

**Bureau proposal to strengthen the advisory leadership, to be read in  
conjunction with the Bureau Statement in Annex 1**

*The meeting will be invited to discuss the Bureau proposal to strengthen the advisory leadership and to agree:*

- 1. To set a clear direction regarding a strengthening of the advisory leadership by extending the responsibilities of the ACOM chair and employment time for the ACOM chair and at the same time ensuring an effective and full mobilisation of the expertise and capacity within the Secretariat to support the work of ACOM.;*
- 2. On the need for a full time ACOM Chair and a Head of ACOM Support for 2015 et seq.;*
- 3. To establish temporary full time positions for the ACOM Chair and the Head of ACOM Support, and to increase the salaries for the ACOM Vice-Chairs until the full implementation of the proposal in 2016;*
- 4. To establish a Council/ACOM Working Group – January to June 2015, with clearly defined Terms of Reference on how to take the process forward;*
- 5. To mandate Bureau, informed by the recommendations of the Council/ACOM Working Group, to prepare a proposal for the October 2015 Council meeting;*
- 6. To consider the Bureau proposal at the October 2015 Council meeting for implementation in 2016; and*
- 7. To consider the cost implications from a full time ACOM Chair, in addition to increased salaries for the ACOM Vice-Chairs.*

**Background**

Bureau has recognised the need to support the implementation of the ICES Strategic Plan by strengthening the advisory leadership and by facilitating the effective and efficient use of Secretariat resources to this effect. At its meeting during the Annual Science Conference in A Coruna, Bureau elaborated a “Statement on a Proposal to Strengthen the Advisory Leadership”, which was presented by the President at the ACOM consultation meeting on 19 September. The objective was to update ACOM on the Bureau proposal against a background of “corridor talk and rumour”. Based on the feedback received, and further discussions at a Special Bureau meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> October, Bureau has elaborated the attached proposal for consideration by Council. The proposal

consists of the original Bureau statement, with clarifications clearly indicated by text boxes.

The Bureau proposal is driven by the need to continue to address the issues outlined in the 2012 External Advisory Review of ICES Advisory Services (2012 Advisory Review) and the new tasks that ICES and, specifically, ACOM will encounter, in the implementation of the ICES Strategic Plan, 2014-2018 (ISP).

The Bureau proposal establishes a stronger advisory leadership focused on the new advisory tasks set out in the ISP. Central to this is an extended and redefined ACOM chair position that will focus more on strategic leadership and the enhancement of Secretariat support for the work of ACOM.

The proposal is therefore not about a redefinition of tasks between existing posts alone. Rather it is about establishing entirely new posts that are fit for a new purpose; that of implementing the ISP and addressing the issues raised in the 2012 Advisory Review.

The proposal must not be regarded as a simple reallocation of tasks where (a) the tasks of the present Head of Advisory Programme related to strategic issues/policy aspects, and the overall use of Secretariat resources for advice are “added” to the ACOM chair position, and (b) the other tasks related to financial management and line management of Secretariat advice resources are delegated to a new Head of ACOM Support.

It is neither productive nor advisable to consider whether positions are being upgraded or downgraded. The proposal reallocates existing tasks while incorporating new tasks, with the overall aim of ensuring:

- 1) a more strategic leadership of ACOM;
- 2) a focussed resource mobilization in the Secretariat, in cooperation with the ACOM leadership/Chair, to support ACOM needs; and
- 3) an efficient and effective working relationship between ACOM and the Secretariat.

The proposed new model will not, in itself, solve all challenges that confront ACOM. However, it will provide the advisory leadership with a continuous focal point and bring attention to the resources and working conditions required to address advisory challenges including, but not limited to:

- i) the need to enhance ACOM’s role as steward of the ICES advisory process—as opposed to being the drafter of the ICES advice—and to ensure ACOM’s engagement in advice on environmental and ecosystem matters, as well as on fisheries issues;

- ii) the need to develop proactive demonstration advice that promotes the ICES Strategic Plan, such as the implementation of the MSY approach for all fisheries resources, and the development of a risk-based approach for by-catch reduction of species that are important from an ecosystem perspective or under threat;
- iii) the need for integrated advice on fishing possibilities that considers both fisheries impacts and important non-fisheries drivers (e.g., climatic, environmental, and ecosystem factors) — as recently demonstrated during the ICES Workshop on Scoping for Integrated Baltic Cod Assessment;
- iv) the need to discuss with recipients of advice their aspirations and needs, in relation to integrated advice;
- v) the need to address increased advisory services workloads, in full recognition of the limited and reduced resources of the national laboratories; and
- vi) the need to coordinate the SCICOM input into the integrated assessment.

Some of these issues were also highlighted in the 2012 Advisory Review, whose recommendations included:

- i) ICES should consider letting the Secretariat play a larger role in conducting update assessments and in generally supporting the advisory process;
- ii) ICES should continue to clarify its role as a provider of integrated advice in a close dialogue with the clients;
- iii) ACOM should consider its overlap with advice drafting groups to reach a more efficient use of resources;
- iv) ICES should continually evaluate the format of the ICES advice from the perspective of the recipient, and
- v) ICES should consider establishing a public-relations strategy.

(For the full report of the Advisory Review, cf. CM 2012 Del 3.2, and for an overview of the recommendations and initial responses see Annex 3).

While the proposal by Bureau to take an immediate step to enhance the advisory leadership and strengthen the mobilization of Secretariat resources is a move in the right direction (and will also deal with some of the identified shortcomings and recommendations from the 2012 Advisory Review), other pressing issues require attention as well:

- 1) the resourcing and support of the advisory process by Member Countries. An overview of the situation will emerge through the development and application of the Resource Coordination Tool (RCT);

- 2) the need for further integration between Data and Information, Science, and Advice, especially in the Benchmark Process. While ACOM is expected to take the lead in this process, input from SCICOM is essential;
- 3) the increased role of the Secretariat, and the need to make best use of the Secretariat's resources. The General Secretary has been requested to report at the February 2015 Bureau meeting on the configuration of the Secretariat, the current recruiting process to support the implementation of the ICES Strategic Plan, and identify challenges that the Secretariat faces in fulfilling its support function, including those related to the cost effectiveness of the expert network;
- 4) the overall ICES financial situation. A review will be initiated by Bureau in February 2015 on ICES fiscal health and funding operations, and on the need for priority setting (i.e., revisiting the ICES Business Model).

## Annex 1



Bureau Meeting 237

Proposal on Advice

September 2014

---

### Bureau Statement on a Proposal to Strengthen the Advisory Leadership (Presented to ACOM, 19 September 2014), with additional clarification based on feed-back received, and discussion and agreement at the Special Bureau meeting, on 8th October 2014

**This Bureau statement** of 19 September was presented to the ACOM consultation meeting during ASC. Elements of the Bureau Statement have been clarified based on feed-back received. The statement sets a direction that Bureau considers will significantly strengthen the ACOM leadership, provide enhanced Secretariat support for the work of ACOM and will enhance the implementation of the ICES Strategic Plan, 2014-2018.

The clarifications have been clearly marked by insertion in boxes, under the original text.

#### Background

The ICES advisory system was reformed in 2007 to meet the scientific advisory needs of a changing marine policy landscape. Since that reform, the advisory landscape has continued to evolve and the advisory workload has substantially increased. To meet these demands, ICES and its advisory system must continue to adapt and address the many challenges ahead including the implementation of the ICES Strategic Plan, 2014-2018, the move towards more integrated advice, and regionalization. At the same time, the advisory system faces increasing pressure on the human resources in both the expert network and in the Secretariat to continue to deliver high-quality recurrent advice while also responding to an increased number of special requests for advice on many diverse topics. The advisory leadership must clearly address these issues, while bearing in mind the financial climate in which ICES operates.

#### Clarifications

The Bureau proposal is driven by the need to continue to address the new tasks that ICES and, specifically ACOM will encounter, in the implementation of the ICES Strategic Plan, 2014-2018 (ISP) and the issues outlined in the 2012 External Advisory Review of ICES Advisory Services.

### The current model

Currently the ACOM Chair (Grade P5, V) works half-time, and the three ACOM Vice-Chairs share the equivalent of one full-time position (Grade P5, I). The Head of the Advisory Programme (Grade P5, IX) works full time in the Secretariat. The ACOM Chair works closely with the Secretariat, and the current ACOM Chair is based there part time. The ACOM Chair is not part of the Secretariat and is responsible to ACOM, Bureau, and Council. The Head of the Advisory Programme is part of the Secretariat and reports to the General Secretary.

### Why the need for change?

Changes are needed for several reasons:

- Strengthened strategic leadership: ACOM needs more than ever a strategic and visionary leadership to implement the thrust of the strategic plan towards integrated advice in a situation where resources are diminishing and multiple actors are entering the scene.
- Best possible use of Secretariat resources in accordance with ACOM's needs: In view of the resource situation and increasing demands for more diverse expertise the resources in the Secretariat - mainly the expertise available there - must be fully mobilized to provide substantial support to ACOM in a way which is seen as genuine support in full understanding with ACOM
- Clear division of responsibilities: There is at present no clear division of roles and responsibilities between the ACOM Chair and the Head of the Advisory Programme. To clarify these roles, establish a clear division of responsibilities, and foster a professional environment which will attract the best people to these positions, it is necessary to strengthen the role of the ACOM Chair, as well as the three ACOM Vice-Chairs. This change is also required to better distribute the workload.

### Clarifications

Why the need for a change:

1. *Can ACOM implement the ICES Strategic Plan?*
2. *Is the secretariat providing sufficient support for ACOM needs?*
3. *Are we maximising the use of the skills and expertise of the Secretariat?*
4. *Is the current model an efficient and effective way to do business?*
5. *Is there clarity on roles and responsibilities in ACOM leadership?*
6. *Why are we not attracting more people for the ACOM chair position?*

The drivers for the proposed change by Bureau are the 2012 External Advisory Review of ICES Advisory Services (2012 Advisory Review) and the ICES Strategic Plan, 2014-2018 (ISP). The recommendations stemming from the 2012 Advisory Review and the new tasks outlined in the ISP require a new structure. While this structure will not be able to deal with all of the identified issues, the change has been proposed to be able:

- to mobilize and maximize the use of the skills and expertise available in Secretariat in support of ACOM, and
- to clarify who is providing the strategic leadership within ACOM.

### A proposed model from Bureau to Council

Following a Bureau Sub group meeting (June, 2014) focused on this issue, and subsequent discussions at the June and September Bureau meetings, the Bureau has developed a proposed model to effect the needed changes. This proposal, which will be submitted to the Council for consideration at its October 2014 meeting, sets a direction for the advisory leadership and comprises two initial steps.

*Step 1;*

With the retirement of the current Head of the Advisory Programme (Grade P5), at the end of 2014, the following changes are proposed:

Within the Secretariat, the post of Head of the Advisory Programme will be replaced by a Head of ACOM Support (Grade P3).

The Head of ACOM Support will report to the General Secretary and will focus on: (a) managing the advisory resources (staff and finances) in the Secretariat; (b) maintaining the technical/scientific knowledge base; and (c) ensuring an effective and efficient secretariat support for ACOM. This person, to be recruited by a vacancy announcement issued this fall, will work in close cooperation with the ACOM leadership, especially the ACOM Chair.

To strengthen the ACOM leadership:

- the position of ACOM chair will increase from 50% to approximately 68% time, with a corresponding salary increase for this additional time commitment; to recognize the new strategic responsibilities.
- the salaries of each of the Vice-Chairs will be increased from 33% to approximately 39% to better reflect the time commitments that they actually devote to their responsibilities.

The changes proposed by Bureau will be cost-neutral.

#### **Clarifications**

The Bureau Statement initially put the ACOM chair at 68%. However, the Special meeting of Bureau on 8<sup>th</sup> October agreed that this should be 100%. This will not be cost neutral.

#### What are the gains?

With the proposed change and the establishment of the Head of ACOM Support, ACOM will receive enhanced support and expertise from the Secretariat. This will also be facilitated through a closer link between the ACOM Chair and the Secretariat/Head of ACOM Support, enabling better use of resources according to ACOM needs.

Furthermore, the proposed change ensures a more focused and strategic ACOM leadership by empowering strategic responsibilities to the ACOM Chair. This will provide the basis for the implementation of the advisory component of the ICES Strategic Plan.

#### Practical steps in implementation – the transition period 2015:



Until the implementation of the full package in 2016 which will be based on the work and recommendations from the COUNCIL/ACOM Working Group, and to ensure an appropriate recruitment process:

- the Head of ACOM Support will be a temporary position,
- the current ACOM Chair will continue with the new functions in a full time position, until the end of his three year term

#### *Step two*

At the October 2014 Council meeting, Bureau will seek support from Council on the general direction of the proposed model. Council will be asked to establish a Council-ACOM working group on the Advisory Leadership to further develop the process. The group will look into strengthening the strategic leadership of ACOM by examining the evolving role of the ACOM Chair (including the need for a full time chair and where the Chair should be based), the relationship of the Chair with the Secretariat, and potential cost implications for any additional changes.

The Council/ACOM working group on the Advisory Leadership will report to the July Bureau, which will then develop a proposal for the October 2015 Council meeting.

#### **Clarifications**

Step 1 and step 2 are to be considered as components of a “linked package”. That is, one component cannot be implemented without the other. Assuming Council agrees in 2014 to the direction proposed, 2015 will be a transition year.

As such, the Head of ACOM Support will be a temporary position and—only with the agreement of Council in October 2015—will this position be advertised in 2016. The current ACOM Chair will continue with the new functions in a full time position until the end of his three year term. This will ensure that both Council and ACOM have sufficient opportunity to address all of the details of the strengthened Advisory Leadership within the established Council/ACOM Working Group (January-June 2015). The Bureau Proposal will specifically ask the Council to agree to the following actions:

- To set a clear direction regarding a strengthening of the advisory leadership by extending the responsibilities of the ACOM chair and employment time for the ACOM chair and at the same time ensuring an effective and full mobilisation of the expertise and capacity within the Secretariat to support the work of ACOM.;
- On the need for a full time ACOM Chair and a Head of ACOM Support for 2015 et seq.;
- To establish a Council/ACOM Working Group – January to June 2015, with clearly defined Terms of Reference on how to take the process forward.



## Annex 2

### **Overview of key tasks to be addressed by the Advisory Leadership based on the implementation of the ICES Strategic Plan, 2014-2018**

- (1) Provide recurrent advice on fisheries and environmental issues in the North Atlantic and Adjacent Seas;
- (2) Responding to the evolving policy context and to the non-recurring special requests on fisheries, aquaculture and environmental issues;
- (3) Promoting the use and delivery of integrated advice in an ecosystem based approach to fisheries and environmental management;
- (4) Ensure quality assurance;
- (5) Use the available expertise in the most cost effective way to deliver the required advice;
- (6) Continue to evolve the benchmarking and auditing of recurrent advice;
- (7) Streamline data and report management to more clearly document data and analyses;
- (8) Support the implementation of an ecosystem approach to the management of human activities at sea by translating ecosystem understanding into an integrated framework for the provision of advice;
- (9) Produce integrated ecosystem assessments for at least 3 regions;
- (10) Continue to work with partners on the provision of advice for the implementation, review and potential revision of the MSFD;
- (11) Continue to provide advice on MSP working with strategic partners;
- (12) Ensure the efficient use of resources and quality assurance by developing new systems and tools;
- (13) Encourage expert groups to identify data needs and promote the use of regional databases;
- (14) Arrange dialogue meetings with advice recipients and stakeholders;
- (15) Continue to invest in training of experts and expert group chairs;
- (16) With support from the Secretariat, improve the communication and dissemination of ICES Advice.

## Annex 3

**Overview of recommendations, and initial follow-up, from the  
External Advisory Review of the ICES Advisory Services (Cf. CM 2012 Del 3.2)**



Council Meeting

October 2012

CM 2012 Del 3.2

(Without attachments)

*The meeting is invited to discuss the report and decide how to take forward the recommendations.*

*The main recommendations from the external panel have been synthesized in the table below.*

**External Advisory Review of Advisory Services**

ToR	Recommendation	Work already undertaken and Proposed Follow-up action
<p>ToR 1</p> <p>Is ICES Advice based on the right information and data, and are appropriate models used?</p>	<p>ICES consider introducing a formal data call system. The data call system could include a request from ICES to member countries to specify in detail the data to be delivered by the member country in support of ICES advisory work. The call for data to be used in addressing recurring advice could be issued annually, while data needed in support of non-recurring requests for advice could be issued when required.</p>	<p><i>Work already undertaken</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preparations are made for establishing databases per ecoregion to hold data resulting from formalised data calls.</li> <li>2. Formalised data calls are prepared for two ecoregions for 2013.</li> </ol> <p><i>Proposed Follow-up action</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The Secretariat will further develop a formal data call system, for recurring as well as non-recurring requests, to cover all ecoregions by 2014</li> <li>4. Regional databases to hold data from data calls will be established for all ecoregions. Being able to plan sampling by ecoregion rather than by</li> </ol>

		country should help reduce cost while maintaining or increasing precision.
	ICES as one of the main end users of fisheries and environmental data, could and should provide an important input to the revision of the Data Collection Framework and the development of monitoring plans in support of the MSFD.	<p><i>Work already undertaken</i></p> <p>5) ICES has already contributed a general comment to the revision of the Data Collection Framework, and will during November develop a detailed technical comment.</p> <p>6) ICES is considering the development of integrated surveys/monitoring (See CM 2012 Del-04.1 and e.g. the DG Environment call for proposals: "Pilot Project New Knowledge for an integrated management of human activities in the sea"), and seeking cooperation with Regional Seas Commissions having due regard to the 2014 deadline for the presentation of monitoring programmes under MSFD.</p> <p><i>Proposed Follow-up action</i></p> <p>7) Formal feedback on the use and utility of data will be developed within the framework of the regional databases.</p> <p>8) ICES will develop guidelines and protocols for integrated research vessel surveys in extension of existing survey guidelines, on the basis of experiences gathered through pilot surveys/possible project participation.</p>
	ICES continues to clarify its role as a provider of integrated advice in a close dialogue with	<p><i>Work already undertaken</i></p> <p>9) ICES has through its regional seas programme</p>

	the clients.	<p>established integrated assessment groups for most ecoregions, to develop the science basis for integrated advice.</p> <p>10) ICES has, upon request from EC developed a roadmap for the provision of integrated advice (ACOM 2011/ Doc 7.i.i). With the yearly update of the MoU, this is a recurrent negotiation issue.</p> <p>11) ICES has recently bid on various tenders/project proposals, which will be important for the further development of integrated advice. And the Secretariat has been strengthened with an Ecosystem Professional Officer.</p> <p><i>Proposed Follow-up action</i></p> <p>12) The issue of ecosystem overviews, integrated assessments and advice is deemed to play a core role in the review of the ICES Strategy and the derivative Action Plans. Very close interaction with recipients of ICES advice will be required as there is currently no forum requesting integrated advice. It should be noted that integrated advice, generally, means integrating fisheries and environment concerns as well as social and economic considerations.</p>
ToR 2. Are the processes used to prepare the advice appropriate in terms of management control, quality control, efficiency, responsiveness and transparency?	The review panel recommends that ICES considers to let the secretariat play a larger role in conducting update assessments and generally supporting the advisory process.	<p>This touches on a core issue in ICES about the roles of the secretariat versus the ICES scientific network, which requires a strategic decision to change significantly. There are some experiences though:</p> <p><i>Work already undertaken</i></p>

		<p><b>13)</b> There have been cases where the Secretariat has provided technical work which normally would be done by expert groups – the most prominent example being the delivery of advice on data limited stocks for the first time in 2012. This case demonstrated that mechanisms can be implemented to ensure engagement with the network.</p> <p><i>Proposed Follow-up action</i></p> <p>14) To provide a basis for a discussion and possible strategic decision in Council and in order to help the advisory processes and ensure the most efficient use of resources, the Secretariat would be ready to elaborate a document on how such a more active Secretariat role could be put in place. The general philosophy would be that the Secretariat could help, but given the varied nature of topics on which ICES provides advice, considerable involvement by the scientific network will continue to be required.</p>
	<p>The review panel recommends that ACOM considers the overlap between advice drafting groups and ACOM to reach a more efficient use of resources of both the drafting groups and advice.</p>	<p>This seems to relate to the problem that a culture has developed where many issues are discussed in technical detail twice – first in the ADG and then in ACOM via the Webex, which was originally intended as an approval process:</p> <p><i>Work already undertaken</i></p> <p>15) ACOM is encouraged to focus its attention on ADGs and limit dealings in later</p>

		<p>stages to approval or not.</p> <p><i>Proposed Follow-up action</i></p> <p>16) ACOM will be encouraged to avoid substantive discussions at the ACOM advice approval webex except in cases of outright errors. Substantive issues should be resolved prior to the advice approving WebEx; at the EGs or in ADGs.</p>
	<p>The review panel recommends that ACOM considers the consistency of the review process and investigates the possibility of establishing a more robust system, based on information of how independent peer reviews are undertaken outside Europe.</p>	<p>The review process resembles to a large extent what is done internationally as far as the benchmarks are concerned – in some jurisdictions similar processes constitutes the extent of peer review. What is special in ICES is the ‘peer review’ (actually a technical audit) of the annual implementation of methods already peer reviewed in benchmarks – these often do not occur in other systems. Although it is felt that ACOM has already considered the strengths and weaknesses of other advisory services outside of Europe, these models will be looked at on an ongoing basis using in part the expertise from the USA and Canada participants.</p> <p><i>Work already undertaken</i></p> <p>17) Conducting reviews through student groups has proven very efficient both in actually discovering errors and in not using existing academic resources while actually helping to develop new resources.</p> <p><i>Proposed Follow-up action</i></p> <p>18) The audit review will be</p>

		made the responsibility of expert groups and the separate audit will generally be omitted for standard stock assessments. This will progressively be implemented from 2013.
ToR 3: Is the ICES advice considered relevant and credible among scientists, end users, ICES Member States governments, Member States of cooperating organisations, the EU commission, stakeholders and the public process	<p>The Panel also noted comments that communication between the direct clients and the scientific community is regarded as poor, especially for communication to stakeholders and public media.</p> <p>ICES continually evaluate the format of the ICES advice from the perspective of the recipient, and recommends that ICES consider establishing a public-relations strategy focusing on ways to “translate” ICES advice into language for the general public. The Panel believes that such communication could be enhanced through the use of modern, interactive media.</p>	<p><i>Work already undertaken</i></p> <p>19) The outreach and communications activities have been upgraded in ICES secretariat, including press releases, information brochures, and social media (Twitter, LinkedIn and Facebook).</p> <p>20) The first ICES popular advice was released in August, under the ICES–EC MoU, giving a simplified account of the June Advice. This will be further refined and a version will be produced next year which satisfies the needs of the advice recipients/outreach purposes while genuinely reflecting the ICES advice as intended by ACOM.</p> <p>21) ICES meets with the recipient of ICES advice (Commissions and member states) and with users of ICES advice (RACs and other stakeholders) in order to explain and have discussions on advice.</p> <p><i>Proposed Follow-up action</i></p> <p>22) Ecosystem overview reports with ‘state of the sea’ overviews including stock status overviews are under development. These will not focus on TAC advice per se, but on status and trends.</p>



		<p>23) The issue of communication is expected to have a higher profile as a result of the review of the ICES Strategy and the subsequent Action Plans.</p>
	<p>The review panel recommends that the delivery of advice is considered and that a process of moving from ex-cathedra advice to embedded advice is started as soon as possible.</p>	<p><i>Work already undertaken</i></p> <p>24) Whenever possible, responses to special requests are developed in a process involving a scoping workshop – expert group work – what-if outcomes workshop – advice finalisation process. For standard fisheries management advice, this is not currently possible as there is only one of three options on the table: agreed management plan, MSY approach, or Precautionary Approach.</p> <p><i>Proposed Follow-up action</i></p> <p>25) Clients and stakeholders are informed that in order to move to an integrative, participatory process based on options exploration, their input is required, regarding time to complete it and participation in the process.</p> <p>27) The model of an embedded process to be implemented wherever possible given</p>

		<p>limitations in timing and availability of client /stakeholder representatives.</p> <p>27) The bulk of the advice is delivered during May/June and a popularization of this as well as an invitation to a presentation, of major trends and new issues could be seen as a start up of a new process for the delivery of the advice.</p>
<p>ToR 4: Is the scope of ICES advice appropriate in terms of addressing policy and societal needs, and is it consistent with the implementation of an ecosystem approach to management?</p>	<p>ICES widen the scope of the ICES advice to include descriptions of the various industry sectors having an impact on the oceans, their economies, and the social conditions of dependent communities. These descriptions should be as quantitative and data-driven as possible.</p> <p>The Panel also notes that for comprehensive fisheries advice, data on fleet activity and economy, and the dependence of fishing communities on these activities, will be required.</p>	<p><i>Work already undertaken</i></p> <p>28) Work on socio-economic aspects are carried out in several ICES science expert groups (see Council Working Group on Economics and Social Sciences in ICES (CWGESS) and the approval of this report in Council in 2011).</p> <p><i>Proposed Follow-up action</i></p> <p>29) As part of the work on the integrated assessments, the issue of socio-economics will have to be dealt with.</p> <p>30) In order to move from integrated assessments to integrated advice Council needs to take a decision accepting that socio-economic information is necessary to the development of this advice. ICES must recognize that the integration of social aspects is a prerequisite for the development of integrated advice.</p> <p>31) The issue of socio-economics to be considered in the review of the ICES Strategy and the subsequent Action Plans.</p>
<p>ToR 5: Is ICES sufficiently proactive in</p>	<p>ICES widen its advisory scope to include social and economic</p>	<p><i>Work already undertaken</i></p>

preparing the basis for possible future policy needs for advice?	considerations, and that ICES in a dialog with present and possible future clients explore its possible role as advisor on social and economic impacts of management measures.	<p>32) The potential and capacity for advice incorporating social and economic considerations is being developed in the science pillar of ICES.</p> <p><i>Proposed Follow-up action</i></p> <p>33) This issue should be considered in the development of the ICES Strategic Plan and in connection with the renewal of the ICES–EC MoU.</p>
	ICES strengthens the dialogue with present and possible future clients on the ICES advisory approach, to ensure that ICES addresses their needs for advice.	<p><i>Work already undertaken</i></p> <p>34) In the annual meetings with recipients of ICES advice (MIRIA) future needs are on the agenda and discussed.</p> <p>35) In connection with submission of bids for project proposals/tenders concerning MSFD, ICES has worked with the regional seas commissions as well as opened up for the possibility for cooperation with academia. While ICES participation in projects cannot be equated with advice, this strengthens the ICES profile and broadens the ICES network.</p> <p><i>Proposed Follow-up action</i></p> <p>36) Dialogue meeting on future integrated advice will be arranged.</p> <p>37) Strengthen dialogue in MIRIA.</p>
ToR 6. Are present advisory commitments commensurate with available human resources and science expertise, and are there sufficient mechanisms in place to obtain human resources from ICES	<p>ICES should consider three proposals to ensure the commitments of ICES Member States to fund the ICES Advisory Services:</p> <p>1) ICES could revise its convention to commit Member States to funding the advisory</p>	<p><i>Work already undertaken</i></p> <p>38) First attempts to slim down the process by moving audit review to expert groups rather than as separate process, reduce the frequency of advice and implement a simplified process to evaluate if an</p>

Member States?	<p>services properly (including the basic scientific work).</p> <p>2) ICES could draw up agreements or MoU's with its member countries specifying the human resources that the ICES advisory system can draw upon.</p> <p>3) The funding of participation in the Advisory system could be included in the annual budget, including budget lines describing the funding of the participation of experts in ACOM and SCICOM expert groups.</p>	<p>updated assessment should be attempted or if the current assessment should be used to provide advice.</p> <p><i>Proposed Follow-up action</i></p> <p>39) Secretariat could relieve expert groups of some burdens subject to available Secretariat resources and mechanisms set in place to ensure continued ownership by the ICES network</p>
	<p>ICES considers ways to enhance the academic status of the scientists participating in scientific and advisory expert groups, for example with an active policy to assist with the publication of assessments and the underlying working papers in peer-reviewed journals.</p>	<p><i>Work already undertaken</i></p> <p>40) CRR's increasingly used as outlets for expert group products</p> <p><i>Proposed Follow-up action</i></p> <p>41) Expert groups encouraged and supported to publish core results in peer reviewed journals</p>
ToR 7: Is the ICES advisory process consistent with the ICES constitution and commitments made internationally and regionally?	<p>The Review Panel recommends that the Member States of ICES consider updating the Convention to reflect commitments of States and Regional Organisations found in international law and instruments. This would increase the responsibility and accountability of Member States within the ICES system with respect to international commitments.</p>	<p><i>Work already undertaken</i></p> <p>42) As part of the published advice, an account is given of the general context of the ICES advice by reference to international, regional as well as national agreements and policies. This document is regularly updated.</p> <p><i>Proposed Follow-up action</i></p> <p>43)</p> <p>The issue of international commitments will be considered during the development of the ICES Strategic Plan, where a scoping document of the legal and scientific environment will be one of the background documents</p>

		44) Special point for MIRIA
ToR 8: Is the ICES advisory process cost-effective?	The Review Panel did not have access to enough information to make any recommendation.	<i>Proposed Follow-up action</i> 45) Secretariat to develop system for getting a better overview of the resources used in the advisory process