

2013 Council Minutes
ICES 101st Statutory Meeting
23–24 October 2013

1 Adopt the Agenda

Council was welcomed to the meeting by the President, Paul Connolly. The agenda was adopted (**CM_2013_Del-01**). Iceland was congratulated and thanked for hosting a very successful 2013 Annual Science Conference in Reykjavik.

New delegates and alternates were welcomed:

Serge Scory (Belgium), Alain Vézina (alternate for Canada), Jakob Munkhøj Nielsen (Denmark), Niall Ó Maoiléidigh (Ireland), Tammo Bult (Netherlands), Eduardo Balguerías (Spain), Anders Hermansson (alternate for Sweden), and Steve Murawski (United States).

The agenda was **adopted**.

The action points from the 2012 Council meeting were reviewed by the ICES President to ensure they had been addressed or that relevant work was on-going. Council was satisfied that all actions had been followed up or would be dealt with during the meeting.

2 ICES Strategic Plan

The President reviewed the work and process followed over the past year to develop the ICES Strategic Plan (ISP) 2014–2018, based on the ToRs adopted by the Council in 2012 Council for the renewal of the ISP:

ToR 1 - To prepare a new ICES Strategic Plan (2014 to 2018) in line with the schedule agreed by Council, the ICES Convention and the Copenhagen Declaration.

ToR 2 - To prepare a scoping document that reviews the current and future policy and research landscape in which ICES operates. This document will inform and guide the new ICES Strategic Plan (2014 to 2018).

ToR 3 - To guide the development of the new Plans (2014 to 2018) for the Advisory Services, Science, Data and the Secretariat in line with the schedule agreed by Council.

The ISP is a high-level document that sets the direction for ICES over the next five years, and will be implemented through four associated plans (Advisory; Science; Data and Information; Secretariat). The main elements of the ISP are:

Introduction

1. The Basis for ICES
2. The ICES Organization
3. The Science and Policy Landscape in which ICES Operates
4. Vision and Mission
5. Core Values
6. Strategy – Pillars, Goals and Activities
7. Implementation and Review of the ICES Strategy

The latest version of the ISP (including the comments received from Council and incorporated by the Bureau on 22 October) was made available to Council in **CM 2013 Del-02.3**.

Council provided positive feedback for the work done to develop the ISP. The following points were mentioned during the discussion:

- Workforce development and the ICES training programme are not mentioned in the Plan. These fit more appropriately in one of the associated plans, and the SCICOM Chair noted that the Science Plan will be revised to include these two activities.
- The issue of prioritization and the need to clearly indicate the fundamental choices made by ICES should be highlighted in the Introduction section of the ISP. Financial and personnel constraints should to be stressed as these have important implications for Member Countries. The President noted that Integrated Ecosystem Assessments, Arctic activities, and aquaculture represent major focus areas in the ISP. A sentence will be added to the Introduction of the ISP to highlight these choices, with the associated details provided in the Science Plan. Harmonizing workloads with the human and financial limits available to ICES will be critical and, in part, will be addressed using the Resource Coordination Tool (RCT), which is expected to make the advisory system more efficient and productive.
- Implementation plans beyond the associated plans must be considered. The President indicated that the performance indicators outlined in each of the associated plans will be important to both the Council and the Bureau in assessing progress on the implementation of ISP.
- The ISP must strike a balance between the realities of resource limitations and the requirement to be visionary and strategic. If the ISP is based only on available resources, it becomes an action plan, not a strategic plan.
- In the Science and Policy landscape diagram, it was suggested to clarify what is meant by “Women’s organizations” (or otherwise delete this text from the diagram).

Regarding references to socio-economic issues within the ISP, a range of views were expressed, including:

- ICES does not currently have the competence to deal with socio-economics. Socio-economic considerations could be included in the science section of the ISP, but should not be mentioned in the advice section, as this is not achievable in a 5-year period. If this is a long-term goal, more ground work needs to be done to acquire this competence.
- Providing socio-economic information (*e.g.*, effects or consequences) in the management options provided by ICES may help inform decision-making by managers.

- Multi-species advice cannot be provided without using socio-economic information.

To address this issue, Council agreed to edit section 6.2 *Producing the information and advice decision-makers need* (i.e., the first bullet point or activity under Goal 3) to read:

- providing recurrent advice on fisheries and environmental issues in various areas of the North Atlantic and adjacent seas, such as the provision of advice on multi-annual fisheries management plans, and spatial management needs. Whenever possible, the biological, environmental, and social and economic consequences of alternative management scenarios will be presented.

Next Steps

Bureau will implement the agreed edits from Council and revise the text in the ISP as appropriate. No substantive changes will be introduced. By the end of 2013, a final version of the ISP will be uploaded to the ICES.

Action: Council unanimously **approved** the ICES Strategic Plan, 2014–2018. The Secretariat will make the minor edits and include the additional points suggested by the Council. A final version will be uploaded to the ICES website by the end of 2013.

Council mandated the Bureau to approve the associated plans for Data and Information, Science, Advice, and Secretariat at the Bureau's February 2014 meeting. The four associated plans will implement the ICES Strategic Plan.

Action: Following the special Bureau meeting in January 2014, the associated plans will be circulated to Council for review. Any review comments on these plans will subsequently be considered by the Bureau at its February 2014 meeting.

Action: The ICES Strategic Plan and associated plans will be launched at a public event in March 2014.

3 Report from the Council Steering Group on the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (CSG MSFD)

The Chair of CSG MSFD, Bill Turrell updated Council on the activities of the Council Steering Group (CM_2013_Del-03)

CM 2013 Del-03.1 is an internal discussion paper that presents the background information concerning the invitation received by ICES to provide input to the Common Implementation Strategy for the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (CIS MSFD). The Implementation Strategy will be presented at the Marine Directors Meeting, 3–4 December, in Vilnius, Lithuania.

CM 2013 Del-03.2 is the draft ICES input to the CIS for the marine directors at their meeting in December.

The following points were mentioned in the Council discussion:

- Regardless of having a legal commitment to implement MSFD, ICES EU Member States are all struggling to implement the Ecosystem Approach. The two main policy streams, conservation and sustainable yields, will eventually have to merge, and the Council's thinking should take this into account.

- The on-going work of CSG MSFD should continue. Greater involvement from Science and Advice leadership is needed to facilitate the work of ICES on the MSFD. A Bureau member should also be involved and update the Bureau on the work of CSG MSFD.
- ICES can play an important coordination role with respect to the monitoring phase, which must be done at the regional level.
- ICES work on the MSFD also supports science for the ecosystem approach, a concept many Member Countries are committed to via global agreements, such as the World Summit on Sustainable Development, and the Convention on Biological Diversity.
- MSFD implementation continues and, although many science questions remain, the work of CSG MSFD should proceed throughout the implementation phase.
- EU Member States are responsible for the implementation of the MSFD, and improved coordination could facilitate implementation. These States need to inform the Marine Directors about the competencies and capacities of ICES that could be used in the monitoring phase of the MSFD.
- Trying to enhance the efficiency of ICES work by allowing ICES experts to work in new areas is a good approach, but we need to think more broadly about how these resources should be used.
- ICES is well positioned to contribute further to the MSFD. However, if greater resources are needed, this will have major implications for the commitments from Member Countries. ICES needs to be mindful of scarce resources.
- Integrated Ecosystem Assessments are a focus area in the ICES Strategic Plan, and ICES strategic goals are based on the ecosystem approach.
- Some ICES working/expert groups (and their ToRs) may need to be changed /revised to match current policy demands.

Regarding **CM 2013 Del 03.2**, the draft letter **from ICES** will be edited to include a clear statement about the role of Member States in safeguarding the availability of expert resources to this process, and the gains that would ensue from a pooling of resources through an intergovernmental process. This would help to ensure the efficient use of scarce resources and allow issues to be addressed on an eco-region scale.

The following points were raised in the discussion:

- New resources are emerging to support MSFD, but how these will be allocated is not clear.
- The letter should suggest to Marine Directors that additional resources are essential for integrated monitoring to cover the marginal costs associated with expanding survey sampling programs to include environmental aspects.
- Differences in the division of responsibility between fisheries and environment at the national level make the situation complex. Monitoring may not have the same priority in all Member States compared to other field or research programmes.

- Changing surveys with long time-series (*e.g.*, the International Bottom Trawl Survey; IBTS) requires significant thought, planning, and effort. ICES must consider how it needs to change internally to support changing policy needs. The Science Plan has identified a need for integrated surveys, and the Council Working Group needs to send a clear message to the survey planning groups that adaptation will be necessary.
- Member Countries need to make a connection between monitoring and the other components of the MSFD. ICES ability to link these important aspects of the MSFD should be clearly specified in the Science Plan.
- The Data Collection Framework (DCF) has been an important source of funding. Some countries developed new surveys (*e.g.*, marine litter) and these experiences should be shared. Broader data collection is important, but should not come at the expense of disrupting important time-series or divert attention from the main aims of the DCF.
- Regionalization is a central issue in the reforms of the Common Fisheries Policy, and integration at the regional level is a necessity.
- CSG MSFD could request each of the integrated survey steering groups to provide a document describing what levels of survey integration are possible at different funding levels. These outcomes could be discussed with DG MARE.
- A top-down approach should be used to facilitate any needed surveys changes. Communication with the survey planning groups is essential to help them understand the spheres of influence, and the political processes operating at both national and regional levels.
- Monitoring at the right temporal and spatial scales is critical – but this may not be appreciated at the political level. ICES should advise on this matter.
- The implementation of MSFD goes beyond the development of indicators; implementation measures will also require science input.
- ICES can not only help define the scope of what can be measured for the ecosystem approach with the resources available, but can also provide information on what else is possible at different levels of investment.

Council **concluded** that CSG MSFD should continue its work. The group has made good progress in raising the profile of ICES with the MSFD. Now consideration needs to be given to what can be done internally, especially what interactions ICES can pursue based on resources. A top-down approach via CSG MSFD and the Bureau should be used to foster any needed changes in the survey planning groups and in other relevant groups. Council noted that it is important that CSG MSFD interact with Bureau and also in the development of the associated plans.

Action: Council agreed that the CSG MSFD should continue its work, with a focus on the organization of the ICES work to ensure that significant contributions are made to the integrated ecosystem approach.

A top-down approach via CSG MSFD and Bureau should be used to enact necessary changes in the survey planning groups, as well as other relevant groups.

Council noted that it is important that CSG MSFD interact with Bureau and in the development of the associated plans.

The letter to Marine Directors will be revised to include a clear summary of the key messages, emphasizing that additional work will require additional resources. The importance of pooling of expert resources using integrated monitoring should be highlighted. The Secretariat will ensure timely submission of the letter.

4 ICES and the EU Maritime Strategy for the Atlantic Ocean Area–(CM_2013_Del-04)

The ICES President reported that the “*Galway Statement on Atlantic Ocean Cooperation*”¹, a trans-Atlantic agreement, was signed in May 2013 by Canada, the European Union, and the United States of America. As the agreement has no outlined implementation process, it is important to link this to other initiatives, such as the EU Maritime Strategy for the Atlantic Ocean Area, and existing bilateral agreements. This will help to ensure ICES involvement as an established example of trans-Atlantic marine science cooperation.

The President proposed establishing a Council working group to (a) consider what work is currently underway by Member Countries; (b) identify where coordination could be beneficial; and (c) propose new elements of work. The aim would be to develop a discussion paper for consideration at the October 2014 Council meeting.

Action: The Council agreed to establish a Council Working Group on Maritime Transatlantic Cooperation (CWGMTC) to be chaired by First Vice President Cornelius Hammer. The Group will prepare a paper that will outline what ICES can contribute in terms of Trans-Atlantic cooperation. The Group will initially work by correspondence, and then hold a meeting in April 2014 at ICES Headquarters. The report of the CWGMTC will be presented at the June 2014 Bureau meeting, with the aim of developing a discussion paper for consideration at the October 2014 Council meeting. Terms of Reference will be developed for approval by Council. The following countries volunteered to participate: Canada, Denmark, France, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Portugal, United Kingdom, and the United States.

5 Finance

5.1 Finance Committee Report (CM_2013_Del-05.1)

The report of Finance Committee was presented by the Chair, Konstantin Drevetnyak.

It was noted that there are some outstanding national contributions from Member Countries. The General Secretary informed the Council that progress had been made in addressing this situation, and that payment is expected in the near future from one of the two member countries having outstanding contributions².

The new Science Fund and the cost neutral approach to financing this Fund in 2014 was supported by the Council. However, establishing a long-term source of funding will require a separate budget line and Council approval.

¹ <https://www.marine.ie/NR/rdonlyres/89AC763E-9DCC-4D84-AF34-1EF363B3994B/0/SignedGalwayStatement24MAY2013.pdf>

² Payment was received, beginning September, from one of the member Countries.

Council **approved**:

- The final accounts 2012, including Audit book.
- The proposed budget 2014 (national contributions were approved in 2012).

The forecast budget for 2015 containing a proposed 2% increase in national contributions was not approved; the vote for this budget did not receive the necessary 2/3 majority. An alternative forecast budget for 2015 with no increase in national contributions was distributed, and approved with 19 votes (**CM 2013 Del-05.1**).

Action: Prior to the 2014 Council meeting, the Bureau will review the Rules of Procedure to determine if there are explicit rules regarding the need to vote on an alternate (0%) budget, if the budget as recommended by Finance Committee is not accepted. The Bureau will also consider the implications of a 0% increase in contributions (as this has now occurred for the fifth time in six years).

The Council approved a new Science Fund for the year 2014, with a maximum amount of 500,000 DKR. The Fund is cost-neutral and financed from the Strategic Investment Fund. Based on the experience from the first year, Bureau will recommend to Council whether this fund should continue in 2015. If the fund continues, it will require a special accounting and budget line that will require Council approval. The Secretariat will soon announce a call for research proposals to be supported by the 2014 science fund. Further information will be made available on the ICES website.

5.2 Risk Register

First Vice-President Cornelius Hammer made a presentation to the Council on the ICES Risk Register, which builds on the business model adopted by the Council in 2012 (**CM_2013_Del-5.2**). The next step is to identify the greatest risks for ICES, and for Bureau to develop a detailed risk management strategy. The risk table will be reviewed regularly by the Bureau to update, assess changes, and initiate any needed actions.

Council **supported** the continuation of the Risk Register work, and indicated that the risk register document should be treated as an internal document, not to be distributed outside the ICES community.

Action: First Vice-President Cornelius Hammer will further develop the ICES Risk Register, and present an initial risk management strategy for consideration by the Bureau at its February 2014 meeting

6 Appointment

Pierre Petitgas (France) was **appointed** by Council as the new Chair of the Awards Committee replacing Ed Houde (USA) who had served two terms as Awards Committee Chair.

The Council thanked Ed Houde for his outstanding service as Chair and for his many contributions to the Awards Committee.

7 ICES Science

7.1 Report from the SCICOM Chair

7.1.1 Annual Progress Report

The Chair of SCICOM, Manuel Barange, reported to Council on the activities of SCICOM (CM_2013_Del-7.1).

The new draft Science Plan 2014–2018 is focused on achieving an integrated understanding of North Atlantic ecosystems. SCICOM is reviewing its structures to facilitate implementation of the Science Plan.

The SCICOM Chair reflected on the main achievements of SCICOM during his tenure as Chair from 2010 through 2013:

- Bringing science to the forefront of ICES
- Opening ICES to non-governmental scientists and organizations
- Engendering dynamism and scientific evolution, and implementing Multi-Annual Terms of Reference
- Developing strategic initiatives and collaboration with partners
- Establishing a Science Fund within ICES that will fund bottom-up collaborative research and facilitate implementation of the Science Plan

Challenges for SCICOM in 2014–2018 include:

- Implementation of the new Science Plan
- Ecosystem benchmarking
- Management of expert groups under multi-annual ToRs
- Protecting the uniqueness of strategic initiatives
- Remaining true to the ICES Vision, “To be a world leading scientific organization concerning marine ecosystems...”
- Continuing to attract – and make welcome - new expertise into the ICES community

Feedback from Council:

- The Benchmark process for integrated ecosystem assessments is unclear, as is how ACOM and SCICOM will collaborate in this process.
- The Council thanked Manuel Barange for his excellent service as SCICOM Chair during 2010-2014 and for his many superb achievements.

7.1.2 Joint ACOM/SCICOM scientific strategic initiatives

The Council was updated on the activities and work conducted in support of the following ACOM/SCICOM scientific strategic initiatives:

- Climate Change and Marine Ecosystems (SICCME)
- Biodiversity Science and Advice (SIBAS)
- Stock Assessment Methods (SISAM)

Action: The Council noted that while many activities had been accomplished in support of the joint ACOM/SCICOM scientific strategic initiatives, differences existed in the pace of work among the initiatives. The Bureau will review some specific issues related to SIBAS if these issues have not been resolved by the February 2014 Bureau meeting.

7.1.3 Appointment of SCICOM Chair

Following the nomination by SCICOM and Bureau support, the Council **appointed** Yvonne Walther (Sweden) as SCICOM Chair. (cf. Rule 30, i of the Rules of Procedure).

Action: The recent selection procedure for new Science and Advisory Committee Chairs revealed ambiguity in the Rules of Procedure, and the need for a unified interpretation for use by both committees. The Bureau will prepare a document providing a unified interpretation of the Rules of Procedure in selecting new Science and Advisory Chairs, and submit this document for approval at the October 2014 Council meeting.

7.2 2014 and forthcoming Annual Science Conferences

A brief progress report on the planning for the 2014 Annual Science Conference (ASC) in Spain was presented to the Council. No host has yet been identified for the 2015 ASC, although the Secretariat is in consultations with one country.

Action: Pending the outcome of the Secretariat consultations, the Bureau may have to approach Council in January 2014 and request that the Council actively canvass for a host for the 2015 ASC.

8 ICES Advisory Services

8.1 Report from the ACOM Chair

8.1.1 Annual Progress Report

The Chair of ACOM, Jean-Jacques Maguire, reported to Council on the activities of ACOM (**CM_2013_Del-8.1**).

The main issues highlighted included:

- Proposing a dialogue meeting for MSY in multi-species and mixed fisheries contexts.
- The Planning Group on Commercial Catch, Discards and Biological Sampling (PGCCDBS) may be split into two groups: (1) sampling of catches; and (2) estimation of biological parameters, with possible continuation of PGCCDBS as a steering group. The joint ACOM/SCICOM

Steering Group on Integrated Ecosystem Observation will be the new home of PGCCDBS and its two suggested working groups.

- The development of the Advisory Plan is behind schedule, but a final draft of the Plan will be reviewed at the December 2013 meeting of ACOM, and then forwarded to the Bureau for endorsement.
- A drafting workshop for ecosystem overviews will take place in November 2013.
- Popular advice was issued for the second time, and continues to be developed.

Following questions and feedback from Council:

- The process to manage joint ACOM-SCICOM groups will be agreed on a case-by-case basis; some groups will have co-chairs, and report to both committees. These groups will need clear guidance and ToRs.
- ACOM Review Groups will be replaced by small break-out groups during assessment working group meetings to help ensure that the stock assessment annex has been implemented properly.
- Given potential resource availability constraints within ICES, there is an emerging risk that advice may be produced elsewhere.

Council discussed the problems related to the development of the 2014 ICES advice for the Northeast Atlantic mackerel stock. The following points were noted:

- The lack of advice for mackerel based on a modelling framework proved troublesome for several ICES clients.
- In the past, ICES hasn't been clear enough about the uncertainty in the mackerel assessment and that it was almost rejected in 2012. The main problem is the reliability of the catch data prior to 2005. If age-based models are not possible, other options will have to be explored to produce advice based on a quantitative assessment.
- ICES needs to have a process for addressing situations that arise in the future similar to that experienced with mackerel. The ICES network has to be ready to mobilise the needed resources in a timely fashion to resolve any such future difficulties.

Action: At its February 2014 meeting, the Bureau will look at lessons learned from the mackerel assessment and the advice for 2014, and review the various issues and problems and develop possible solutions.

Council feedback on the ACOM report:

The WebEx meetings at which ICES advice is approved and finalized by ACOM should not be the only activity in which ACOM members participate. ACOM members should more fully share in the work of the Committee and assume some of the work burden now placed on the Vice-Chairs. To better understand this matter, more detailed information should be provided on how the Committee's work can be more fully shared among all ACOM members.

Action: At its February 2014 meeting, the Bureau will consider the matter of workload sharing in ACOM as part of the broader resource management theme, including the organization of Advisory Services and the ICES advisory process.

Council thanked Jean-Jacques Maguire for his outstanding leadership as ACOM Chair during 2011–2013 and for his many achievements on behalf of ICES.

8.1.2 Resolutions/ToRs

ACOM has adopted a two-step process for planning the annual advisory work with (1) most of the recurrent expert groups and ToRs developed during the ASC and submitted to Council in October; and (2) any additional ToRs developed at the annual ACOM meeting in December.

The workplan and resolutions are available through a link on the Council SharePoint site and on the dedicated site.

(<http://community.ices.dk/admin/Workplan/layouts/15/start.aspx#/default.aspx>)

8.1.3 Appointment of Chair

Following nomination by ACOM and Bureau support, Council appointed Eskild Kirkegaard (Denmark) as ACOM Chair. (cf. Rule 30, i of the Rules of Procedure).

Action: The recent selection procedure for new Science and Advisory Committee Chairs revealed ambiguity in the Rules of Procedure, and the need for a unified interpretation for use by both committees. The Bureau will prepare a document providing a unified interpretation of the Rules of Procedure in selecting new Science and Advisory Chairs, and submit this document for approval at the October 2014 Council meeting.

8.1.4 Status of ICES–EC MoU renewal

Poul Degnbol, Head of Advisory Services, provided the Council with an update on discussions with the European Commission on the renewal of the ICES–EU Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). The following points were discussed:

- To date, few concrete proposals for changes to the 2014 MoU have been received. The expectation is that there will be no substantive changes to the MoU.
- One major issue is that the table of species must be changed to a table of stocks. This will be based on the table of contents of the ICES advice, listing the EU-stocks and EU relevant stocks.
- The deadlines for advice are now agreed, as suggested in the ICES workplan. The advice on elasmobranchs will be released in the autumn.
- During the MoU negotiations in spring 2013, the Commission accepted that the budget share key between bodies requesting advice from ICES is an issue between those bodies and therefore should be agreed between them. The European Commission will hold a meeting with other advice requesters in autumn 2013 to discuss this matter, but it is not clear what the outcomes from this meeting will be. ICES has indicated that if a new share key has not been agreed by the end of 2013, the assumption must be that the present key will continue in 2014. A delay in finalizing the 2014 MoU because this matter remains unresolved is not acceptable.
- In the future, it would be desirable to see the Council become more engaged in discussions about the ICES–EC MoU.
- The MoU is still being renewed annually, and a longer time horizon is being negotiated.

Action: At its February 2014 meeting, the Bureau will review the MoU negotiations and identify strategies to improve the negotiation process, including how to develop a longer-term MoU.

8.1.5 Resource Coordination Tool

The need to match available scientific expert resources to the proposed work plans of the advisory process has resulted in the initiation of a new Resource Coordination Tool (RCT). This tool is under development in the ICES Secretariat as part of a larger process to streamline work within the Secretariat. The tool will first be implemented on the advisory side and eventually expanded to include science.

During the discussion, the following points were raised:

- The tool should include a way for Member Countries to be informed on how costs will be covered with respect to the specific requests for advice, including the costs for participation at (and preparation for) specific meetings.
- Procedures should be established to guide actions when resource gaps are identified between what is needed and what is available.
- Implementation will be complex and time-consuming, but it is important to communicate that the resource problem is being addressed. Because of increasing demands for advice and finite available resources, ICES must be careful not to commit beyond its personnel and fiscal means.
- Delegates are responsible for nomination of experts to ICES working groups. Reviewing the status of available resources at home is a part of their national responsibility.
- The Secretariat is currently identifying experts to respond to requests received outside of the usual work plan (*i.e.*, special requests). The RCT may not be dynamic enough to match the needed resources to the work.
- A new tool does not create more resources.
- The system should be offered to all advice providers (*e.g.*, STECF) and document the advice directed to each of these providers.
- Work on recurrent advice occurs annually during a very compressed time interval, with many ICES working groups overlapping. Scheduling is an important issue that is NOT addressed by the tool. Travel costs account for a large proportion of the total advisory costs. ICES needs to review the specific work that is needed before resources can be committed, and re-evaluate how experts are used, even when they cannot physically attend meetings. Experts can participate in the process in many different ways.
- The RCT will enable the Secretariat to identify the needed resources.

The Council **concluded** that identifying resources for requests for advice that occur outside the regular work planning process is a complex problem. The RCT will not create new resources, but will provide an overview of what resources are available. The tool itself is not the complete solution, but represents a commitment by ICES to address the situation.

Action: Council agreed that the development of the ICES Resource Coordination Tool is a good way to start addressing many of the issues concerning resource allocation and work planning. The tool will allow a more informed discussion

with/among the providers of experts, users, and those requesting advice.

A demonstration of the RCT will be conducted in 2014, with full implementation in autumn 2014 corresponding to the beginning of the 2015 advisory work planning process.

Progress will be reviewed at the October 2014 Council meeting. During 2014, there will be continued close contact with EFARO (in its capacity as a resource provider) and through the participation of President Paul Connolly in the 2014 EFARO General Assembly where he will inform EFARO on the advances that ICES has made using the RCT.

9 Data and Information Services

The Head of Data and Information, Neil Holdsworth, provided an update to the 2013 status report on the activities and deliverables of the Data and Information Group and also the Data and Information Centre (**CM_2013_Del-09**).

The Data Plan has been drafted by the Data Centre and the Data and Information Operational Group (DIG); together these two entities constitute Data and Information Services (DIS). The main elements of the new Data Plan are:

- Gearing up for new/expanding areas of dataset collections from integrated ecosystem monitoring (*e.g.*, marine litter, anthropogenic noise, etc.) and maintaining user rights, security, and integrity of the data sources;
- Ensuring the use of international standards/interoperability to enable the use and application of ICES datasets, products, and services to an expanded international user base, and providing the tools and knowledge to facilitate this use.

Council feedback:

- The ICES Data portal is a valuable tool, but better communication and promotion is needed.
- DIS is working to make an established system for data validation.
- Council requested that DIS report back on specific meetings of EMOD-net having an ICES perspective, so that this information can be used by Member Countries.
- Because data are decentralized, some countries have national databases that can be accessed from home. This makes data updating complicated.

Action: The Head of Data and Information, Neil Holdsworth, will provide Council with reports from DIS on EMOD-net meetings. A list of data held at ICES will be made available to Council.

DIG will look into de-centralization of data and how to provide access to such data staying “at source”.

Council **concluded** that Data is a new and important pillar of the ICES organization. This is clearly reflected in the ICES Strategic Plan, with Goals 4 and 5 supported by the work of Data and Information Services.

10 Secretariat

The General Secretary, Anne Christine Brusendorff, provided a 2013 status report on the Secretariat's activities and deliverables, as described in **CM_2013_Del-10**.

The main points of the presentation and subsequent discussion were:

- The development of the Report and Advisory Content Management System (RACMS)
- Internationally recruited staff and an emerging issue related to their registration in Denmark and the CPR and CDR numbers (social security numbers).
- A new communications plan has been developed that will be included in the Secretariat Plan.
- The new ICES website is continually being updated and improved based on user feedback.
- The EMFF letter from Lowri Evans (Director-general, DG MARE) included in the Secretariat's status report does not recognize that any changes to survey programmes require input from the Commission. This matter should be discussed at the November 2013 ICES/DG MARE meeting.

Action: The Secretariat will develop a draft outline of an ICES position paper around common monitoring for MSFD, NATURA2000, and CFP related data. A draft document will be circulated for Council approval in early 2014.

11 Any other Business

11.1 ICES white, discussion, position, and policy papers

The meeting **endorsed** the document *"Definitions, components, and administrative structures of white, discussion, position, and policy papers"* (**CM_2013_Del-11.1**) that standardizes definitions and uses of these terms and documents.

11.2 Electronic decision making

The meeting **endorsed** the guidelines on electronic decision making via e-mail, taking into account Rule 6 of the Rules of Procedure. (**CM_2013_Del-11.2**)

11.3 ICES Observer Rules

A harmonized document compiling all observer issues into one set of rules was presented to Council. The only change was to Rule 12:

"Observers may not insist on alterations or edits being made to the meeting report. Observers may not make minority statements in the report."

The meeting **endorsed** the harmonized document on ICES observer rules. (**CM_2013_Del-11.3**)

How to handle observers in Expert Groups should be a part of the training programme course "How to Chair a Technical Meeting."

11.4 2014 Council meeting

The 2014 Council meeting will occur during 22–23 October.

In his closing remarks, ICES President Paul Connolly thanked the Delegates for their contributions to this year's Council meeting, including the adoption of the ICES Strategic Plan, which will guide ICES work over the next five years. Special thanks were also extended to the Irish Ambassador to Denmark, who hosted the Wednesday evening reception.

Participants List

Paul Connolly	ICES President
Kris Cooreman	Belgium
Serge Scory	Belgium
Alain Vezina	Canada
Fritz W. Köster	Denmark
Jakob Munkhøj Nielsen	Denmark
Eero Aro	Finland
Kai Myrberg	Finland
Maurice Héral	France
Pierre Petitgas	France
Cornelius Hammer	Germany
Gerd Kraus	Germany
Olafur S. Astthorsson	Iceland
Eugene Nixon	Ireland
Niall Ó Maoiléidigh	Ireland
Georgs Kornilovs	Latvia
Tomas Zolubas	Lithuania
Joost Backx	Netherlands
Tammo Bult	Netherlands
Peter Gullestad	Norway
Tore Nepstad	Norway
Tomasz Linkowski	Poland
Piotr Margonski	Poland
Manuela Azevedo	Portugal
Konstantin Drevetnyak	Russia
Yuri M. Lepesevich	Russia
Eduardo Balguerias	Spain
Carmela Porteiro	Spain
Anders Hermansson	Sweden
Carl O'Brien	UK
Bill Turrell	UK
Steve Murawski	US
Fredric Serchuk	US

Other Participants

Anne Christine Brusendorff	ICES General Secretary
Jean-Jacques Maguire	Advisory Committee Chair
Manuel Barange	Science Committee Chair
Adi Kellermann	Head of Science Programme
Poul Degnbol	Head of Advisory Programme
Neil Holdsworth	Head of Data and Information
Ellen Johannesen	Coordinating Secretary/Rapporteur
Yvonne Walther	Incoming SCICOM Chair
Eskild Kirkegaard	Incoming ACOM Chair