

ICES CM 2005/MCAP:06

Advisory Committee on Fishery Management (ACFM) Minutes from May 2005

ICES HQ, 26 May – 2 June 2005

1) Opening

The General Secretary, David Griffith welcomed the Committee and observers and informed them about the new facilities. He also spoke of the development with more integration between ACE and ACFM and that for the first year there will be a joint session between the two Committees; this is considered the start of an important process.

Diane Lindemann informed about practical arrangements and a presentation round followed (see participants list in Annex 1).

Documents and reports for the meeting were provided on a CD at the start of the meeting.

2) Observer process (docs 9 and 21)

Poul Degnbol outlined the rules for the new observers and referred to doc 21. The observers were invited to give feedback to ICES on the new system, and Doug Wilson will be at the meeting during the second week to interview observers with a view to evaluating the process after these two first trial meetings.

a) Observers present (Doc 9)

The different status of observers was explained. Michael Andersen was observer from Baltic Fishermen's Association, Charlotte Mogensen from WWF and Kaare Nolde Nielsen who has the task of observing the observers in connection with a social science study. Other invitations have gone out to organisations that are believed to have an interest in this meeting. Observers have additionally been informed that the part of the meeting dealing with stocks will start on the Monday of the following week.

b) House rules for observers (Doc 21)

The Chatham House Rules apply for this meeting. This means that information can be given from the meeting but is not allowed to refer to who said what at the meeting. The intention of this rule is to secure an open discussion and that nobody is to present national interests. Information is not to be quoted on basis of affiliation.

c) Information on the process leading to an evaluation of the effects of opening the advisory committees

The ICES Council has not wanted to open up the meetings on a permanent basis yet, so it is on a trial basis to make sure that free speech is still the case with observers present. From the ACFM side there has been much support with regards to this process and the increased transparency.

3) Press Policy – Release of Extract of ICES Advisory Report (Fisheries Issues) (doc 7)

The meeting will be closed on Thursday afternoon and thereafter the report will be open to factual corrections and one week later the final report will be released. Issue of possible loss of credibility when the process of the correction week is visible was discussed and a view was expressed that this process should be closed. It was however pointed out that it is not possible

to have a transparent process and keep the editing week closed. There will still be a password on for the whole week so the editing process is not open to everybody.

Also the ICES press release was discussed and the Chair outlined the procedure agreed by ICES Delegates. The Council has taken a decision on press policy and the formulation of the press release has been taken out of ACFM and the ICES press policy officer is to draft the press release. The General Secretary has the overall responsibility. Poul Degnbol will get this draft to correct for factual corrections and to remove over-dramatisation of the advice.

4) Approval of Minutes from October 2004 ACFM meeting (doc 3). Technical Minutes for October 2004 for information

No comments.

5) Adoption of agenda and timetable (docs 1, 2, 2a, 9)

The main point is agenda point 7 on developing the ICES advice (see agenda and timetable in Annex 2).

6) Requests for Advice for this meeting (doc 4)

Mette Bertelsen introduced this item giving an account of the requests to be dealt with and the responsibilities for each subgroup, both with regards to the special requests and the eco-region overviews.

7) Developing the ICES Advice

a) Review of Clients' input on the existing advice

i) The RAC process (docs 8a, 10) [Henrik S]

Henrik Sparholt showed slides and provided an update of the status of the different RACs.

We might expect more fast track requests in the future as EC may want some evaluations of advice coming from RACs. WGs under RACs are inviting individual scientists to their meetings (these individuals are often members of ICES and ACFM).

The Baltic meeting on 22 June 2005 is not a general assembly, but a preparatory meeting for a general assembly. The attempt is to get all stakeholders together.

The RAC system might increase work load for ICES significantly.

ii) Fast track advice. Review of requests that have been answered since October 2004 update (doc 22) [Mette]

An account of non-recurrent requests for advice since last ACFM meeting was provided and the corresponding answers were given.

It is likely that, in the future, there are going to be more and more of this kind of requests; this includes an increasing need for advice on specific issues in relation to providing more integrated advice. A more firm structure may be needed in future; members for whom the request is of national interest generally do take part in answering the requests, but in some cases even members of ACFM who have been asked to make an in-depth review of an analysis have not responded. Furthermore, in quite a few cases there have been zero or very

few responses to draft advice circulated to ACFM and it was therefore questioned whether this is a general sign that people are too busy to respond to such requests. Some participants responded that some of the advice to be given is of a very local nature and it cannot be helped that people don't have the time to go into all issues. If the response should be really good, a lot of work is needed to be done to make this so and often time doesn't allow for such in-depth analysis. Nevertheless, the national labs have a responsibility to make room for resources in planning for ACFM members to get time to work on those fast track advice issues, which will arise during the year.

At the moment the instructions are to respond to all requests that are not of a political nature but a mechanism of ways to filter may have to be found in future if the frequency of requests should increase further.

Also it was noted that the delivery mechanism of the advice to managers should change to be given more on a dialogue basis.

**b) Developing tools for longer term advice and reference point evaluations
(management strategy and recovery plan evaluations)**

(1) SGMAS 2005 (doc 18) [Dankert]

Dankert Skagen presented the SGMAS report. It was emphasised that the dialogue with managers is very important. The problem is how can this be done? It could be considered to establish case specific groups including Assessment WG members.

Multispecies aspects are something that SGMAS would like to deal with next year. Managers are very interested in what will happen if stocks are built up to large sizes. However, the outcome of simulations is more to give directions than absolute estimates of yield and stock sizes.

The issue of whether ICES can be proactive on suggesting HCRs was, after some discussion, supported by both AMAWGC and SGMAS. This could be for instance in the "management considerations" in the ICES Advice report. Maybe ICES should specifically ask for comments back from managers. In order to speed up the process specific letters could be sent to clients inviting them to develop this together with ICES.

The experience in Canada is that the managers tool box is important to know beforehand so that scientists do not spend many years developing things that only represent a small part of the total number of tools managers have.

The EC has about 10 stocks under recovery, some of them together with Norway. What seems to be missing at the moment is not a lack of discussions on tools, but rather on long term targets. It is important that ICES find out what we can deliver, e.g. can we deliver precise enough forecasts? There are also cost implications if more is demanded. An adaptive approach could be the way forward.

(2) Ad-hoc group on Long-term advice (doc 18) [Poul]

Poul Degnbol made a presentation of AGLTA. The North Sea plaice case was described in some details for illustration. We have to be careful with too large stock sizes simulated because there will be density dependent factors coming into play. It was pointed out that very large variations from year to year were often seen and some are far in excess of what is realistic. When formulating the advice this should be phrased as this shows the trends only and

absolute values should not be given. The focus should be within the range of what has been observed historically and uncertainties should always be given in the plots. It was questioned whether the very large stock sizes should be taken out of the plots or be grey shaded.

It was informed that the Baltic multispecies working group at an earlier stage have analysed cod 24-32 forecasts as well and this might be useful to consider in this process.

Another note was made that managers do not seem to look at confidence intervals and probability profiles seem to be preferred.

(3) Action in 2005 - AMAWGC (doc 17) [Poul]

Poul Degnbol presented the conclusions from the AMAWGC meeting and the report was tabled. This forum of WG chairs will exist for at least some years to exchange ideas and coordinate. Stocks for which management strategy evaluations may be relevant in 2005 had been identified, as well as problems concerning data and methods for each stock had been listed.

c) Developing tools for fisheries based advice

(1) PGCCDBS (Sampling strategy) and data bases (doc 25) [Hans]

The conclusions from the PGCCDBS report were reported by Hans Lassen. Coordination of surveys are done within ICES but the coordination of commercial sampling is done outside of ICES. This might not be a desirable situation. If ICES thinks this is critical to ICES advisory work, ICES should have control over the sampling but who inside ICES should be tasked with this is uncertain. The PGCCDBS has done important things like age readings exercises. The group has given ICES a service and if this group does not continue another structure should be established in its place. It should be noted that the EC Data regulation Directive is only a minimum sampling program. If the data quality can be determined and ICES can accept that then in principle ICES can use the data in the assessment.

(2) Action in 2005 – AMAWGC 2005 (docs 11, 17) (new document on mixed fisheries format and MAWGC) [Poul, Hans]

Hans Lassen presented a working document concerning mixed fisheries strategy. The issue of the present forecasts being too imprecise and the further disaggregation into fleet groups will make it even more uncertain. It is clearly useful to produce the variation of the linkages between fleets by annual catch by fleet, but whether it is used for forecasts is questionable. ACFM might be focusing too much on the problems in the issue rather than on how ACFM can improve the advice. However, to some extent it is rather a matter of a discussion using something simpler than the MTAC and maybe more correct, as MTAC assumes a fixed partial F in future. One could try finding similar situations in the past and then use that (i.e. catch by fleet) as a guidance. MTAC has meant that a lot of unexpected complexities in mixed fisheries have been made clear to scientists. A table with catch of cod by one unit catch of haddock was presented which could be done on a partial F basis and this would take changes in stock sizes over time into account.

(3) WGFTFB interactions (doc 26) [Mette]

Mette Bertelsen made a presentation giving an account of previous interactions and dialogue between FTC and ACFM and the draft report from the WGFTFB meeting 2005 was tabled. In 2004 some FTC members took the initiative to have FTC contribute more actively to the

advisory process and this process was continued this year by the participation of the WGFTFB chair at the AMAWGC meeting. A list of issues for which fish technologists can give inputs to has been provided and at it is at the stage of getting the work started and the feed-in process organised. A group had been formed at this year's WGFTFB meeting to use the North Sea as a test case as for what and how much the fish technologist can contribute with. A first place to start will likely be to provide information to fisheries related headings in the eco-region overview and correct present factual mistakes in the advice. It is the intention that similar groups will eventually be formed for all eco-regions.

d) Non reported catches and landings – AMAWGC 2005 (doc 17) [Poul]

It has been concluded in the process that in most cases it is not possible to come up with information pointing out the countries for which non-reporting and misreporting is relevant, because then no data will be obtained at all. It is likely that half of all assessments would have to be thrown out if misreporting estimates cannot be used without referring to individual countries. ACFM will have to take the best assessment even if it includes misreporting but this has to be clearly stated in the advice. If EC is demanding that ICES cannot use misreporting then there is another situation.

Assessment models that ignore the problem are not acceptable. Instead, alternatives can be presented, comparing survey and catch data and in some cases to change to survey based assessments and advice.

e) WG dynamics/resources and the need for change (doc 17) [Stuart Reeves]

Stuart Reeves made a presentation of an analysis of the past assessment of North Sea cod made in connection with the PKFM project.

It was agreed that quality control is very important.

WG resources might be fruitfully used by doing similar analysis for other stocks assessments: what is the reason for the past errors, is it mainly R overestimation, weight at age problems, etc. Knowing the past errors can be useful when trying to improve assessments in the future.

The XSA part of the problem was discussed, but there were mixed feelings about to what extent this method contributes to the problem.

It was mentioned that we have produced assessments in an “industrial way” and that it was time to get more science back into the work.

In most cases it seems that the problem is in the data. One consequence of this could be to focus more on system analysis, and how the management framework will react to data problems. For instance when we cannot make a forecast how should management react to this? However, we can also be said to have “simple” task, namely to estimate stock numbers, biological processes like growth, recruitment, and fishing pressure. One should gear the management system to the (often low) precisions of the estimates of these parameters.

8) Fisheries Statistics (WGSTAL) (doc 19) [Hans]

i) Changes in the reporting divisions and Other changes

Hans Lassen made a presentation. Some concern was expressed that the new divisions could be seen as compromising the ecosystem region.

9) Formulating advice

a) Guidance for ACFM sub groups, meeting next 2 days (doc 5: examples of stock summary and overview sections, (doc 17, AMAWGC 2005))

Docs 27 (guide to the advice template and language) and 28 (template for single stock summaries) were added to the list of documents.

The term “overfishing” should be changed to over-exploitation as this term does not relate or indicate an illegal fishing. The EC observer remarked that this would not lead to legal text problems for the EC. However, it was also expressed that it is not advisable for ICES to change advice language every year.

b) ACFM Subgroups review of Ecosystem Overviews, Human use of Ecosystems, Advice on fisheries exploitation and stock summaries

The work on eco-sections was based on WGRED drafts.

10) Progress on development of Assessment Software: INTERCATCH (doc 15) [Henrik]

Henrik Sparholt presented this item.

The issue of platform independence was raised, and it was informed that the software will not be completely platform independent. The ideal, of course, would be for an international organisation to have platform independency and it is therefore the intention in the second phase of the process to make it more independent, but to make it completely independent is too costly.

11) ACFM Consultations at the 93rd Annual Science Conference 2005 in Aberdeen, Scotland (doc 20)

It was informed that there will be a full day business consultations on Monday 19 September when strategic issues are to be discussed. The finalising of ToRs will take place the following Saturday. More groups will meet at the ICES Secretariat in 2006 in order to avoid problems with exchange of files after meetings.

12) ACFM meeting 6-13 October 2005

The procedures with regards to the autumn meeting are the same as in previous years.

13) Evaluation of working procedure (Independent review groups, transparency, observer process etc.)

The ACFM Chair introduced the item by expressing that in his view the procedure concerning the division of work between review groups and sub-groups has matured this year and that the distinction between responsibilities of tasks is much clearer to everybody this year. The draft summary sheets are also considered to have been at a higher standard at the start of the plenary meeting this year.

The Committee agreed that the review/subgroup procedure has worked much better this year after a year of introduction. It was noted that in some cases it is important to have more experts possessing local knowledge present at the subgroup meetings and a suggestion was made to extend the presence of WG chairs to the subgroups also. This however has financial implications and it is not considered possible in ICES budgets to allow for participation of WG chairs in subgroups. Instead, the solution to this problem could be to extend the length of review group meetings and shorten the length of subgroup meetings, but the two things should not be mixed in order not to confuse the quite different tasks of the two groups. The clear splitting of the tasks is important for the quality control and separating the technical review of the assessment from the advice.

A very large extent of continuity between the RGs and the ACFM Sub groups is important. It is also easier when the RG is held immediately before the ACFM meeting to remember all the details needed for formulating the advice.

For some reviews it is important to be able to bring in experts with specific knowledge i.e., as for the WGBAST review where Bayesian experts should be invited and for the eel review and advice.

The importance of having the first draft of the summary sheets prepared by the WGs was emphasised. Especially the task of inserting graphs etc. took too much of the subgroups time. Guidelines for when to accept an assessment should also be developed.

WGRED work had helped a lot. Maybe such a system should be considered for other parts of the ACFM report.

It was mentioned that age distribution of stocks are important to include in the advice because it often shows important aspects of the stock status.

One could consider to color (or otherwise indicate) special sections that WGs should pay special attention to.

The EC observer found the harvest rule based advice work encouraging, but was still disappointed, however, that no more progress has been made with regards to mixed fisheries interactions – cod in Kattegat example. Also there are still too many firm statements which lack a sound basis.

Evaluation of observer process

No observers were left at the end of the meeting except the WWF representative who expressed positiveness about the increased transparency in the ICES advisory process. Doug Wilson has been interviewing the observers and an evaluation of the process will be available at a later date.

Any Other Business

a) A problem with the Biscay anchovy stock was discussed. The new surveys indicate that the stock is very low. The EC Observer asked whether ACFM could react on this during the present meeting. ACFM decided to reply using the fast track advice procedure.

b) Nomination of a new ACFM chair will take place at the Consultations. Poul Degnbol will chair the October 2005 meeting and a new chair will need to be found for 1 January 2006.

There are considerations about making some revisions to the job and that this was awaiting some decisions from the Bureau in June 2005.

c) Poul Degnbol outlined the procedures for the work ahead by the ACFM subgroups. The review group work had been finalised and consequently the extracts should be moved to the ACFM subgroup directory. Of course clear errors should still be corrected, but the technical issues should have been dealt with at this stage. It is important to make the distinction between review groups and subgroups and that the latter are responsible for formulating the advice.

Finally, compliments went to the Secretariat for good support during the meeting.

**Minutes from
Joint session ACE-ACFM
(Chairs Simon Jennings and Poul Degnbol)
Friday 27 May 9-13.30**

1 Overview of Council, MCAP and MCAP-MICC decisions relating to the advisory process and the response of Client Commissions to ICES advice in 2004

Hans Lassen made an introduction on key issues from the two meetings; the reports were available at the meeting.

Opening up the Advisory Committees to observers is a pilot project running for a year that will be evaluated before the process is continued. This evaluation will be done to make sure that ICES has maintained its scientific integrity while at the same time been transparent during the pilot project.

There has been a review of membership of Expert Groups under the Science Committees; the EG Chairs are now allowed to invite relevant experts. This rule does not apply to Advisory Committees for which membership apart from client representatives only includes national representatives nominated by Delegates and experts invited by the General Secretary.

ICES is in the process of introducing an ecosystem approach and in this process is pursuing two lines of development; a holistic through REGNS, and also an incremental route in order not to wait with all progress until a holistic full-blown approach is ready.

2 Provision of fast track and non-recurrent advice

Mette Bertelsen gave an overview of the fast track procedure.

With the change to the form of the advice, ICES can expect many more requests related to integrated ecosystem issues in the future, and therefore ICES has to come up with an advisory process that can deal with it.

2.1 Influence of sonar on marine mammals and fish (EC DG Env)

Mark Tasker informed about the process with the sonar request, of which only the part of impact on cetacean populations has been answered so far. This is an example where a topic comes up which is in the margins of ICES current expertise and politically the sonar request was very sensitive. The request had also presented a political challenge inside ICES – not just outside. It is a strategic issue how to avoid and deal with this in the future; the view was that ICES has to take the challenge with the risk with these types of requests.

Only very few ACE members reacted during the process of developing the advice and it would have been good also to have had more objective scientists involved in the work. Also the level of risk acceptable was very difficult to get agreement on from the individual scientists that participated in the advice production. The science was more or less easily agreed on.

It was mentioned that FTC scientists felt that they should have been consulted in the process, but Mark Tasker replied that he had actually contacted them at the FTC Committee meeting at the ASC in Vigo 2004 and e-mails had been sent to about 70 people including FTC without anybody reacting. As the process is still not final there is still time for their input.

2.2 Eco-regions for European Marine Strategy (EC DG Env)

Jørgen Nørrevang-Jensen presented the eco-regions advice and the response was tabled at the meeting.

4 Review and report on integration and co-ordination of fisheries and ecosystem advice in ICES

Simon Jennings introduced the item. The aim was to make an evaluation of the 2004 process and to get feedback. Input from ACFM back to ACE on the ecoregions work was also needed.

Niels Daan is responsible within ACE for the environment integration part regarding eco-region sections and Jake Rice is responsible for future ToRs to WGRED. Eco-region text from ACE should be circulated to ACFM and hopefully there will be feedback from ACFM.

4.1 Review of outputs of WGRED (Jake Rice)

4.2 Co-ordination of WGRED and AMAWGC work (Poul Degnbol)

Jake Rice in his capacity as WGRED chair presented this subject.

It had turned out to be difficult to agree on what were the important aspects of each ecosystem to include in the text. Therefore there was a clear tendency that the text got too large. The template was logical but not practical in implementation. Some ecosystem texts were reviewed by many (also after the meeting and before the final text was agreed by WGRED), others by very few.

It was considered important also to give guidelines for what should NOT be included in the ecosystem. Caution should be given regarding integrated advice as there should be full consistency for the whole report. It is important to avoid discrepancies between fisheries sections and sections provided by WGRED/ACE.

The aim is to write what is useful for managers. Focus should be given to ecosystem changes as a background for the fisheries advice; for instance not to write that *C. finmarkicus* is the most important species but rather that its production was low this year etc. It is however also important to think beyond fisheries.

WGRED has to meet before the Assessment WGs in order to feed ecosystem considerations into the assess groups to be taken into account in the same year's assessment. Ecoregion text drafting will be over a two year cycle as the feedback from WGs will go to WGRED for their meeting in 2006.

It was suggested that ICES should put the issue of climate change very high on the priority list. Individual papers that are published in Nature and Science are not always of an outstanding quality but get published anyway. It is important that ICES starts to include more information on what role the climate has for the stock developments and that not all trends can be explained by fisheries. Work should be put into getting the sources for information on regime shifts and climate change effects available for ICES groups to look at.

4.3 Co-ordination of work of REGNS and other WG/SG (Stuart Rogers)

Stuart Rogers gave an account of this process. 19 requests were directed from REGNS to expert groups in last year's cycle and there was a variety in the types of responses received back from the expert groups this year. The process has identified gaps for which more information is needed and these include information with regards to biological effects, benthos and habitat. At the workshop in May it was also realised that some sort of assessment needs to be produced with the aim of having it presented at ASC 2005 and the datasets to work from for this presentation have also been identified.

4.4 Co-ordination of WGDEC and WGDEEP work (Mark Tasker)

In short, there has been hardly any coordination yet. WGDEEP is not having a group meeting this year. Instead a subgroup has been set up for a meeting in September to deal with requests and it was pointed out that it is important to have ACE representation at that meeting. More coordination between WGDEC and WGDEEP is needed and Mark Tasker will take action.

4.5 Co-ordination of SGRESP and WGMHSA work (Dave Reid)

Dave Reid presented slides. Coordination works well here. SGRESP is investigating potential impacts for management. An example was made that anchovy have moved or spread to northern areas and may need new assessment.

4.6 Co-ordination of WGEF, WGFE and WGNSSK work (Dave Reid)

Dave Reid introduced this item. Coordination did not work so well here and as an example it was mentioned that the chair of WGNSSK had heard nothing from WGFE. Some overlap of work between WGFE and SGRESP was also noted.

In general, there is too little coordination of work going on between different groups showing trends of more disintegration than the intended integration. Conc should look more into this.

5 Format of ICES Advice Report

Poul Degnbol explained the build up of the 2005 advisory report; the draft table of contents was tabled.

6 Advice and guidance on future scientific needs and priorities related to the work of ACE and ACFM (fao Science Committees). See WGRED report section 5 (Recommendations)

WGECO are to meet simultaneously with SGMAS next year to be able to include points about taking ecosystem considerations into management strategies.

6.1 Planning for further involvement of the ICES science community in the European Marine Strategy

This item will be dealt with on Monday 30 May when Ben van de Wetering will make a presentation to ACE/ACFM.

6.2 Consider and report on the nature and form of ecosystem information, inputs, and advice which would best contribute to putting the development and evaluation of management strategies into an integrated ecosystem perspective

The Committees were invited to read section 3 of the WGECO report and give feedback to Stuart Rogers.

7 Presentation and discussion of CONC initiative to review the WG structure

Harald Loeng presented slides to give a summary of the May Conc meeting. Open membership has been suggested by Conc for groups under the Advisory Committees also. The ICES EG structure is partly built on tradition and therefore Committee Chairs will be asked to review its EGs and evaluate overlap and coordination. A discussion paper on revision of EG structure is currently being prepared for presentation and consideration at ASC in Aberdeen 2005.

ICES should also consider the Science Committees structure and how to get them to work properly. Views were expressed that the membership in Science Committees should be given

to the people that will be active instead of the national representatives as is the case now. Currently there are no tasks assigned to the members and some people only accept memberships as this allows them to go to the ASC.

In the past papers were given at SCOM meetings. This is not the case now where Theme sessions have replaced it. This year however, is the first year where the Secretariat has a scientist dedicated to the science groups and this should be given a chance to work. Many committee Chairs are frustrated with the lack of progress on the role and task of the science committee. There needs to be more tasks for the Chairs than just running the annual ASC sessions. Reviewing EG work could be one of the tasks. It is important to be conscious of the fact that only if people find the tasks worthwhile will they invest more resources in the system.

8 Work programmes for 2006

Hans made a presentation on a very early Advisory Committee workplan for 2006. Listing of HELCOM and OSPAR requests were presented. No other requests have been received so far.

9 SGQUA

Henrik Sparholt made a presentation.

Views were expressed that the potential ISO certifications will not improve the actual ICES advice but will describe the product better. At the same time they will definitely have an effect on the level of creativity. This underlines a permanent contradiction in the system between ensuring quality and ensuring creativity.

10 BWGDDP

Hans Lassen gave a summary of the report from the Bureau WG. Two meetings had been held; one in January 2005 and one in May 2005. The group has focused on what the data needs are for ICES in order to fulfil the action plan/strategic plan. The next step is to define a strategy specifying which steps to take to obtain the defined goals. This will be discussed at Bureau level in June 2005 and will be reported back to the Council in autumn 2005. The data policy is unclear at present and data submitted to ICES are still under the ownership of the contributor. Work is ongoing to revise the data policy; many of these issues are only related to the ICES Secretariat Data Centre.

11 Information on ICES and external fora

The Chair of ACE welcomed Ben van de Wetering (BW) from DG Environment.

11.1 European Marine Strategy (Ben van de Wetering)

BW explained that he is only at DG ENV for approx 2 more months before moving back to the Netherlands. On 20 July the final process of the European Marine Strategy is to be adopted with a Communication and a Guidance document on the Marine Strategy (being drafted by ICES). The presentation by BW to ACE/ACFM was tabled, and BW pointed out that his presentation was the view of DG Environment, not necessarily the view of the Commission.

11.2 EMS Guidance (Jørgen Nørrevang Jensen)

JNJ gave a brief introduction to this guidance, which had been a slow and tedious process, requiring input from national representatives, stakeholders and international commissions. Nevertheless, the end product was a good product. ICES has provided the advice on the

European Marine Strategy to DG ENV already, and will publish a CRR on the same topic later this year.

BW added that the EMS Guidance had support from all countries from a policy point of view which therefore proves a good result had been achieved. He also mentioned that the document from the EAM process has been brought into the UNEP Global Programme of Action and this was also a good sign that it was being distributed.

11.3 Eco-regions (Ben van der Wetering)

BW gave a brief introduction. ICES was asked to provide advice as to how to divide the main sea areas into management units. The advice was delivered at the Rotterdam Stakeholders Conference in November 2004. A meeting on 1 April gave support to the proposals made by ICES for the Baltic, Mediterranean and the Black Sea. There was no consensus for the NE Atlantic; there was both strong opposition and some endorsement.

The result is that the Commission decided to have a bit of both. In the legal proposal, 4 marine regions have been identified: NE Atlantic, Baltic, Mediterranean, and Black Sea, and in addition an indicative list of sub-regions is provided. This list only addresses waters under the jurisdiction of Member States.

11.4 EMMA, February 2005 (Ben van der Wetering)

BW gave a brief introduction. EMMA is one of 4 WGs that has been established since the beginning of the Marine Strategy process. The goal of EMMA is to try to increase cooperation at the European level. All regions had their own monitoring and assessment programmes (OSPAR, EEA etc) and there were clear cases of inconsistencies. It has proved to be a difficult process, but EMMA is trying now to achieve horizontal cooperation and coordination between different regions, i.e., between HELCOM and OSPAR, and also vertical cooperation.

The overall aim is, in 2008, to produce together a pan-European assessment on a specific issue.

General discussion

BW pointed out that the EMS process hoped to achieve a strong cooperation in the Mediterranean and the NE Atlantic. The Marine Framework Directive does include some assessment and monitoring, and they want to see coherence between the Water Framework Directive and monitoring beyond this area.

In answer to a question about the implementation of the Guidance document, BW explained there was a continued need for advice from the scientific point of view, and ICES is a key player here for the NE Atlantic and for monitoring and assessment. There is a need to find out how to use existing monitoring for fisheries in an environment context. Another element in the process is the knowledge gaps: the bridge between research and assessment is very weak. The feedback from research funded by the EU back into the assessment process can also be improved.

Finally, there was a short discussion on the role of ICES in encouraging cooperation among Commissions. The example of how ACE is developing advice at this meeting for coral on the Rockall Bank demonstrates that there are a number of areas where it should be really useful to work together. One of the frustrations of ICES is that it is not invited to that part of the process where Commissions plan cooperation. The key role of ICES is to demonstrate the need for this cooperation; it is then up to the Fisheries and Environmental Commissions to take up the challenge.

The 13th Dialogue meeting (April 2004) was the beginnings of very constructive dialogue. ICES can provide a neutral setting to the management agencies where managers can meet and this should be taken seriously.

The Chair of ACE thanked Ben for his time and important contribution to this meeting.

12 Other issues

An issue with regards to giving long term advice was raised. It was the problem our models do not normally take account of density dependent processes. This is a rather large question with clear ecosystem aspects and thus not only an ACFM problem but also an ACE one.

It was also noted that our models mainly focus on F and not discard pattern or exploitation pattern.

It was argued that the models should only be used for giving directions. At the moment it is clear that F in many stocks should be reduced significantly, from say 0.90 to 0.3. It does not matter so much whether this should rather be 0.4 tah 0.3. This fine tuning can be done along the road.

Restore size structure in the ecosystem was also mentioned as an important aspect of fisheries management and thus of long term harvest rules..

A technical point about how to calculate mean weight at age was raised and it was stressed that we need to be sure that the calculations done are technically correct.

The question was also put forward: Precautionary level – what is this? This has been mis-used and mis-understood several times, especially when making overviews of the general state of stocks in a given area.

It was also argued that we need to explain to the outside world (this is one of ICES main tasks) what the state of the stocks are. We should not take the Bpa points away before we have something new to replace it with (which hopefully is better).

It was mentioned that the EC is only asking ICES advice on what the fishery should look like and not what the absolute stock size is. However, this could give problems in ecosystem consideration and advice because the relative stocks sizes might not be on the same scale across stocks within an ecosystem.

There was an extensive discussion about the definition of Bpa or a similar reference point (a HCR , a Btrigger, etc.) and its translation into what that means in terms of how big a percentage of stocks that should be higher than Blim, with a 95% probability. No conclusion was reached.

Annex 1: List of participants

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FISHERY MANAGEMENT

ICES Headquarters, 26 May – 02 June 2005

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

NAME	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	FAX	E-MAIL
Poul Degnbol (Chair)	Institute for Fisheries Management and Coastal Community Development North Sea Center P.O. Box 104 9850 Hirtshals Denmark	+45 9897 8282	+45 9894 4268	pd@ifm.dk
Michael Andersen (Observer Baltic Fishermen's Assoc.)	Danish Fishermen Association H. C. Andersens Boulevard 37, 1. sal DK 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark			ma@fiskeriforening.dk
Eero Aro	Finnish Game and Fish. Res. Institute Vükinkaari 4 P.O. Box 2 FI-00791 Helsinki Finland	+358-205751253	+358-205751201	eero.aro@rktl.fi
Frans van Beek	CVO P.O. Box 68 1970 AB IJmuiden Netherlands	+31 255 564 646	+31 255 564 644	fransa.vanbeek@wur.nl
Jesper Boje (Observer Greenland)	Danish Institute for Fishery Research Charlottenlund Slot DK-2920 Charlottenlund Denmark	+45 33 96 34 64	+45 33 96 33 33	jbo@dfu.min.dk
Steve Cadrin	Northeast Fisheries Science Center NMFS/NOAA 116 Water Street Woods Hole, MA 02543- 1026 USA	+1 508 495 2335	+1 508 495 2393	steven.cadrin@noaa.gov
Fátima Cardador	IPIMAR Avenida de Brasilia P-1449-006 Lisbon Portugal	+351 21302 7000		cardador@ipimar.pt
Massimiliano Cardinale	Institute of Marine Research Box 4 SE-453 21 Lysekil Sweden	+46 523 187 501	+46 523 13977	massimiliano.cardinale@fiskeriverket.se
Yuri Efimov	VNIRO 17 V. Krasnoselskaya St. 107140 Moscow Russia	+7 095 264 9129	+7 095 264 9129	efimov@vniro.ru

NAME	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	FAX	E-MAIL
André Forest	IFREMER Rue de l'Île d'Yeu BP 21 105 44 311 Nantes France	+33 240 374 238	+33 240 374 075	andre.forest@ ifremer.fr
Tomas Gröhsler	Institute for Baltic Fisheries An der Jägerbäk 2 18069 Rostock-Marienehe Germany	+49 381 810 267	+49 381 810 445	tomas.groehsler@ior.bfa-fisch.de
Jan Horbowy	Sea Fisheries Institute Kollataja 1 81-332 Gdynia Poland	+48 58 620 17 48	+48 58 620 28 31	horbowy@mir.gdynia.pl
Jan Birger Jørgensen (Observer Norwegian Fishermen Assoc.)				
Ciaran Kelly	The Marine Institute Fisheries Science Services Galway Technology Park Galway Ireland	+353 91 730 454	+353 91 730 470	ciarán.kelly@ marine.ie
Eskild Kirkegaard (Observer EC)	European Commission DG-Fish Office : J-79 02/79 Rue Joseph II 79 B-1000 Brussels Belgium	+32 2 299 6991	+32 2 299 4802	eskild.kirkegaard@cec.eu.int
Fritz Koster	Danish Institute for Fisheries Research Jægersborgvej 64-66 2800 Lyngby Denmark	+45 33963350	+45 33963333	fwk@dfu.min.dk
Harald Loeng (Chair of CONC)	Institute of Marine Research P.O. Box 1870 Nordnes N-5817 Bergen Norway	+47 55 238466	+47 55 238687	harald.loeng@imr.no
Jan Ivar Maråk (Observer Norwegian Fishermen Assoc.)				
Charlotte Mogensen (Observer WWF)				
Carl O'Brien	CEFAS Lowestoft Laboratory Lowestoft Suffolk NR33 0HT United Kingdom	+44-1502-524256	+44-1502-513865	c.m.obrien@cefass.co.uk
Christian Olesen Observer NPWG of EAPO)				

NAME	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	FAX	E-MAIL
Maris Plikshs	Latvian Fish Resources Agency Daugavgrivas Street 8 LV-1048 Riga Latvia	+371 7610 766	+371 761 6946	maris.plikss@latfri.lv
Carmela Porteiro	Instituto Español de Oceanografía Centro Oceanográfico de Vigo Apdo 1552 36280 Vigo Spain	+34 986 49 21 11		carmela.porteiro@vi.ieo.es
Tiit Raid	Estonian Marine Institute of the University of Tartu Mäealuse 10A EE-12618 Tallinn Estonia	+372 671 89 53	+372 671 8900	tiit.raid@ut.ee
Denis Rivard	Fisheries Research Branch Fisheries & Oceans 200, Kent Street, 12th floor Ottawa, ONT K1A 0EG Canada	+1 613 990 0281	+1 613 954 0807	rivardd@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Jákup Reinert (Observer Faroe Islands)	Faroese Fisheries Laboratory Nóatún 1 P.O. Box 3051 FO-110 Tórshavn Faroe Islands.	+298 353900 Direct +298 35 3935	+298 353901	jakupr@frs.fo
Dave 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
Denis Rivard	Fisheries Research Branch Fisheries & Oceans 200, Kent Street, 12th floor Ottawa, ONT K1A 0EG Canada	+1 613 990 0281	+1 613 954 0807	rivardd@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Vladimir N. Shibanov	PINRO Knipovich Polar Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography 6, Knipovitch Street 183763 Murmansk Russia	+7 8152 47 2614	+7 8152 47 3331	shibanov@pinro.ru inter@pinro.ru

NAME	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	FAX	E-MAIL
Dankert Skagen (Resource Management Committee)	Institute of Marine Research P.O. Box 1870, Nordnes 5817 Bergen Norway	47 55 23 84 19	47 55 23 86 87	dankert@imr.no
Bjorn Steinarsson	Marine Research Institute P.O. Box 1390 Skúlagata 4 IS-121 Reykjavík Iceland	+354 57 52000	+354 57 52001	bjorn@hafro.is
Reidar Toresen	Institute of Marine Research P.O. Box 1870 Nordnes N-5817 Bergen Norway	+47 55 238420	+47 55 238687	reidar@imr.no
Willy Vanhee	CLO Sea Fisheries Department Ankerstraat 1 B-8400 Ostende Belgium	+32 593 42255	+32 593 30 629	Willy.vanhee@dvz.be

Annex 2: Agenda

Agenda Advisory Committee on Fishery Management ICES HQ, 26 May–2 June 2005

Plenary Sessions 26 May and 30 May - 2 June 2005

Thursday 26 May 10-18

Presenter in [...]

- c) Opening**
- d) Observer process (docs 9 and 21)**
 - a. Observers present (Doc 9)**
 - b. House rules for observers (Doc 21)**
 - c. Information on the process leading to an evaluation of the effects of opening the advisory committees**
- e) Press Policy – Release of Extract of ICES Advisory Report (Fisheries Issues) (doc 7)**
- f) Approval of Minutes from October 2004 ACFM meeting (doc 3). Technical Minutes for October 2004 for information**
- g) Adoption of agenda and timetable (docs 1, 2, 2a, 9)**
- h) Requests for Advice for this meeting (doc 4)**
- i) Developing the ICES Advice**
 - a. Review of Clients' input on the existing advice**
 - 10) The RAC process (docs 8a, 10) [Henrik S]**
 - 11) Fast track advice. Review of requests that have been answered since October 2004 update (doc 22) [Mette]**
 - b. Developing tools for longer term advice and reference point evaluations (management strategy and recovery plan evaluations)**
 - 1. SGMAS 2005 (doc 18) [Dankert]**
 - 2. Ad-hoc group on Long-term advice (doc 18) [Poul]**
 - 3. Action in 2005 - AMAWGC (doc 17) [Poul]**
 - c. Developing tools for fisheries based advice**
 - (4) PGCCDBS (Sampling strategy) and data bases (doc 25) [Hans]**

- (5) Action in 2005 – AMAWGC 2005 (docs 11, 17) (new document on mixed fisheries format and MAWGC) [Poul, Hans]**
- (6) WGFTFB interactions (doc 26) [Mette]**
- d. Non reported catches and landings – AMAWGC 2005 (doc 17) [Poul]**
- e. WG dynamics/resources and the need for change (doc 17) [Stuart Reeves]**
- j) Fisheries Statistics (WGSTAL) (doc 19) [Hans]**
 - 10) Changes in the reporting divisions**
 - 11) Other changes**
- k) Formulating advice**
 - a. Guidance for ACFM sub groups, meeting next 2 days (doc 5: examples of stock summary and overview sections, (doc 17, AMAWGC 2005))**
 - b. ACFM Subgroups review of Ecosystem Overviews, Human use of Ecosystems, Advice on fisheries exploitation and stock summaries**
- l) Progress on development of Assessment Software: INTERCATCH (doc 15) [Henrik S]**
- m) ACFM Consultations at the 93rd Annual Science Conference 2005 in Aberdeen, Scotland (doc 20)**
- n) ACFM meeting 6-13 October 2005**
- o) Evaluation of working procedure (Independent review groups, transparency, observer process etc.)**

Thursday 2 June 17-18

- p) Any Other Business**
- q) Closing**

**Joint sessions ACE-ACFM
Friday 27 May 9-13**

1. Overview of Council, MCAP and MCAP-MICC decisions relating to the advisory process and the response of Client Commissions to ICES advice in 2004 (Hans Lassen)
2. Provision of fast track and non-recurrent advice (Hans Lassen / Jørgen Nørrevang Jensen)
 - 2.1. Influence of sonar on marine mammals and fish (EC DG Env)
<http://www.ices.dk/iceswork/ace.asp?topic=acereports>
 - 2.2. Eco-regions for European Marine Strategy (EC DG Env)
<http://www.ices.dk/products/icesadvice/Book1Part1.pdf>
4. Review and report on integration and co-ordination of fisheries and ecosystem advice in ICES
 - 4.1. Review of outputs of WGRED (Jake Rice)
 - 4.2. Co-ordination of WGRED and AMAWGC work (Poul Degnbol)
 - 4.3. Co-ordination of work of REGNS and other WG/ SG (Stuart Rogers)
 - 4.4. Co-ordination of WGDEC and WGDEEP work (Mark Tasker)
 - 4.5. Co-ordination of WGRES and WGMHSA work (Dave Reid)
 - 4.6. Co-ordination of WGEF, WGFE and WGNSSK work (Dave Reid)
5. Format of ICES Advice Report
6. Advice and guidance on future scientific needs and priorities related to the work of ACE and ACFM (fao Science Committees). See WGRED report section 5 (Recommendations)
 - 6.1. Planning for further involvement of the ICES science community in the European Marine Strategy
 - 6.2. Consider and report on the nature and form of ecosystem information, inputs, and advice which would best contribute to putting the development and evaluation of management strategies into an integrated ecosystem perspective
7. Presentation and discussion of CONC initiative to review the WG structure
8. Work programmes for 2006
 - 8.1. European Commission
 - 8.2. Helsinki Commission
 - 8.3. OSPAR Commission
 - 8.4. Other fisheries Commissions
9. SGQUA
10. BWGDDP

Monday 30 May 9-11

11. Information on ICES and external fora
 - 11.1. European Marine Strategy (Ben van de Wetering)
 - 11.2. EMS Guidance (Jørgen Nørrevang Jensen)
 - 11.3. Eco-regions (Ben van der Wetering)
 - 11.4. EMMA, February 2005 (Ben van der Wetering)

TIMETABLE

Doc 1 ACFM May 2005

Friday 27 May

Room	9-11	11-13	Chair	Members	Lunch	14-16	16-18	Chair	Members
210 (Hans)	Joint meeting with ACE	WGBFAS	Ciaran Kelly	Tomas Grohsler, , Willy van Hee, Reidar Toresen			WGBFAS	WGBFAS	
North Sea		HAWG	Carmela Porteiro	Max Cardinale, Andre Forest,			HAWG	HAWG	
224		WGEEL	Dankert Skagen	Bjorn Steinarsson, Dave Reid, Eero Aro, Carl O'Brien			WGBAST	WGBAST	Jesper Boje Carl O'Brien, BC rep, Eero Aro, Jan Horbowy, Bjorn Steinarsson
Atlantic		NWWG	Steve Cadrin	Fatima Cardador, Jakup Reinert, Frans Van Beek, Tiit Raid			NWWG	NWWG	
Baltic		AFWG	Denis Rivard	Maris Plikshs, Fritz Koster, Yuri Efimov			AFWG	AFWG	

Saturday 28 May

Room	9-11	11-13	Chair	Members	Lunch	14-16	16-18	Chair	Members
210	WGBFAS	WGBFAS				WGBFAS	WGBFAS		
North Sea	HAWG	HAWG				HAWG	HAWG		
224	WGEEL (see list above)	Special req. on HCR	Carl O'Brien	Jesper Boje, Dankert Skagen, Dave Reid, Eero Aro, Bjorn Steinarsson		Special req. on HCR	Special req. on HCR		
Atlantic	NWWG	NWWG				NWWG	NWWG		
Baltic	AFWG	AFWG				AFWG	AFWG		

ACFM Plenary 26 May and 30 May - 2 June

	9-11	11-13	Lunch	14-16	16-18
Thursday 26 May	Business Start at 10.00			Business	
Friday 27 May	Joint meeting with ACE				
Monday 30 May	Joint meeting with ACE	Report		Report	
Tuesday 31 May	Report			Report	
Wednesday 1 June	Report			Report	
Thursday 2 June	Report			Report and Business	