Production Symposium”	2004/2CSY04	Internatio nal Conferen ce Center, Hiroshim a, Japan	Dr. Shin-ichi Uye, Professor, Hiroshima University, and Louis Valdés, Spain	ICES, PICES and GLOBEC The Plankton Society of Japan, The Japanese Society of Fisheries Oceanography	Suggestion included in Annual Report from Working Group on Zooplankton Ecology (WGZE) 2004, draft resolutions for 2005 Local steering comm.: Dr. Shin-ichi Uye, Chief (Professor, Hiroshima University); Dr. Hideaki Nakata (Professor, Nagasaki University); Dr. Shuhei Nishida (Professor, the University of Tokyo) Dr. Michio Kishi (Professor, Hokkaido University)	(OCC – E. Svendsen) Well in line. It is being advertised on the web. Linkage: ACE, ACME, ACFM, WGZE, OCC	JMS, 2008
2007	11–14 June	International Symposium on Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM)	2004/2ESY06	Arendal, NO	Erlend Moksness		Link to symposium website from ICES website in place. International Scientific Committee: Chairman: Josianne Støttrup, DK Denis Bailly, FR Nicholas J. Bax, AU Johann Bell, MY Einar Dahl, NO Jessica Hjerpe, SE Victoria J. Isaac, BR Masahiko Isobe, JP Gerard M. Janssen, NL Beatriz Morales-Nin, ES Alice Newton, PT Stephen Olsen, US Qisheng Tang, CN	(MHC – H. Rumohr) Adi: everything is well in way. It is on the web. There are dates for abstracts, publications...etc.	Proceedin gs: Blackwell Publishing (UK)
2007	Summer	Young Scientist Conference	2004/2ASY08	US East Coast		PICES	Funding sources currently being fathomed are NSF, Sloan Foundation, Humboldt Foundation, Nippon Foundation. The target is to raise 300.000 USD.	(CONC/ICES Secretariat)	After the first YSC a selection of papers

YEAR	DATE	TITLE	RESOLUTION NO	VENUE	CONVENERS	CO-SPONSORS	DEVELOPMENT/COMMENTS/EVALUATIONS	DECISIONS/ RESPONSIBLE/ACTIONS	PLANNED PUBLISHED (YEAR & PUBLICATI ON)
									was published: The space issue did not arise.
2007	Sep	Symposium on Marine Protected Areas	Tentative. Not approved by resolution at this stage.			–	PD had received a request for ICES to <i>co-sponsor</i> a new symposium on Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) with logo. The co-sponsorship would also include publication through the ICES JMS. CONC was informed that there are two European projects regarding MPAs and a symposium planned in Spain in 2007, they would like ICES to cosponsor the symposium, not financially, but to add credibility to the project.		(JMS, 2008)
2007	November	Marine Environmental Indicators Utility in Meeting Regulatory Needs	2003/2ESY01	GB	Hubert L. Rees, GB Eric Jagtman, NL Kris Cooreman, BL	OSPAR, IOC, EEA have been confirmed. DEFRA currently negotiated.	A provisional booking at a London venue (a University conference centre) has been made for November 2007. Current cost for hire of the venue is about £1,300 per day. The Conveners are assisting the General Secretary in acquiring the co-sponsored support of DEFRA (UK). EEA and IOC have confirmed co-sponsorship.	(Marine Habitat Committee, H. Rumohr) Well on its way. Two new cosponsors: IOC and EEA. Fliers have not been sent out.	JMS, 2009
2008	June	Fisheries Acoustics, Science and Technology	2004/2BSY05	Bergen, NO	Eigil Ona, NO Rudy Kloser, AU David Demer, US		Steering Committee met in Rome and decided to postpone till June 2008. Organisation is well in line. No financial problem in postponing.	(FTC – F. Gerlotto)	JMS, 2009
2008	Summer	Linking Herring	2004/2ACFMSY07	Galway, IR	Maurice Clarke (IR), Mark Dickey-Collas	GLOBEC?	Herring in the middle - the trophic and ecological interactions and impacts of herring;	(Resource Management, Dankert Skagen) Better title needed? Role of	JMS, 2009

YEAR	DATE	TITLE	RESOLUTION NO	VENUE	CONVENERS	CO-SPONSORS	DEVELOPMENT/COMMENTS/EVALUATIONS	DECISIONS/ RESPONSIBLE/ACTIONS	PLANNED PUBLISHED (YEAR & PUBLICATI ON)
					(NL), Aril Slotte (NO)		Managing Change - management and exploitation of herring in a dynamic environment, within the context of long term change; Variable Production - particularly the role of reproduction, recruitment and life history strategies; Population Integrity - the rigidity of stocks and the drivers of migration; Counting herring - qualitative and quantitative estimation of herring and its application.	herring in the ecosystem? Hearing on Herring? Will be discussed further in September 2005.	
2008 or 2009		Marine Mortality of Salmon				ICES, PICES	Linked to SALSEA, NASCO initiative – survey on salmon post-smolt mortality.	(Diadromous Committee, Niall O'Maileidigh) Will be discussed further in September 2005.	JMS, xxxx
2008		Ecosystem approach			Robert Stevensson, CA, Ted Perry		Biological stations 100 th anniversary - ecosystem approach, fisheries management, relevant issues to ICES. One option to publish a book.	(Mariculture Committee, Tom Sephton) Will be discussed in September 2005.	JMS, 2010
2009 or 2010		International Polar Year Symposium					Proposal submitted to ICSU/WMO on 14 January, letter of approval received 1 April. Development of a final proposal on the way.		

Annex 7: Symposium Publication schedule

Year	Symposium - 15 month publication	2005												2006												2007												2008												2009												2010											
		J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
2004 Apr	IJMS	Ecosystem indicators												P																																																											
2004 May	IJMS	Climate change and North Atl fish stocks												P																																																											
2004 Jun	IJMS	Gadoid Mariculture												P																																																											
2005 May	ProgOc	Climate Change (ESAS)																																																																							
2005 Oct	IJMS	NASCO - wild/cultured salmon												P																																																											
2005 Dec	n/a	Deep-sea corals																																																																							
2006 Jun	IJMS	Management strategies												P																																																											
2006 Nov	IJMS	Fishing Technology 21st century												P												P																																															
2007 May	IJMS	Marine Bio-invasions												P												P																																															
2007 Jun	IJMS	4th International Zooplankton												P												P																																															
2007 Jun	Blackw ell	Coastal Zone Management																																																																							
2007 Sep	IJMS	MPA -- PROTECT																								P																																															
2007 Nov	IJMS	Environmental Indicators																								P																																															
2007 ???		Young Scientist																																																																							
2008 Jun	IJMS	Fisheries Acoustics																								P																																															
2008 Jun	IJMS	Herring and climate change																								P																																															
2008 Jun	IJMS	Ecosystem approach																								P												P																																			
2008/09 Oct	IJMS	Marine Mortality - Salmon																								P												P												P																							
2009/10 ???		International Polar Year																																																																							

Annex 8: Proposed guidelines for membership for all ICES Expert Groups

Membership and participation in Expert Groups is based on scientific credentials in relation to the subject matter of the Expert Group.

The membership of Expert Groups is by either nomination from Delegates or invitation from the Chair.

Thus, Expert Group members nominated by National Delegates are experts appointed by the Member Countries, which also bear the cost of their attendance at meetings. All Member Countries are entitled to appoint members to each Expert Group and to change them as they wish (unless decided otherwise by the Council, there is no specified limit to their numbers). National Delegates are required to notify the Secretariat of the names, affiliation and contact details (particularly e-mail address) of the members (and changes in them).

The Chair may invite relevant experts to be members of the Expert Group on the basis of scientific credentials in relation to the specific Terms of Reference for the expert group meeting. The basis for an invitation is thus that the expert will contribute to fulfilling the Terms of Reference of the Expert Group either by provision of data and/or analysis and/or expertise. ICES does not bear the cost of the participation.

Members appointed by the Chair will serve for one year at a time, unless re-appointed. When a chair of an Expert Group is appointing members, Delegates should be informed in advance where possible, or as soon as practicable. Expert Group chairs are thus required to notify the Secretariat of the names, institutional affiliation and e-mail addresses of the appointees and the Secretariat will notify the Delegates.

Each year, a list of members is provided to each Expert Group chair immediately following any change in membership notified by Delegates. This will normally occur early in the year, shortly after revised listings have been received from the Delegates.

Annex 9: Example ToRs for Expert Groups in support of WGRED

For WGOH, WGMHM. Critically review the text on bottom topography, substrate, climate and hydrography for each ecosystem described in the WGRED report from [2005] [and previously updated in 2006 by WGOH/WGMHM] and update the text to take account of new research and other information that has not been included. Confirm that any review of contentious science issues is appropriately balance and amend to achieve balance if not. Provide a copy of the redrafted text to the Chair of WGRED by [date] recognising that the total length of text on bottom topography, substrate, climate and hydrography for each ecosystem should not exceed 2 pages.

For MCWG, WGBEC, WGOH. Critically review the text on physical and chemical oceanography for each ecosystem described in the WGRED report from [2005] [and previously updated in 2006 by MCWG/ WGBEC/ WGOH] and update the text to take account of new research and other information that has not been included. Confirm that any review of contentious science issues is appropriately balance and amend to achieve balance if not. Provide a copy of the redrafted text to the Chair of WGRED by [date] recognising that the total length of text on physical and chemical oceanography for each ecosystem should not exceed 2 pages.

For WGPE. Critically review the text on phytoplankton for each ecosystem described in the WGRED report from [2005] and update the text to take account of new research and other information that has not been included. Confirm that any review of contentious science issues is appropriately balance and amend to achieve balance if not. Provide a copy of the redrafted text to the Chair of WGRED by [date] recognising that the total length of text on phytoplankton for each ecosystem should not exceed 1 page.

For WGZE. Critically review the text on zooplankton for each ecosystem described in the WGRED report from [2005] and update the text to take account of new research and other information that has not been included. Confirm that any review of contentious science issues is appropriately balance and amend to achieve balance if not. Provide a copy of the redrafted text to the Chair of WGRED by [date] recognising that the total length of text on zooplankton for each ecosystem should not exceed 1 page.

For BEWG, WGDEC, WGMHM. Critically review the text on benthic communities and biogenic habitat for each ecosystem described in the WGRED report from [2005] [and previously updated in 2006 by BEWG/ WGDEC/ WGMHM] and update the text to take account of new research and other information that has not been included. Confirm that any review of contentious science issues is appropriately balance and amend to achieve balance if not. Provide a copy of the redrafted text to the Chair of WGRED by [date] recognising that the total length of text on benthic communities and biogenic habitat for each ecosystem should not exceed 1.5 pages.

For WGFE. Critically review the text on fish communities for each ecosystem described in the WGRED report from [2005] and update the text to take account of new research and other information that has not been included. Confirm that any review of contentious science issues is appropriately balance and amend to achieve balance if not. Provide a copy of the redrafted text to the Chair of WGRED by [date] recognising that the total length of text on fish communities for each ecosystem should not exceed 1.5 pages.

For SGMAB, SGMSNS. Critically review the text on species interactions/ food webs for each ecosystem described in the WGRED report from [2005] [and previously updated in 2006 by SGMAB/ SGMSNS] and update the text to take account of new research and other information that has not been included. Confirm that any review of contentious science issues is appropriately balance and amend to achieve balance if not. Provide a copy of the redrafted text to the Chair of WGRED by [date] recognising that the total length of text on species interactions/ food webs for each ecosystem should not exceed 1.5 pages.

For WGSE. Critically review the text on seabirds for each ecosystem described in the WGRED report from [2005] and update the text to take account of new research and other information that has not been included. Confirm that any review of contentious science issues is appropriately balance and amend to achieve balance if not. Provide a copy of the redrafted text to the Chair of WGRED by [date] recognising that the total length of text on seabirds for each ecosystem should not exceed 1 page.

For WGMME. Critically review the text on marine mammals for each ecosystem described in the WGRED report from [2005] and update the text to take account of new research and other information that has not been included. Confirm that any review of contentious science issues is appropriately balance and amend to achieve balance if not. Provide a copy of the redrafted text to the Chair of WGRED by [date] recognising that the total length of text on marine mammals for each ecosystem should not exceed 1.5 pages.

For WGECO. Critically review the text on the ecosystem effects of fishing described in the WGRED report from [2005] and update the text to take account of new research and other information that has not been included. Confirm that any review of contentious science issues is appropriately balance and amend to achieve balance if not. Provide a copy of the redrafted text to the Chair of WGRED by [date] recognising that the total length of text on the ecosystem effects of fishing for each ecosystem should not exceed 3 pages.

Annex 10: Recommendations from WGRED (2005) report (Agenda Item 11)

Management strategies should take account of ecosystem considerations, but currently few or none do. ICES needs to focus its diverse expertise on development of such strategies.

Recommendation 1:

A provision has to be made within ICES so that members of Expert Groups which are working on management strategies and Expert Groups which are working on ecosystem issues will collaborate on methods to include environmental and ecosystem considerations in the management strategies and advisory frameworks to be used by ICES. A start could be made by having the relevant Expert Groups meet jointly, and there would be value to a Theme Session on the topic at an ASC. In the medium term making progress on this work is likely to require redistribution of responsibilities among some of the current Expert Groups and possibly creation of one or more new groups.

One of the key tasks of WGRED was to identify emerging major environmental changes that need to be considered by assessment WGs in carrying out their work. For this to be done effectively, these environmental changes should be identifiable in the same time scale as the most recent fisheries data used by these WGs, and be available before the assessment season begins. Hence we would seek to use environmental data from the preceding year when providing suggestions and guidance to the assessment WGs scheduled to meet following our meeting each year. WGRED recognises that it may not be possible to obtain synthesised environmental data this quickly, and that existing Expert Groups and Science Committees are likely most knowledgeable of what is possible to provide on these time-scales.

Recommendation 2:

Key environmental WGs, particularly those under the Oceanography Committee and ACE, should provide WGRED with a guide to key diagnostic indicators that could be consulted at the time of the WGRED meeting in February. Ideally these indicators should be specific to eco-region and substantiated by previous research. They would be made available to WGRED when it meets annually, and augmented by any additional ecosystem or environmental signals which the Expert Groups thought were of particular importance that year. As an extension of this WGRED recommends that key environmental WGs, particularly those under the Oceanography Committee and ACE be invited to provide eco-region specific descriptions of their expert area, acknowledging the overall size limit expected for these Ecosystem Overviews in the ICES Advisory Documents.

Recommendation 3:

To support 2) WGRED recommends that ICES develops a global approach to the use of eco-regions or RACs to provide coherent data provision across activities. Non exclusive examples would be the use of eco-regions in the preparation of the ICES Annual Ocean Climate Status Summary, and commercial catch distributions.

In addition to the role of WGRED in facilitating the inclusion of environmental and ecosystem considerations in the annual work of Assessment working groups and their tactical advice, there is longer term need to include these considerations in management strategies and strate-

gic advice. These tasks are likely to require use of more synthetic indicators of the state of ecosystem components, and indicators specific to the management approached being applied.

Recommendation 4:

One or more Expert Groups within ICES, including WGRED, WGECO [others] should review the results of the Symposium on Quantitative Ecosystem Indicators in Fisheries Management, and other relevant sources, with the objective of selecting a tractably small but ecologically meaningful set of ecosystem indicators whose values could be prepared routinely for each ecosystem, for inclusion by WGRED in the annual updates of the Ecosystem Overviews. They would also consider from time to time progress on process-based studies of stock and ecosystem dynamics, and ensure that indicators appropriate for inclusion in management strategies and/or assessment approaches were being made available on appropriate time scales.

Annex 11: User survey for ICES data and data products

SGMID & WGMDM comments

SGMID & WGMDM welcome the initiative to explore the needs and requirements of present and future users. They have made a number of concrete suggestions which are already implemented in the draft “skeleton” survey annexed herein. Both groups suggest the following:

- Preface the survey with an explanation of the purpose of the survey
- Use professional assistance to ensure an unbiased, unambiguous survey with clear goals.
- It is especially important to also survey *former* data users/contributors
- Data used by internal & external projects should be analyzed independently if possible, e.g., by request logs.

Furthermore, WGMDM recommends the following:

- 1) IODE surveys: parts of these 3 surveys could be re-used. Peter Pissierssens would be able to advise on the usefulness of the various parts.
- 2) *Monkeysurvey.com*: several WGMDM members have experience with this on-line surveying service and highly recommend it.
- 3) Distribution:
 - Request for survey response and endorsement by leaders in ICES , f.ex., General Secretary, chairs of committees, is essential.
 - Distribute through chairs of expert groups to distribute to group members. Group members shall further distribution within their countries.
 - Distribute hard-copies in the ASC package. This option is not foreseen as being very effective, but will be pursued as a low-cost means of surveying active ICES participants who do not submit or use our data.
 - Distribute to NODC's
 - Further distribution should be carefully considered as it may stimulate expectations which cannot be met.
 - To the extent possible, keep track of the surveys distributed.
- 4) *Distributed databases*: BWGDDP had suggested a specific question on opinions regarding distributed vs. centralized databases. Both SGMID and WGMDM did not want this question because “distributed databases are often the way forward” (WGMDM), and “the differences between distributed and centralised databases...are in most instances not visible to the user any more” (SGMID).

We have thus included this distinction only as a possible preferred method for data submitters (see Survey question 9).
- 5) Categories of Users should be well-defined and aligned with commonly used categories, e.g., those in IOC's surveys.

Please note that the Survey in the Appendix is a “Skeleton” survey.

All lists therein are examples only. They need expansion. Optimally, they should be aligned with comparable surveys (e.g., IOC's).

Appendix: Draft Survey

Part 1: You

1. Where do you work (country) ?
2. Do you participate in ICES?
 - Working or Study Group
 - Annual Science Conference
 - Symposia or workshops
 - Publications
 - Data contributor
 - Data user
 - Other _____
3. What type of organization do you represent ?
 - Academic organization
 - Government organization
 - Commission
 - Other _____
4. What is your position ?
 - Researcher
 - Student
 - Administrator
 - Other _____
5. What level are your computer skills ?
 - Inexperienced User
 - Experienced User
 - Programmer

*< The user will be guided to various sections/questions depending on his/her answers above
– in particular question 4 >*

Part 2: Data

< Each question in this section will be divided into two – one for data contributors and one for (potential) data users. >

6. Data of interest (please check all that apply)
< also explicitly include data which is not held at ICES >

ICES DATA	DESCRIPTION	
CTD (high resolution profile)		
Hydrochemistry (bottle)		
Surface		
Pump		
Contaminants Sea water		
Contaminants Sediment		
Contaminants Biota		
Biological Effects		
Biological Community		
ROSCOP		
Intercalibration results		
Fisheries Survey		
Project datasets (E.g. HELCOM, ESOP, VEINS, TRACTOR)		
Other:		

7. Geographical area(s) of interest.

<table>

8. Time period(s) of interest.

<table>

9. Data exchange preferences

		PREFERENCE
Formats	Comma-separated-file (ASCII csv)	
	XML	
	etc.	
Data storage < data contributors only >	distributed databases	
	centralized databases	
	etc.	
Medium	Internet download	
	CD ROM	
	etc.	

10. < accessibility of data: is it open enough, are tools to access it user-friendly, etc. >

Part 3: Data Products

11. Which ICES data products do you use ?
< possibly include products of other organizations >

ICES DATA PRODUCTS	
Aggregated data (e.g. survey indices, gridded parameters, stock assessment summaries)	
Time series plot, trend analysis such as indicators, spatial distributions	
TRACTOR	
Other:	

Part 4: Systems

12. Which standard systems do you use ?

SYSTEMS	
Spreadsheet such as Excel	
Database such as Access or Oracle	
GIS such as ArcInfo	
Other:	

13. Which ICES systems do you use ?

ICES SYSTEMS	
Accessions (submission overviews)	
ICES Integrated Inventory	
Reference codes (RECO)	
Oceanographic data distribution maps	
Data screening (DATSU)	
GIS facilities to expedite data access	
GIS products	
Other:	

Part 5: Hardware / Operating systems / Browser

< technical specification to be included >

Part 6: Data Policy

<

1. *Are you familiar with our (new) policy ? (include link to policy)*
2. *data submitters: does the data policy in any way deter you from submitting data*
3. *data users: are you satisfied with data availability*

>

Part 7: Additional comments, critiques, wishes, etc.

< free text >

Annex 12: Recommendations and action list

The Consultative Committee **recommends** that:

- the 2005 Annual Science Programme is adopted (Section 2);
- the Bureau adopts the proposal for ICES Travel Financial Support (Section 4.5, Annex 4)
- the Bureau and Delegates secure financial support in order to improve participation of Expert Group chairs at the ASC (Section 9).
- The guidelines for open recruitment in all ICES Expert Groups as outlined in Annex 8 (Section 10.3) are adopted.
- The term of office for Committee chairs be prolonged from three to four years.
- The BWGDDP considers the need of having two versions of the questionnaire to be handed out to different user groups: A standard questionnaire for all users of ICES databases, as well as an extended questionnaire for ICES Expert Groups (Section 14.2).
- A simple address database of ICES committee members be established to be accessed via the ICES website (to be included in the Secretariat's Workplan). (Section 18).
- For future Annual Science Conferences a one-day registration fee should be introduced in order to allow for, e.g., stakeholders/industry representatives to participate in a specific session or lecture. The fee should be higher than 1/5 of the overall registration fee. (Section 18).

Action list

NUMBER	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE	SECTION/ANNEX
1	A better price for accessing the wireless system during the ASC in Aberdeen should be negotiated (the price is now 6£ per hour or £39 per day)	Secretariat	4.1
2	The General Secretary will be asked to announce a new procedure during the ASC Opening Ceremony: Presenters are requested to contact their conveners - at the latest the day before their Theme Session - to assure that people are present	Secretariat/General Secretary	5.2
3	Establish contact to plenary speakers / ASC 2006	Chairs of OCC, LRC, ACME/MCC, Head of Science Programme, and Chair of ConC	5.3
4	The Chair asked the ConC members to contact their Expert Group chairs and ask for proposals for Theme Sessions in 2007. We should be clear in our guidelines as to what we want to attract, i.e., 1) the Baltic Sea, and 2) the Ecosystem Approach should be a central topics.	All Committee chairs	6.2
5	The Head of Science Programme, in consultation with the Chair of the Publications Committee and Editor-in-chief (Andy Payne), will prepare a letter for the organisers of the various Symposia to inform them of the planned publication schedule.	Head of Science Programme, PUB Chair	7

NUMBER	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE	SECTION/ANNEX
6	BCC was especially asked to do a pilot project using the ten review points (as guidelines for the review), and report back to ConC. All the other Committee Chairs also agreed to carry out the review process and report back to ConC in September.	BCC Chair, and all Committee chairs	9
7	Update of Chairman's Handbook / Improved Executive Summary for Expert Group reports	Secretariat	9
8	Draft a discussion paper that will be sent to ConC before the end of May. Based on this letter, Committee chairs will write to their Committee members and Expert Group chairs to inform them about the review process. The review process will be the main agenda item for the ConC meeting at the ASC in September 2005	ConC Chair and Secretariat	10.4.2
9	Go through the ICES products and report back to ConC with suggestions on how to make ICES more visible. Target groups are other scientists as well as the non-scientific community such as administrators and decision-makers.	PUB Chair (with his committee)	10.4.3