

MINUTES OF THE
Advisory Committee on Fishery Management

**ICES Headquarters
9–17 October 2001**

This report is not to be quoted without prior consultation with the General Secretary. The document is a report of an expert group under the auspices of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea and does not necessarily represent the views of the Council.

International Council for the Exploration of the Sea

Conseil International pour l'Exploration de la Mer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
1 PLENARY SESSION 9 OCTOBER.....	1
2 PLENARY SESSION 10 OCTOBER.....	6
3 PLENARY SESSION 11 OCTOBER.....	7
4 PLENARY SESSION 14 OCTOBER.....	7
5 PLENARY SESSION 15 OCTOBER.....	7
6 PLENARY SESSION 16 OCTOBER.....	7
7 PLENARY SESSION 17 OCTOBER.....	7
ANNEX I - PARTICIPATION LIST	8
ANNEX II - AGENDA	10
ANNEX III - DOCUMENTATION	12
ANNEX IV - ASSIGNMENTS AND TIME TABLE.....	15
ANNEX V - TEMPLATE FOR TECHNICAL MINUTES	17

1 PLENARY SESSION 9 OCTOBER

The chair Tore Jakobsen opened the meeting on Tuesday 9 October at 10:00. He welcomed the participants to the meeting. In particular, he welcomed two new members Colm Lordan, Ireland and Odd Smedstad, Norway. The chair regretted that a third new member Denis Rivard, Canada unfortunately was forced to cancel his participation. Annex I list the participants. The chair noted that the meeting had been moved forward by about 2 weeks in order to make an earlier release of the advice possible. Wish for such earlier release had been strongly expressed by the ICES partner commissions and by some governments. He expected that this remains standard practice for the future.

The General Secretary David Griffith welcomed the members and explained the new security system now in force in ICES HQ. He drew ACFMs attention to letters that had been received recently from various stakeholders and to the answers given by ICES through MCAP. The most recent letter received was from the Danish Minister Ritt Bjerregaard. This letter had not been answered yet and he invited ACFM to provide input to such an answer. The General Secretary told ACFM that unfortunately the planned remodelling of the ICES HQ had not been realised and that ICES is now considering a move to new premises. He invited ACFM members to visit the proposed site in Amaliegade 13.

The General Secretary told ACFM that ICES had invited the North Sea Commission to provide input for ACFMs consideration on stock status. ICES had not yet received any material but he would distribute such material to ACFM as soon as it became available. The chair thanked David Griffith for his welcome and assured him that any information from the fishing industry will be considered by ACFM in the review phase. This also meant that material received after Friday 12 October could not be part of the review.

The draft agenda was adopted with the comment that that point 4 (Advisory Structure – report from Council) and point 8 (MCAP) would be discussed together. The chair also explained that he intended to discuss the ACFM Working Protocol, Multi-annual advice and possible changes in the format of the ACFM report under point 11. The adopted agenda is given in Annex II. Also attention was drawn to a Spanish letter on hake CPUE series and the review group was asked to take this information into account. The chair noted that ICES had on 6 October received a request for more detailed advice on certain *Nephrops* stocks from France. However, he saw little possibility for ACFM to deal with this issue at this meeting. He would return to this point under Any Other Business. Finally he noted that there were no development in the discussions on the PA between NAFO and ICES and that therefore there would be nothing to discuss under this agenda point 11a.

The Chair recalled that the Commission had asked for a review of the CEFAS Project - Review of the report. He informed ACFM that it had been impossible to find reviewers at this short notice and that therefore ACFM will not be able to honour this request at this time. He would identify reviewers at this meeting.

In reviewing the tasks of the subgroup it was accepted that reviews of Barents Sea Capelin, Celtic Sea Herring, Anchovy HCL and Deep water fisheries statistics would be dealt by the Mackerel Subgroup.

The Fisheries Adviser drew attention to the protocol for release of the advice. For this meeting the embargo would be until Monday morning 22 October. He also noted that the Council had changed the embargo starting from 1 January 2002. Under the new embargo system the release would be after 36 hours and this would mean that in May 2002 the release of the report would be mid Saturday.

The Fisheries Adviser informed ACFM that ICES had received and accepted a request from the Joint Norwegian-Russian Fisheries Commission for a review of the assessment of the Northeast Arctic Cod. The Secretariat had set up this review and the review report will be distributed to ACFM during the meeting and ACFM was welcome if the committee so desired to comment on the review. Einar Hjørleifsson supplemented by informing ACFM on an Icelandic review of the assessment and advice on Icelandic cod that had been undertaken in 2000 and in 2001.

The Chair reminded the Committee that it had in May 2001 adopted a set of guidelines for formulating advice. These guidelines were available in the documentation to the meeting. These instructions are guidelines on formulating advice but ACFM would deviate from these guidelines where it find it appropriate and explain why this was done in each specific case. ACFM have adopted guidelines but these do not constitute a law.

The Documentation for the meeting and Requests for advice were briefly reviewed and did not give raise to specific comments. The chair reminded the committee that there was an outstanding request from NEAFC on statistics on Deep sea resources. The chair of WGDEEP had provided a draft text for consideration. The group dealing with eel and *Pandalus* was asked also to include this topic on their agenda.

The approval of Minutes from Consultations (September 2001) was postponed.

Concerning the requests for advice in 2002 the Chair noted that the IBSFC request about selectivity properties of cod trawls had been given to FTFBWG that will report to the WGBFAS and ACFM in the spring of 2002.

Concerning the ACFM report for 2001, to be published towards the end of 2001 or early 2002, it was noted that DG Fish had asked for some introductory text that will explain the risk concept used by ICES when formulating advice.

C. Hammer proposed that a small group should look on how to change the form of the ACFM report and how to accommodate a wider readership. The Chair welcomed this initiative and dependent on the input he would return to this point under AOB. It was noticed that it was unlikely that much could be accomplished during this ACFM meeting and that intersessional work would be required. The Chair noted that a Study Group on ACFM Working procedures would be convened in February 2002.

The formulation of the advice for NASCO was discussed. As Jake Rice (Canada) who in most recent years has been on the review team will be taken over the CONC chair in January 2002 ACM should identify a replacement. Russ Brown (USA) NEFSC, Woods Hole and John Kocik (USA) NEFSC, Woods Hole were mentioned as possibilities.

Ad 6) Matters from ASC

In general ACFM found that the science part of the ASC had improved significantly and the presentations made were generally very good.

The Chair noted that a Study Group on ACFM Working procedures would be convened at 25 February - 1 March 2002.

The chair reviewed briefly the RMC Resolutions and mentioned the Methods Working Group (3-7 December 2001) and the assessment course/workshop to be held 4-9 February 2002 at ICES Headquarters. It was recognised that selection procedure among applicants should be developed. The criteria on which to select applicants should include regional aspects as being important.

The proposal of a North Sea cod and plaice eggs surveys was discussed. EU has been informal approached concerning co-financing of the survey but EC has not replied yet.

Also the resolutions adopted by LRC were briefly reviewed. There was no particular comment.

ACFM noted with regret the foreseen future clashes between timing of ASC and ACFM. Since in 2002 the ASC is one week later than in 2000 and in 2001 and because the clients maintain the need for a mid-October advice it is inevitable that the ACFM meeting follows directly after the ASC. This puts strain on both the members and the Secretariat. ACFM emphasised that it is important that this clash be addressed when planning future ASCs. It is essential to ACFM that there is time between the ASC and ACFM.

The NPAFC/NASCO/IBSFC/ICES joint meeting on salmon in Vancouver on 15-16 March 2002 was mentioned. ICES is involved in finding speakers and is represented in the Steering Committee (Kevin Friedland, USA). This meeting is not a scientific symposium but rather a dialogue meeting type to identify Atlantic salmon research needs.

Ad 7) Location of the ICES Secretariat

The Fisheries Adviser presented the two locations considered for a new ICES HQ. Dampfærgevej and Amaliegade. Later (In November and December) both options have been abandoned for various reasons.

Ad 8) MCAP

The work of MCAP during the ASC was briefly reviewed. MCAP had answered a number of letters criticising the ICES fisheries advice. A SG on ACFM working procedures (25 February-1 March 2002) with Robin Cook as Chair has been established. The SG TORs are broad and there is a need to decide which aspects to deal with. The ACFM chair encouraged ACFM members to take active part in the work of that SG.

In 2001 MCAP met in January 2001, August 2001 and at the ASC 2001. In 2002 MCAP will meet January 2002 and presumably during the ASC in October. MCAP is especially concerned with quality of the advice and the manpower

problem in many labs. The MCAP chair has announced that this will be discussed at the coming MCAP meetings and that he hopes to initiate discussions outside the ICES circles on the problems that this creates for the advisory function of ICES.

Ad 8a) Admission of Observers

In introducing this topic the chair told ACFM that he saw a general move towards allowing observers access to the advisory process in order to increase transparency. He found this a difficult issue because one would need to strike a delicate balance between the need for ICES to provide advice "on a scientific basis and free of political influence" on the one hand and the legitimate stakeholder needs for improved transparency of the process. He also expected that observers could have valuable input to the process. Finally he noted the political wish for biologists and fishermen to work better together. Several groups are eager to become observers so ICES have to find out how to manage this process. He therefore concluded that the discussions should focus on under which circumstances and restrictions and where in the process observers should be admitted. There are two aspects of the issue. One is transparency and openness and the other is about real use of the possible input from the observers. He also noted that there is a difference between influence on the outcome and input to the process by observers to the ICES work. He closed his introduction by noting that ACFM is a scientific body that must not be lobbied by interest groups.

ICES had housed the North Sea Commission Fisheries Partnership in August 2001 and at that meeting invited the fisheries organisations for input to ACFM. This organisation is an attempt to improve the relationship and co-operation between biologists and fishermen. At this point in time ICES had received comments from four organisations on the demersal stocks in the North Sea and in VIa. The Chair asked the reviewers to consider this input.

ACFM was unanimous that the overwriting concern is to ensure that ICES continues to remain an objective body. Therefore it could be that it would be most appropriate to only have observers included in the review process but not in the Plenary or at least there without the right of speech. Inclusion of observers in the assessment working groups would be possible way of introducing their knowledge and data in the assessment process. However, experience is that such inputs can easily be tinted by the expected outcome of the statement, for instance on trying to talk TAC higher. Mark Terceiro informed the meeting that in USA fishermen shall be involved in all steps in the process. This has not always been easy, e.g. fishermen have had problems with following the technicalities of assessments. However, it was also considered that observers in the Assessment working groups and in review process could have a positive impact on the quality of our product. It was also noticed that "observers" is not a homogenous group but consist of many different groups (managers, fishermen, NGOs etc.).

ACFM considered that an inventory of how observers are involved in other similar organisations would be useful as part of the basis on which ICES can decide how to proceed in this issue.

Ad 8b) "Safe biological limits"

ACFM noted that MCAP had discussed this issue and had nothing to add to that discussion. ACFM will continue to use the standard phrasing "Inside/Outside safe biological limits" as at present and will endeavour to provide appropriate explanations in the ACFM report (Form of Advice).

Ad 8c) Response to comments on ICES Fisheries advice

Answers to five letters were tabled (to DG Fish, Joe Horwood (UK), Latvian fishermen association, 2 Russian fisheries organisations).

In relation to the answer to the Russian Fishing Enterprises of the North Association the Chair mentioned that the effect of using a TAC vs. a Status Quo projection for NEA Cod was surprisingly large, i.e. a difference in the TAC advice of 340,000t vs. 180,000t for the same F. He could not quite understand how this came about and in any case when there are such large differences ACFM needs to provide rather detailed explanations. He found the comments from the Russian Fishing Enterprises to be a mixture of misunderstandings and relevant points.

Ad. 9) ACE

The main points raised in the ACE report (September 2001) for ACFMs consideration related to PA reference points. There were two issues: The first was whether the stock specific PA ref. Points may serve also for ecosystem management objectives or if the reference point concept had to be extended to serve this purpose. The second point concerned the definition of the reference points (F_{pa} and B_{pa}) themselves. ACFM realises that there is a need for a

dialogue with ACE. ACFM took in particular the points raised concerning the definitions as a sign that ACFM needs to be very explicit and clear in its explanations when it comes to the reference points.

ACFM recognised that assessment as understood by ACE and ACFM are not the concept. Assessment as used by ACE in connection with environmental assessment is more qualitative than the use of the term in fish stock assessment. This leads to problems in transferring terms from one discipline to the other. ACFM therefore considered that part of the problems with the definitions and other issues related to the reference point were based on this difference and asked ACE to be aware of these differences in their comments.

ACE also considered the issue of using environmental information in fish stock assessment. There seems to be a perception that ACFM has been too reluctant to use such information. However, ACFM finds that this is an issue about the predictive power of environmental data and whether the predictive power of these data is sufficiently strong to make them useful. ACFM finds that further co-operation is needed between fishery and environmental scientists on this issue and does not consider that the best use of the environmental in fish stock assessment has been demonstrated so far.

Ad 10) Nominations and Elections

The nomination was postponed because someone wanted to confirm a further nomination.

Ad 11) Working Protocol

There was a brief discussion on the main strategy of the work on producing the advice. The Chair emphasised the need to concentrate on difficult stocks and ignore the unimportant stocks.

The Chair asked if the subgroups might identify stocks that should not be brought up in plenary. He emphasised that of course individual members could request to bring up any stock in plenum, but he reckoned that there was a group of stocks that was uncontroversial and therefore would not need to take up valuable time in plenum. This will save time for those stocks that are important and may present problems. The criteria he proposed was to identify stocks that are in reasonable good shape and show no obvious trend in SSB and F. Stocks in bad shape should be considered in plenary. He concluded his proposal that Subgroups will make proposals and the chair and vice chair will consider this on Sunday.

This proposal was followed by considerable discussion:

It was underlined that candidates for such a procedure only would be stocks in good shape, i.e. inside safe biological limits. It was also noted that there are a number of stocks where there is only catch data available and that there is little one can do in terms of stock assessment with these stocks and such stocks would likely be candidates for the proposed procedure. However, these stocks did not take up much time in Plenary and the saving might be only marginal. Also stocks where any assessment is not acceptable might be candidates. However some of these stocks might also be problem stocks and ACFM would like to take a closer look on these stocks, the example would be stocks for which substantial data are available but where these data are inconclusive, e.g. Spring spawning herring in the Western Baltic (IIIa +22-24).

It was considered that this proposal includes an element of regional and may give problems with the consistency. Furthermore, the time between when the subgroup review and draft advice becomes available is short and the time to decide if a stock should not be considered further might be too short to allow that the decision not to consider a stock any further would be made without due considerations.

Others voiced support for the idea: it was noted that there is precedence in ACFM using such an approach. It was recognised that the procedure might help in focusing the committee's attention to those stocks for which that are considerable data and where review in plenary may have substantial impact on the advice. It was required that the summary sheets should be available before the subgroup meeting ends. It was also noted that this proposal followed logically from the development in the use of the reference points and the positive points of the proposal was acknowledged but at the same time doubt was expressed whether it can implemented at this time, ACFM might need time to consider the implications of the proposal.

The Chair noted that consistency should be checked by Chair and vice-chair in their review much following the procedure as it has been in recent year when the chair has used the time during subgroups to review the entire report and check on consistency both between regions and between years.

Start with stocks that are most important, aim to do them all.

The Chair concluded the discussion: ACFM should run through the procedure as proposed, the subgroups will identify those stocks that might be candidates for not being brought up in plenary, but he would be inclined in the light of the discussion still to consider these stocks briefly in plenary.

The Fisheries Scientist tabled a proposal for a template for Technical Minutes. He noted that it had been agreed to include the Technical Minutes in each WG report and that therefore there was a need for a standard presentation of ACFM's review. The template covers the stock specific issues. The template should be headed by a general introduction.

The Template was adopted, see Annex V.

The issue of the Technical Minutes raised the standard problem of who should write these Minutes. It was argued that the WG chairs are heavily burdened with work and that somebody else should take on this task. On the other hand, it was also noted that the WG Chair is the contact point between ACFM and the WG and therefore the WG Chair would be the most appropriate person also in the light that the WG Chair was likely to be the person with most intimate knowledge of the assessments.

The Chair concluded the discussion by stating that ACFM would continue with business as usual, however if the Subgroups would agree on somebody else than the WG Chair to be responsible for the Technical Minutes, the Subgroups were free to do so. There was a specific proposal to let the Second Reviewer do the Technical Minutes. This proposal had some support and was subsequently implemented in some Subgroups

Ad 12) ACFM report

The Chair announced a number of minor changes to the ACFM report format. These changes were the result of consultations with the Client Commissions:

- Format of report: The format will be expanded with a table including F_{max} , $F_{0.1}$, F_{pa} , F_{lim} , B_{pa} , B_{lim} , F_{med}
- Reference points (F_{max} , $F_{0.1}$) in the Management option table

He also told ACFM that SGPA has been asked to look on MSY, identifying those cases where the MSY might be useful.

The Chair reminded ACFM on its decision at the ACFM 2001 May meeting to restrict the medium plots to include only the 25% and the 75% confidence limits. This should be adhered to at the present meeting.

There was a discussion whether the biological reference points should be part of this new table. It was considered that including the biological reference points could be confusing as these points have a different standing compared to those proposed. The discussion was concluded to keep the present format with the new table thereby clearly marking the biological reference points as a set of their own standing.

It was proposed that in the Overviews to include a combined status of stocks. This idea will be further considered for the 2002 report. It was also noted that when the procedures have been well established then the Form of Advice should include the advisory decision Flowchart. Also this will be considered for the 2002 report.

Ad 13) Working and Study group Reports

The Chair reminded ACFM of the reports that were tabled for ACFM's attention. He found that there were no actions to be taken but the reports are an important scientific background to ACFM's work. He also noted that the report of the: SGEF and that of WGFS had not yet become available and their presentation was postponed.

The Chair also drew attention to reports from the session of NASCO (June) and IBSFC (September). On both occasions requests for ICES advice in 2002 were adopted and these requests had been included in the recommendations adopted at ASC.

Ad 16) Quality management Procedures

NEWIFAP

The NEWIFAP is slowly developing but not at sufficient speed. As part of this system a new module producing graphs and some tables were introduced in May 2001. This system had been further developed and an improved system was available at this meeting. It was noted that there is a need to have well defined interface between the publication system and assessment programs. It was noted that the size of summary sheet is quite big (3.5 MB) and the Secretariat was asked to look into this problem. Subsequently the Secretariat has found the reason why the files were so big and has changed its procedures the files are now generally below 100 KB.

Development of Handbooks and Manual

The Secretariat briefly presented the development of the handbooks and manual and had compiled a paper presenting the comments received from WGs and SGs. It was noted that the second phase of this plan was to develop the handbooks at the 2002 round of WG meetings. It was also noted that the Chair needs to explain better to the WGs on the content and needs for these documents. It was proposed that the SGWP could take a look at this issue. There was a general proposal for a meeting of chairs of WG to get a homogeneous lay-out and understanding of how the lay-out should be filled in.

As part of the discussion on quality the recurring problem with the quality of national data was raised. It is as always recognised that this is a fundamental element in the quality of the fish stock assessments. There was no conclusion on this discussion.

Ad 17) Any Other Business

The Secretariat reported on the slow progress of the FIGIS+FIRMS system. This is because so far it not has been possible to obtain funds for this part of the FIGIS (FAO) project. There is still hope that it will be possible to raise external funds but the project is somewhat delayed compared to the original plan (at least 6 months).

ICES had received two letters that concerned ACFMs work. A letter from the Danish Minister, Ritt Bjerregaard, included a number of general criticism of the advisory work. This letter is directed to the president and he will answer directly. There was also a letter from the French administration concerning a reassessment of *Nephrops* in the Bay of Biscay. After consultations with the chair of MCAP it has been agreed that it would not be possible in the short time frame to accommodate the French wish for a reassessment. The Fisheries Adviser will answer the French administration accordingly.

It was noted that ICES had received input from Scottish, Dutch and English fishermen organisations concerning their impression and observations on stock status in the North Sea (demersals) and west of Scotland. This material was given to the WGNSSK subgroup for further processing.

The Chair drew ACFMs attention to the Report from Delegates meeting but also noted that he had not found topics that were directly relevant to ACFM at this meeting.

The Chair mentioned that in the coming years there would be significant problems with the temporal placing of ASC relative to ACFM. This topic would be on MCAPs agenda in January 2002 and he noted that he cannot see how these clashed can be avoided in the short term because the ASC cannot be moved significantly and the clients insist on having the advice by mid October.

2 PLENARY SESSION 10 OCTOBER

Denis Rivard had distributed a paper which he finds relevant for the discussion when using commercial CPUE data for tuning; ref: Harley, Myers and Dunn, 2001. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 58: 1760-1772. Furthermore, he supplied written reviews on the report of WGNSSK.

3 PLENARY SESSION 11 OCTOBER

Procedure for dealing with the autumn surveys in the North Sea demersal assessments:

The new survey data for some of the WGNSSK stocks need to be considered by ACFM. However, to check whether the new data are in line with the assessment made by WGNSSK, almost a complete assessment is needed. This is very cumbersome and is really basic WG work.

It was suggested that the best approach for the future would be to set up a small group, which is to meet before the ACFM meeting to make these new assessments. This relates to 6 WGNSSK stocks (North Sea: Cod, Haddock, Whiting, Plaice, Sole, saithe).

There is still a problem with the Skagerrak Pandalus stock, but the survey data for this stock are not available until after the ACFM meeting (becomes available in late October) so ACFM will anyway not be able to deal with updates of this stock.

4 PLENARY SESSION 14 OCTOBER

Ad 3) Minutes

The Minutes from the ACFM Consultations during the ASC in September 2001 were approved.

The remainder of the day was spent in Plenary developing the advisory report.

5 PLENARY SESSION 15 OCTOBER

Ad 10) Nominations and Elections

The Fisheries Adviser conducted nominations and election of chairs for:

HAWG: There were two nominated candidates both ready to stand: C. Zimmermann (Germany) and (Ms) E. Torstensen (Norway). The first round ended with a draw, each candidate got 7 votes. The second round gave a majority to Else Torstensen (10 votes) C. Zimmermann (5 votes). Else Torstensen was elected for three years, starting from 2002.

WGSSDS There was only one candidate Steve Flatman (CEFAS, UK) and for one year (2002 only). He was elected.

WGHMM. There was only one candidate Alain Biseau (IFREMER, France) for one year only (2002). He was elected for one year for the 2002 round of assessments.

The day was spent in Plenary developing the advisory report.

6 PLENARY SESSION 16 OCTOBER

The day was spent in Plenum developing the advisory report.

7 PLENARY SESSION 17 OCTOBER

The start of the day (up to lunch) was spent in Plenary developing the advisory report. There were a number of minor supplementary comments to various agenda points. These comments are included under the Minutes of the agenda points under the 9 October made above.

The chair reviewed the development of the agenda and noted that all topics had been covered. He thanked the participants for their ardour in bringing this meeting to a successful conclusion and in closing the meeting he wished everybody a safe trip home.

ANNEX I

PARTICIPATION LIST

NAME	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	FAX	E-MAIL
Tore Jakobsen (Chair)	Institute of Marine Research P.O. Box 1870 Nordnes, N-5817, Bergen Norway	+47 552 38636	+47552 38687	torej@imr.no
Manuela Azevedo	IPIMAR Av. Brasília 1400 Lisbon, Portugal	+351 21302 7148	+351 21309 5948	mazevedo@ipimar.pt
Frans van Beek (vice-chair)	RIVO P.O. Box 68 1970 AB IJmuiden Netherlands	+31 255 564 646	+31 255 564 644	vbeek@rivo.wag-ur.nl
Alain Biseau	IFREMER Station de Lorient 8, rue F. Toullec 56100 Lorient France	+33 297 87 38 20	+33 297 87 38 01	abiseau@ifremer.fr
Willem Dekker (Chair WGEEL)	Netherlands Institute for Fisheries Research, P.O. Box 68, Haringkade 1, NL-1970 AB IJmuiden, Netherlands	+31 255 564 712	+31 255 564 644	Willem@rivo.dlo.nl
Wim Demaré	Department of Sea Fisheries Ankerstraat 1 8400 Oostende Belgium	+32 59 342 258	+32 59 330 629	wim.demare@dvz.be
Yuri Efimov	VNIRO V. Krasnoselskaya St. 17a 107140 Moscow, Russia	+7 095 264 9129	+7 095 264 9129 +7 095 264 9021	Inter@vniro.ru
Cornelius Hammer	Federal Research Centre for Fisheries Palmaille 9 22767 Hamburg Germany	+49 4038905- 232	+494038905- 263	hammer.ish@bfa-fisch.de
Einar Hjorleifsson	Marine Research Institute Skúlagata 4 121 Reykjavík Iceland	+354 55 20 240	+354 56 23 790	einarhj@hafro.is
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
Hjalti. i. Jakupsstovu	Fiskirannsóknarstovan P.O. Box 3051, Noatun FO-110 Tórshavn Faroe Islands Denmark			hjaltij@frs.fo
Eskild Kirkegaard (DG Fish Observer)	EC DG-Fish 200, rue de la Loi 1049 Brussels Belgium			eskild.kirkegaard@cec.eu. int
Phil Kunzlik	FRS Marine Laboratory P.O. Box 101 Victoria Road Aberdeen AB11 9DB Scotland, United Kingdom	+44 1224 295 404	+44 1224 295 511	p.kunzlik@marlab.ac.uk

NAME	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	FAX	E-MAIL
Colm Lordan	Marine Fisheries Services Division Marine Institute Abbotstown Laboratory Complex Snugborough Road Dublin 15 Ireland			
Sten Munch-Petersen	Danish Institute for Fishery Research Charlottenlund Slot DK-2920 Charlottenlund Denmark	+45 33 96 33 90	+45 33 96 33 33	smp@dfu.min.dk
Carl M. O'Brien	CEFAS Lowestoft Laboratory Lowestoft Suffolk NR33 0HT United Kingdom	+44 1502 562244	+44 1502 513865	c.m.obrien@cefas.co.uk
Martin Pastoors	RIVO P.O. Box 68 1970 AB IJmuiden The Netherlands	+31 255 564 690	+31 255 564 644	martin@rivo.wag-ur.nl
Maris Plikshs	Latvian Fisheries Research Inst., Laboratory of Marine Biology Daugavgrivas Street 8 LV-1007 Riga Latvia	+371 761 0766	+371 761 6946	maris@latfri.lv
Jukka Pönni	Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute, Kotka Unit Keskuskatu 19 FIN-48100 Kotka Finland	+358 205 751894 +358 40 759 0055 (mobile)	+358 205 751894	jukka.ponni@rktl.fi
Carmela Porteiro	IEO Apartado 1552 36280 Vigo Spain	+34 9 86 49 21 11	+34 9 86492351	carmela.porteiro@vi.ieo.es
Tomas Saat	Estonian Marine Institute Viljandi Road 18B Tallinn EE-11216 Estonia	+372 6281 569	+372 6281 563	tsaat@sea.ee
Bengt Sjöstrand	Institute of Marine Research Box 4 453 21 Lysekil Sweden	+46 523 18708	+46 523 13977	b.sjostrand @fiskeriverket.se
Dankert Skagen (chair WGMHSA)	Institute of Marine Research P.O. Box 1870 Nordnes 5817 Bergen Norway	+47 55 23 84 19	+47 55 23 85 55	dankert@imr.no
Odd M. Smedstad	Institute of Marine Research P.O. Box 1870 Nordnes 5817 Bergen Norway	+47 55 238 683	+47 55 238 687	odd.smedstad@imr.no
Mark Terceiro	NMFS/NOAA Northeast Fisheries Science Center Woods Hole, MA 02543 USA	+1 508 495 2203	+1 508 495 2393	Mark.Terceiro@noaa.gov

ANNEX II

AGENDA

Advisory Committee on Fishery Management
ICES Headquarters, 9-17 October 2001

Plenary Sessions 9 October, 15-17 October 2001

1. Opening
2. Adoption of agenda and timetable
3. Approval of minutes of ACFM Consultations
4. Advisory Structure - report from Council
5. Documentation and Requests for Advice
6. Matters from 2001 Annual Science Conference
 - a. ACFM recommendations
 - b. RMC recommendations and report
 - c. LRC recommendations and report
 - d. Symposia and theme sessions in the coming years
 - e. Theme session reports from ASC in Oslo
7. Meeting facilities (Plan for relocation of the ICES HQ)
8. MCAP report
 - a. Admission of observers
 - b. Use of the phrase "safe biological limits"
 - c. Response to DG Fish
 - d. Response to Joe Horwood
9. ACE report
 - a. Reference points
 - b. Use of Environmental data in fish stock assessment
10. Election of WG Chairs (HAWG, WGSSDS, WGHMM)
11. ACFM Working protocols and Form of Advice
 - a. NAFO-ICES PA terminology
12. ACFM report

- a. Format of the report
 - b. Introductory items
 - c. Table of contents
13. Working and Study Group Reports
14. Preparation of Advice to Commissions and Member Governments
15. Reports from meetings with Cooperative Organisations
16. ACFM Quality Management Procedures - Manuals and Handbook
- a. Progress in developing a new IFAP
 - b. Progress on developing a handbook for WGs – reply from assessment WGs
17. Any Other Business
- a. FIGIS + FIRMS progress report
 - b. Project on expanding the IBTS Database to include Beam trawl Survey Data and IBTS data for Western and Southern Divisions
 - c. Workshop on Fish Stock Assessment
18. Closing

ANNEX III

DOCUMENTATION

Plenary Sessions 9 October, 15-17 October 2001

ACFM agenda item no.	Agenda item title	Documentation
A1	Opening	Participants list Release of Information from ACFM Meeting Doc. On shading policy in catch option tables Flow diagram on how advice is done
A2	Adoption of agenda and timetable	Revised Agenda Revised Timetable Revised Presentation and Review Assignments
A3	Approval of minutes of ACFM Consultations	Draft minutes
A4	Advisory Structure	MCAP report Minutes from MCAP meeting at ASC
A5	a. Documentation	This list
	b. Requests for Advice	Requests for advice applying to this meeting
A6	Matters from Annual Science Conference	
	a. ACFM recommendations	Draft resolutions
	b. RMC	Draft resolutions + Report
	c. LRC	Draft resolutions + Report
	d. Symposia and theme sessions in the coming years	List from Consultative report
	e. Theme session reports from ASC 2001	Report
A7	Meeting facilities	Plan for relocation of the ICES HQ - Verbally
A8	MCAP report	
	a. Admission of observers	Invited document by Joe Horwood, North Sea Commission Fisheries parties – report and feedback from fishermen, ICES policy on admission of observers Report of the Fourth Meeting of the North Sea Commission Fisheries Partnership North Sea Commission, Fisheries Partnership – comments from fishermen
	b. Use of the phrase “safe biological limits”	See MCAP report
	c. Response to comments on ICES fisheries advice	5 letters
A9	ACE report	Draft report from August 2001 meeting
	a. Reference points	
	b. Use of Environmental data in fish stock assessment	
A10	Election of WG Chairs	List
A11	ACFM Working Protocols	ACFM ToRs

ACFM agenda item no.	Agenda item title	Documentation
		WG on ACFM procedures under MCAP - ToRs
A12	ACFM report	
	a. Format of the report	Document
	b. Introductory items	
	c. Table of Contents	Revised version for 2001 ACFM Report + table of contents and cover page of extract ACFM Oct. 2001
A13	Working and Study Group reports	
	WG on Fishing Technology and Fishing Behaviour	CM 2001/B:05 Ref. ACFM
	Planning Group on Surveys on Pelagic Fish in the Norwegian Sea	CM 2001/D:07 Ref. ACFM, ACME
	WG on Beam Trawl Surveys	CM 2001/G:06 Ref. ACFM, E
	SG on Elasmobranch Fishes	CM 2001/G:07 Ref. ACFM
	WG on the Application of Genetics in Fisheries and Mariculture	CM 2001/F:03 Ref. ACME
	SG on Multispecies Predictions in the Baltic	CM 2001/H:04
	WG on Fishery Systems	CM 2001/D:06 Ref. ACFM
	Workshop on Synthesis of Surveys on Pelagic Fish in Norwegian Sea and Adjacent Areas	CM 2001/D:01
	SG on Modelling of Physical/Biological Interaction	CM 2001/C:03
	SG on Baltic Cod Age Reading	CM 2001/H:05
	Crangon Fisheries and Life History	CM 2001/G:10 Ref. ACFM, B
	Joint ICES/NAFO Working Group on Harp and Hooded Seals	CM 2001/ACFM:08
A14	Preparation of Advice to Commissions and Member Governments	1 st draft advice (summary sheets)
A15	Reports from meetings with Cooperative Organisations	Observers reports – NASCO, IBSFC, Deep-water Symp., IBSFC Aug., EC
A16	ACFM Quality Management Procedures – Manuals and Handbook	
	a. Status on data system development	Document
	b. Progress on developing a handbook for WGs – reply from assessment WGs	Document
A17	Review of EC project report on multi-annual TAC strategies for flatfish	Analysis of possibilities of limiting the annual fluctuations in TACs FISH-2000-02-01

ACFM agenda item no.	Agenda item title	Documentation
A18	Any Other Business	
	a. FIGIS + FIRMS progress report	Appendix to CWP report
	b. Project on expanding the IBTS Database to include Beam trawl Survey Data and IBTS data for Western and Southern Divisions	IBTSWG ToRs A16a document
	c. Workshop on Fish Stock Assessment	ToRs
	d) Celtic Sea herring	Draft summary sheet Discussion paper by John Molloy and Ciaran Kelly
	e) Barents Sea capelin	Draft summary sheet Report from the 2001 joint Russian-Norwegian meeting to assess the Barents Sea capelin stock
	f) Management measures on cod and hake	COM (2001) 326 final – Rebuilding stocks of cod and hake in community and adjacent waters
A19	Closing	

Sub-Groups 10-13 October 2001

ACFM Sub-group	Assessment Working Group	Documentation
	WG on the Assessment of Northern Shelf Demersal Stocks	CM 2002/ACFM:02 Addendum to haddock in Division VIIb
	WG on the Assessment of Demersal Stocks in the North Sea and Skagerrak	CM 2002/ACFM:01 Working doc. By M. Pastoors, F. van Beek, C. Needle, P. Marchal “Some further explorations into the assessment of North Sea plaice”
	WG on the Assessment of Southern Shelf Demersal Stocks	CM 2002/ACFM:05
	WG on the Assessment of Mackerel, Horse Mackerel, Sardine and Anchovy	CM 2002/ACFM:06 3 working documents on hake
	<i>Pandalus</i> Assessment WG	CM 2002/ACFM:04
	EIFAC/ICES WG on Eels	CM 2002/ACFM:03

ANNEX IV

ASSIGNMENTS AND TIME TABLE

REPORT	SUB-GROUP CHAIR	PRESENTER	REVIEWERS	SUB-GROUP
Northern Shelf Demersal Stocks	E. Hjørleifsson	Carl O'Brien	Germany/Finland	I
Demersal Stocks in the North Sea and Skagerrak	P. Kunzlik	M. Pastoors	USA/Canada	II
<i>Pandalus</i>	F. van Beek	B. Sjöstrand	Russia/Latvia	III
EIFAC/ICES WG on Eels	F. van Beek	W. Dekker	Sweden/Belgium	IV
Southern Shelf Demersal Stocks	J. Horbowy	A. Biseau	Portugal/Denmark	V
Mackerel, Horse Mackerel, Sardine and Anchovy	C. Porteiro	D. Skagen	Ireland/Norway	VI
SG on Elasmobranch Fishes	Netherlands			Plenary
WG on Fishery Systems	Chair of RMC			Plenary
EC report on Multiannual TAC strategies for flatfish				
Joint ICES/NAFO Working Group on Harp and Hooded Seals	Tabled			
SG on Multispecies Predictions in the Baltic	Tabled			
Planning Group on Surveys on Pelagic Fish in the Norwegian Sea	Tabled			
WG on Beam Trawl Surveys	Tabled			
SG on Baltic Cod Age Reading	Tabled			
Crangon Fisheries and Life History	Tabled			
Working Group on Fishing Technology and Fishing Behaviour	Tabled			
Working Group on the Application of Genetics in Fisheries and Mariculture	Tabled			
Workshop on Synthesis of Surveys on Pelagic Fish in Norwegian Sea and Adjacent Areas	Tabled			
Study Group on Modelling of Physical/Biological Interaction	Tabled			

	Sub-group Chair	WG Chair	Reviewers	
			1. Rapporteur	2 Rapporteur.
Northern Shelf	E. Hjørleifsson	C. O'Brien	N. Hammer	J. Pönni
North Sea Demersal	P. Kunzlik	M. Pastoors	M. Terceiro	D. Rivard
Pandalus	F. van Beek	B. Sjöstrand	M. Vitins	V. Shleinik
Eels	F. van Beek	W. Dekker	B. Sjöstrand	W. Demaré
Southern Shelf	J. Horbowy	A. Biseau	M. Azevedo	S. Munch-Petersen
Mackerel	C. Porteiro	D. Skagen	C. Lordan	O. Smedstad

Wednesday 10 October – Reports

Sub-group	Room	9-11	11-13	Lunch	14-16	16-18
I	Castle	WGNSSK	WGNSSK		WGNSSK	WGNSSK
II	Hjort	WGSSDS	WGSSDS		WGSSDS	WGSSDS
III	Beverton					

Thursday 11 October – Reports

Sub-group	Room	9-11	11-13	Lunch	14-16	16-18
I	Castle	WGNSSK	WGNSSK		WGNSSK	WGNSSK
II	Hjort	WGSSDS	WGSSDS		WGSSDS	WGSSDS
III	Beverton				WGNSSK	WGNSSK

Friday 12 October – Reports

Sub-group	Room	9-11	11-13	Lunch	14-16	16-18
I	Castle	WGMHSA	WGMHSA		WGMHSA	WGMHSA
II	Hjort	WGPAND	WGPAND		WGEEL	WGEEL
III	Beverton	WGNSSK	WGNSSK		WGNSSK	WGNSSK

Saturday 13 October – 2. Draft of Advice

Sub-group	Room	9-11	11-13	Lunch	14-16	16-18
I	Castle	2. Draft of advice & draft of technical minutes			2. Draft of advice & draft of technical minutes	
II	Hjort					
III	Beverton					

ACFM Plenary 9 October and 15-17 October

	9-11	11-13	Lunch	14-16	16-18
Tues. 9 Oct.	Business			Business	
Mon. 15 Oct	Report			Report	
Tues. 16 Oct.	Report			Report	
Wed. 17 Oct.	Report			Business	

ANNEX V

TEMPLATE FOR TECHNICAL MINUTES

To be used by ACFM sub-groups
By H. Sparholt

The Technical Minutes will from May 2002 and onwards be included as an Annex to each WG report. Therefore, the text needs to be intelligible for persons outside ACFM, i.e. especially for WG members but also for the general “educated” public who wish to see what ICES have done. This is part of the ICES policy of transparency.

At the ACFM Consultations in Oslo September 2001 it was decided in this context to try to develop a template for the Technical Minutes for the use by ACFM sub-groups when reviewing assessments.

This is a simple template where the following points are checked and text only included in the Technical Minutes, if there are any comments.

1	Have the wg answered the TORs?
2	<u>Input data</u> . Especially whether national data are correctly summed to give international catch and the SOP?
3	<u>The VPA</u> , is the settings/options and input data optimal, check diagnostics, retrospective pattern etc.
4	<u>The short-term projection</u> . Does initial stock numbers match survivors from VPA; are F and M before spawning in agreement with the VPA; Are weight at age correct; Are R for all years correct. Does exploitation pattern give <i>status quo</i> F; Are assumptions about current year catch OK.
5	<u>The medium-term projections</u> . Does it fits with the short-term projection and the VPA survivors. Check especially that the S-R model used is appropriate.
6	Consider the overall assessment including whether there is a need for a general change in method, data collection, surveys, mis-reporting estimation, discard estimation and data sampling, etc.
7	Check that the wg has responded to comments from the previous year given in the ACFM Technical Minutes
8	Check the stock summaries: Is the VPA summary table correct, etc? Are R and SSB from the short-term forecast included and are they correct? Are the forecast table correct? Etc.
9	Are the PA ref. Points OK?
10	Is the advice in accordance with the general rules for giving advice?