

MIRIA 2018

ICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ICES CM 2018/ACOM:03

REF ACOM

Minutes of meeting between ICES and Recipients of ICES Advice (MIRIA)

16–17 January 2018

ICES HQ, Copenhagen, Denmark



ICES

International Council for
the Exploration of the Sea

CIEM

Conseil International pour
l'Exploration de la Mer

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

H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44–46

DK-1553 Copenhagen V

Denmark

Telephone (+45) 33 38 67 00

Telefax (+45) 33 93 42 15

www.ices.dk

info@ices.dk

Recommended format for purposes of citation:

ICES. 2018. Minutes of meeting between ICES and Recipients of ICES Advice (MIRIA), 16–17 January 2018, ICES HQ, Copenhagen, Denmark. ICES CM 2018/ACOM:3. 21 pp.

The material in this report may be reused for non-commercial purposes using the recommended citation. ICES may only grant usage rights of information, data, images, graphs, etc. of which it has ownership. For other third-party material cited in this report, you must contact the original copyright holder for permission. For citation of datasets or use of data to be included in other databases, please refer to the latest ICES data policy on the ICES website. All extracts must be acknowledged. For other reproduction requests please contact the General Secretary.

The document is a report of MIRIA under the auspices of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea and does not necessarily represent the views of the Council.

© 2018 International Council for the Exploration of the Sea

<https://doi.org/10.17895/ices.pub.8318>

Contents

1	Welcome and opening of the meeting	1
2	Adoption of the agenda	1
3	ICES Advisory Services in 2017 – review	1
4	ICES advisory process.....	2
4.1	Quality assurance of advice	2
4.2	Involvement with stakeholders	3
4.3	Formulation of requests for advice	3
5	ICES advisory frameworks	4
5.1	Advice on fishing opportunities.....	4
5.1.1	ICES MSY approach for category 1 and 2 stocks	4
5.1.2	ICES MSY approach for category 3 and 4 stocks	5
5.1.3	Frequency of assessments	5
5.1.4	Reopening of advice.....	6
5.2	Management plans	6
5.3	Frameworks for ecosystem advice	6
6	Advisory deliverables	7
6.1	Single stock advice.....	7
6.2	Fisheries and Ecosystem Overviews	8
7	ICES Advisory Work-plan 2018.....	8
8	Any other business	9
	Closing	9
	Annex 1 - List of participants	10
	Annex 2 - Draft agenda.....	14

1 Welcome and opening of the meeting

Participants were welcomed by the Chair Eskild Kirkegaard (Chair of ACOM), who explained that all clients with whom ICES has an MoU/Administrative Agreement as well as all ICES member countries are invited to attend the meeting. High priority is given to this meeting with the aim of exchanging views and addressing issues that have arisen during the last year.

Anne Christine Brusendorff, ICES General Secretary, also welcomed the participants and stressed the relevance of the meeting with an agenda developed around process, criteria and the products of the ICES Advisory Services to encourage some important discussions.

The meeting was attended by representatives from Denmark, EU, the Faroe Islands, France, HELCOM, Iceland, ICES, NEAFC, Norway, OSPAR and Sweden. Apologies were received from NASCO.

For list of participants see Annex 1.

2 Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted without further amendments (see Annex 2).

3 ICES Advisory Services in 2017 – review

An overview of the advisory process in 2017 was presented by the Chair. ICES provided in 2017 advice on fishing opportunities for 196 stocks and addressed 33 other requests for advice including 2 technical services. In addition to the Working Groups, preparing the science basis for the advice, the advisory process involved 12 benchmarking processes, 40 Advice Drafting Groups and 39 ACOM Web-conferences.

In general data was delivered within the deadlines in 2017 and no major failures were observed with the exception of VMS data and data on catches by zone (inside and outside EEZ's) where a couple of countries did not deliver or delivered incomplete data.

The scientific basis for the advice prepared by ICES Expert Groups were in general of high quality, addressing the issues of relevance for the advice.

The national participation in Advice Drafting Groups was in general satisfactory. However, it was for several groups difficult to ensure the participation of independent experts. For some of the small Advice Drafting Groups and Groups dealing with non-fisheries requests the participation experts were low.

In addition to the presentation of advice done by national scientists ICES presented the advice at 23 management related meetings in 2017.

The Chair noted that the number of special requests had increased in recent years. While ICES is very happy to see this increase it also constitutes a challenge in form of availability of resources and expertise to address all the requests.

The Clients and other Recipients of ICES advice expressed a high degree of satisfaction with ICES advisory work in 2017. The quality of the advice was in general considered to have been high although the corrections to the 2017 advice for mackerel and the 2018 advice for Norwegian spring spawning herring had questioned ICES

quality assurance of advisory products. These corrections were caused errors in survey data used in the assessment of the stocks. The errors, which had a significant effect on the assessments, were discovered after the advice had been published and the corrections were issued in the case of mackerel after the Coastal State had finalised their consultation and for the herring during the Coastal State meeting.

While acknowledging improvement in communication with ICES including ICES presentation of advice at meetings several Recipients mentioned communication as an area where there still is room for improvements. Several participants referred to difficulties in finding ICES advice, and in understanding the advice. The language in the advice was in some cases found, while scientifically accurate, difficult to read.

Conclusions

Clients and other Recipients of ICES advice acknowledged the hard work of ICES Expert Groups and Advisory Committee to produce the advice and were very satisfied with ICES advice in 2017.

While acknowledging an improved communication between ICES and Clients, ICES was encouraged to continue to improve communication including the accessibility and readability of the advice.

4 ICES advisory process

4.1 Quality assurance of advice

Errors in ICES advice were discussed at the 2017 MIRIA meeting. All Clients acknowledged that errors might appear and that they were satisfied with the current correction process where Clients and ICES Member Countries are informed immediately when errors of substance are discovered. Quality check of data was also discussed at the 2017 meeting and Clients expressed willingness to cooperate with ICES to ensure that ICES has access to all relevant data.

The Chair gave an overview of ICES advisory process and presented the initiatives taken within ICES to quality assure ICES advisory products.

The main issues discussed were:

- Data collection, processing and use in assessments.

The Chair explained the flow of data from collection at national level to use in ICES assessments. He underlined that although data collection and associated quality assurance are the responsibility of ICES Member Countries the final quality of the advice is the responsibility of ICES. It is therefore important that data is made available to ICES at a level of aggregation allowing ICES to estimate the variance and assess the quality. ICES databases are being developed to deal with data at detailed levels and support data check and quality assurance.

The Transparent Assessment Framework (TAF) was mentioned as one of the central ICES initiatives to ensure transparency and quality check of data and assessment methods.

MIRIA also discussed the balance in resources spend on data collection and on data processing and how to ensure that resources are available to use the data collected. ICES impression is that while resources to collect data in general seem adequate the resources to use the data are insufficient.

- Errors and corrections

The Clients expressed satisfaction with the transparent way ICES has been addressing errors in the advice. ICES was asked how errors were spotted and what could be done to discover them earlier. ICES explained that larger errors have been discovered in benchmark processes or at national institutes as part of internal data check.

NEAFC pointed out that where stock advice had changed after an allowable catch had been set in an annual process, this needed to be very clearly marked in the advice in future years. This would mean, in future years, readers of tables setting advice against allowable catch by year could understand the context of the decisions in those particular advice change years.

ICES aim is to ensure that the quality of data used in assessments are investigated at an early stage in the process to allow correction in time for the finalization and release of the advice.

It was mentioned that the stability build into harvest control rules in many management plans reduced the impact on the fishing opportunities following errors in ICES advice.

Conclusions

MIRIA acknowledged the initiatives taken by ICES to strengthen the quality assurance of ICES advice in all parts of the process from data collection to presentation of the advice and encouraged ICES to give quality assurance of advice high priority.

Recognising that limitation in availability of experts to ICES advisory work may constitute a risk to the quality of the advice ICES was encourage to consider how to attract new experts

4.2 Involvement with stakeholders

Stakeholders' involvement in ICES advisory process was discussed at the 2017 MIRIA meeting where Clients, while supportive of the goal of transparency and the added value of increased dialogue, expressed concerns about involvement of stakeholders.

The experiences with observer involvement in the advisory process in 2017 were positive and MIRIA was supportive to the current ICES rules for observers.

Conclusions

The experiences with observer involvement in the advisory process in 2017 were positive and MIRIA was supportive to the current ICES rules for observers.

4.3 Formulation of requests for advice

Recurrent advice requests are formulated in MoUs (NASCO, NEAFC, and Norway) and Administrative Agreement (EU). The MoUs with OSPAR and HELCOM do not contain recurrent requests and are made in order to provide special requests on an annual basis. For special requests an upfront dialogue to ensure a common ground

for understanding the request and what ICES may be able to deliver is needed. The experiences are that a constant dialogue with the requester and the ICES secretariat facilitate a streamlined and informed process.

OSPAR requested ongoing informal dialogue between the requester contact-point and the ICES contact-point during the production of the advice, facilitated by the OSPAR & ICES Secretariats. This would ensure the final advice met the needs of the requester and was fit for purpose.

Clients stated that they among themselves need to have a more streamlined process to get a common understanding and agreed content of the requests put forward to ICES.

Formal dialogue meeting between ICES and stakeholders may be a useful forum for strategic discussions on future needs for scientific advice and how ICES can meet these needs.

Conclusions

The discussions confirmed that dialogue is a necessity to get a common understanding of content and aim of a request.

Formal dialogue meetings may be a good way to discuss strategic developments of ICES advice between ICES and Stakeholders.

5 ICES advisory frameworks

5.1 Advice on fishing opportunities

5.1.1 ICES MSY approach for category 1 and 2 stocks

The Chair presented Document 5ai on the ICES MSY advice for category 1 and 2 stocks. ICES approach hasn't changed from last year with ICES providing MSY advice unless there are management plans in place for those stocks.

The main comment on this point was on how difficult it is to compare F_{MSY} between different RFMOs. It was suggested that the fisheries overviews could include more details on how the F_{MSY} has performed including the risks associated with it.

A presentation by an invited specialist during the NEAFC's PECMAS meeting, had criticised the lack of transparency in ICES advice on the factors taken into account in setting the precautionary/risk levels used by ICES. It was suggested different approaches should be taken by ICES to make the decisions about risk more apparent. However, at PECMAS, Contracting Parties had stated that they were already comfortable in their understanding of the precautionary elements within the advice.

A comment was made that the MSY concept is changing and evolving around the world and ICES is also working hard on that front. It was suggested that ICES should be more proactive informing about its MSY approach.

Conclusions

The Clients accept ICES MSY approach as basis for the advice for stocks for which no agreed management plan exists.

5.1.2 ICES MSY approach for category 3 and 4 stocks

ACOM Vice-Chair Ghislain Chouinard presented Doc 5aⁱⁱ on the proposed ICES approach to deliver MSY advice for category 3 and 4 stocks. It was questioned what exactly the change from PA to MSY advice would mean for the recipients. It was explained that while PA advice is sustainable, but does not ensure that managers are meeting the 'maximum' objective. The EU has indicated to ICES that in future they may only need MSY advice for target stocks in the multiannual plans. For non-target stocks EU will request advice on fishing opportunities based on the precautionary approach alone. Norway expressed concern that given the limited knowledge/information available for many stocks, there would be a significant challenge in trying to produce MSY advice for such stocks. They supported the work on determining which stocks could be moved to category 1 since such stocks were more likely to have the knowledge base to allow for a meaningful MSY based advice to be provided.

ICES has been internally discussing 'bycatch stocks' (clearly only caught as bycatch with no target fisheries). TAC may not be an efficient way of managing the exploitation rate on such stocks and it may be more appropriate to give advice on mitigation measures. ICES is planning work on a system to define stocks for which the TAC has no or very limited influence on the fishing activities.

Norway supported this ongoing work on which stocks require catch advice i.e. they acknowledge the need for focus on what the objectives for various stocks are. Norway had internally been having discussions on this, identifying stocks where they want full detailed advice, are happy to maintain current measures, or where assessment of stock status is needed but no advice on fishing opportunities required. Norway feels this is an important discussion, and would like to hear more about it at future MIRIA meetings

NEAFC noted that they have a number of stocks with 'minimise bycatch' advice where advice on mitigation measures may be more appropriate.

Conclusions

MIRIA supported ICES work on defining target and by-catch stocks and requested ICES to report on progress at the 2019 MIRIA meeting.

Concern was expressed that given the limited knowledge/information available for many stocks, there would be a significant challenge in trying to produce MSY advice for Category 3 and 4 stocks.

5.1.3 Frequency of assessments

The possibilities of reducing the frequency of assessments for category 1 and 2 stocks characterised either by having a zero catch advice or by being in good states with fishing at levels consistent with MSY and relative low catch of the recruiting year class was discussed at the 2017 MIRIA meeting. The conclusion of the discussion was that the issue should be further discussed at bilateral meetings between ICES and Clients.

The issue has as agreed been discussed at bilateral meetings with so far no clear conclusions been reached and the Clients confirmed that they were prepared to continue the discussion bilateral.

Conclusions

Discussion between ICES and Clients on the frequency of assessments to be continued.

5.1.4 Reopening of advice

When ICES moved most of the stock assessment work to the first half of the year to be able to provide the advice on fishing opportunities before July as requested by the Clients, ICES developed protocol for reopening of advice for a number of North Sea stocks when new information from fisheries independent surveys become available after the advice has been issued.

MIRIA discussed at the 2017 meeting a proposal from ICES for changing the timeline for release of advice for stocks currently addressed in the reopening process. It was agreed that ICES should await feedback from EU and Norway before implementing any changes to the advice process.

ICES would still prefer to avoid giving advice for the same stock twice in a year and invites the Clients to consider changing the current process. Experience show that every year advice for several stocks are updated in October.

The Clients acknowledged that the best solution would be for ICES to provide advice only once and that this advice should include updated information on recruitment. However, EC needs the June advice for internal preparation processes for negotiations, but was prepared for a bilateral discussion of the content/basis of the June advice.

Conclusion

With the aim for ICES to give advice for the stocks concerned only once a year, ICES and the EC will bilateral discuss the type of advice needed by June.

5.2 Management plans

The list of management plans known to the ICES Secretariat was presented by Head of Advisory Support. Clients were asked to comment on the list, especially on the management plans that were marked in the list. The list would be formally sent to all clients shortly after the MIRIA meeting with a deadline for commenting.

Conclusions

Clients will provide comments to ICES on the list of management plans.

5.3 Frameworks for ecosystem advice

ACOM has developed a comprehensive framework for assessing the state of fish stocks and their exploitation and for providing advice on fishing opportunities. ICES does not have a similar framework for providing ecosystem advice.

To ensure that ICES ecosystem advice is consistent with international agreed objectives and developed in a transparent process ICES is currently developing a set of frameworks for ecosystem advice. As part of this work ICES is planning a dialogue meeting for late 2018 or early 2019.

ACOM Vice-Chair Mark Tasker presented the progress in developing frameworks for ecosystem advice

The NEAFC representative mentioned that the framework for advice presented should not just be expressed in terms of the EU MSFD, i.e. reflecting the broader interests of all relevant states.

Norway representative asked if multispecies advice was considered in this framework. The ACOM vice-chair explained that the framework will apply more to non-fish advice.

Conclusions

ICES was requested to keep the Clients informed on progress in developing the frameworks for ecosystem advice.

6 Advisory deliverables

6.1 Single stock advice

The Chair presented the single stock advice template for 2018. The current format of the single stock advice sheets was introduced in 2015. The single stock advice sheet template was shown section by section with the main new feature being the inclusion of a column in the catch scenario table showing the change in the predicted catch compared to the previous advice.

Question was made to clarifying the surviving values in the catch scenarios table for the *Nephrops* single advice sheet. The Chair mentioned that the landing obligation and discard bans brought in some more complication to the single stock advice and explained that the values reflect the incorporation of survivability estimates for discards in assessments moving away from the assumption that all discards are dead.

EC proposed changing one of the section headings from "Stock advice" to "Management advice" underlining that it is important to separate what is the stock assessment and the management advice. In his reply the Chair pointed out that the term "management advice" could be interpreted as if ICES has other considerations rather than scientific. Moreover, there is a discrepancy between management areas and some stock assessment areas. ICES therefore presented an alternative for the section heading to "ICES advice on fishing opportunities".

EC explained that it found the reasons behind these large changes in advice from one year to the next not always clearly explained in the advice sheet and requested ICES to include a sentence under catch scenarios table.

EC underlined that they would like interactions between different species and mixed fisheries considerations to be included in the single stock advice sheet. However, Norway does not make use of the mixed fisheries considerations and suggested that these should be given separated from the single stock advice.

Finally, it was mentioned by NEAFC that the wording in the stock status table can be confusing as the same terms have different meanings in the two sides of the table (i.e. the same term could be interpreted as desirable or undesirable).

Conclusions

It was agreed that ICES would try to incorporate all the suggestions and ensure that the advice sheets serve the needs of all clients.

6.2 Fisheries and Ecosystem Overviews

ACOM Vice-Chair, Mark Tasker, gave a presentation on the status and future plans for publication of ICES Fisheries and Ecosystem Overviews. Fisheries Overviews have been published for the Baltic Sea and the Greater North Sea ecoregions and ICES aims at releasing overviews for the remaining ecoregions in 2018 and 2019.

ICES has published six Ecosystem Overviews (Barents Sea, Bay of Biscay and Iberian Coast, Celtic Seas, Greater North Sea, Icelandic waters, Norwegian Sea) and aims at also publishing Ecosystem Overviews for the Baltic Sea and the Azores

The resources allocated to the overviews by ICES Member Countries have, with a few exceptions, been relatively limited and the production of the overviews has taken substantially longer time than anticipated.

OSPAR asked why pollution and eutrophication were not considered pressures. ICES explained that both were considered but that only the 6 to 7 most important pressures were shown and for the overviews published so far the two pressures were not assessed to be among the most important ones on the ecoregion scale. Locally pollution and eutrophication may be important and ICES is discussing how to include the geographical variation within the ecoregions.

The Clients welcomed the overviews and encouraged ICES to develop overviews for the remaining ecoregions.

Conclusions

ICES was requested to keep the Clients informed on progress in developing the overviews.

7 ICES Advisory Work-plan 2018

The meeting was updated with information on the work-plan for ICES advice and where to find pieces of information.

It was explained that the timing of advice is settled through the MoUs and Administrative Agreements with Clients. Organizing the advisory work plan can be a puzzle but suggestions for changes are welcome. Clients were reminded that they are always welcome to contact the ICES Secretariat if unsure about something.

A benchmark overview that is under construction was presented, when final it will be linked to from the ICES web-site.

The meeting was also updated on the establishment of an ICES Economics Expert Group which is the outcome of a number of economists approaching the SCICOM chair last year requesting a forum for networking under the ICES umbrella. The meeting highlighted that it was important that the group would complement and not duplicate the work of similar groups under other organizations.

The ICES advisory work-plan can be viewed in different ways:

The ICES meeting calendar from: <http://ices.dk/news-and-events/meeting-calendar/Pages/default.aspx>

A calendar overview from:

<https://admin.ices.dk/ViewReports/Login.aspx?ReturnUrl=%2fviewreports%2freport%2fadvicelanning.aspx>

A process overview from:

http://xrm.ices.dk/Lists/Group_by_process/2018%20processes.aspx

A benchmark overview will when finalised be linked to from the ICES web-site.

8 Any other business

No other issues were brought up under this agenda item.

Closing

Before closing the meeting, the Chair asked for feedback on the value of the meeting, timing and format. All participants supported the format of the meeting, it was found very informative and useful to also discuss with other ICES Clients. It was suggested that the agenda should bring something new on the table every the year.

The timing of the meeting worked well for all participants but it was noted that this week of the year makes it difficult for NASCO to attend.

The Chair thanked all participants for attending the meeting and emphasized once again the importance of the meeting and the value of being able to discuss with all Clients at the same time.

Annex 1 – List of participants

Name	Address	Phone	Email
Eskild Kirkegaard, Chair	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	Phone +45 22448144	eskild.kirkegaard@ices.dk
Anne-Christine Brusendorff	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	Phone +45 33386701	anne.christine@ices.dk
Darius Campbell	NEAFC 44 Baker Street London W1U 7AL United Kingdom		darius@neafc.org
Ghislain Chouinard	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	Phone +1 506 851- 6206	ghislain@ices.dk
Lotte Worsøe Clausen	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	Phone +45 33386721	Lotte.worsoe.clausen@ices.dk
Mark Dickey-Collas	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	Phone +45 33386759	mark.dickey-collas@ices.dk

Camille Dross	Ministry of Ecology Sustainable Development Transportation and Housing Maritime Fisheries and Aquaculture Directorate Tour Voltair 1 Place des degrés 92055 La Défense France		mas.sdrh.dpma@developpement-durable.gouv.fr
Ida Omenaas Flaageng	Directory of Fisheries Department of Fishery Economics Sentrum 5804 Bergen Norway		ida.flaageng@fiskeridi.no
Jo Foden	OSPAR Commission Victoria House 37-63 Southampton Row London WC1B 4DA United Kingdom	Phone +44 (0) 20 7430 5200	Jo.Foden@ospar.org
Jóhann Guðmundsson	Ministry of Industries and Innovation Skulagata 4 Reykjavik IS-150 Iceland	Phone +354 545 9700	jo-hann.gudmundsson@anr.is
Jannica Haldin	HELCOM Katajanokanlaituri 6 B 00160 Helsinki Finland		jannica.haldin@helcom.fi
Neil Holdsworth	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	Phone +45 33386718	neil.holdsworth@ices.dk
Stefan Kalogirou	Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management Guldbergs Strandgata 15 40439 Göteborg Sweden		stefan.kalogirou@havochovatten.se

Zsuzsanna Koenig	European Commission Directorate for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries Rue Joseph II, 99 BE-1049 Brussels Belgium		Zsuzsanna.KOENIG@ec.europa.eu
Colm Lordan	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark		colm.lordan@ices.dk
Lisbet Nielsen	Ministry of Foreign Affairs Asiatisk Plads 2 DK-1448 Copenhagen K Denmark	+45 33921158	lisbni@um.dk
Michala Ovens	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	Phone +45 33386738	michala@ices.dk
Per Sandberg	Directory of Fisheries Department of Fishery Economics Sentrum 5804 Bergen Norway	Phone +47 55238050	per.sandberg@fiskeridir.no
Thorsteinn Sigurdsson	Marine Research Institute PO Box 1390 Skúlagata 4 Reykjavík 121 Iceland	Phone +354 575 2116	steini@hafro.is
Herluf Sigvaldsson	Ministry of Fisheries Yviri við Strond 15 Tórshavn FO-110 Faroe Islands		hs@fisk.fo
Mark Tasker	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark		mark@ices.dk

Ingibjörg Thomsen	Ministry of Fisheries Yviri við Strond 15 Tórshavn FO-110 Faroe Islands		Ingibjorg.Thomsen@fisk.fo
Ann Kristin Westberg	Department for Fisheries and Aquaculture Postboks 8090 Dep 0032 Oslo Norway	Phone +47 91695372	Annkristin.westberg@nfd.dep.no

Annex 2 – Draft agenda

Meeting between ICES and Recipients of ICES Advice (MIRIA)

16 January (1pm) –17 January (1 pm) 2018

Chair: Eskild Kirkegaard

Draft Agenda (annotated)

1) Welcome and opening of the meeting.

2) Adoption of agenda (Doc 02).

3) ICES Advisory services in 2017 – review (Doc 03).

An overview of the advice process and the advice provided in 2017 is given in document 03.

Meeting participants are invited to review the advisory process in 2017 and to discuss any issues and concerns arose since the 2017 MIRIA meeting.

4) ICES advisory process

a) Quality assurance of advice.

Errors in ICES advice were discussed at the 2017 MIRIA meeting. All Clients acknowledged that errors might appear and that they were satisfied with the current correction process where Clients and ICES Member Countries are informed immediately when errors of substance are discovered. Quality check of data was also discussed at the 2017 meeting and Clients expressed willingness to cooperate with ICES to ensure that ICES has access to all relevant data.

ICES will present initiatives taken within ICES to quality assure ICES advisory products. MIRIA is invited to comment on the initiatives taken by ICES and to discuss possible needs for further initiatives and how Clients and ICES can cooperate to quality assure ICES advice.

b) Involvement of stakeholders.

ICES advisory process involves five types of groups/meetings with different rules for stakeholder involvements:

- *Working group meetings. Meetings are open to experts nominated by ICES Member Countries (Delegates). Representatives of ICES clients can attend as observers,*
- *Workshops. Open meetings with no restrictions on who can participate,*
- *Review groups. Participation by invitation from ICES,*
- *Advice drafting groups. Open to members nominated by ACOM members and experts invited by ICES. Stakeholders can attend as observers,*
- *ACOM approval web-conferences. Open to ACOM members or alternates and experts invited by ICES. Stakeholders can attend as observers.*

Stakeholders' involvement in ICES advisory process was also discussed at the 2017 MIRIA meeting where Clients while supportive of the goal of transparency and the added value of increased dialogue, expressed concerns about involvement of stakeholders.

ICES Council has established a Working Group on ICES Code of Conduct to review and evaluate ICES procedures related to experts in the advisory process, code of conduct, and conflict of interest.

MIRIA is invited to express their views on stakeholders' involvement in ICES advisory process.

c) Formulation of requests for advice

To ensure that there is a common understanding of a request for advice there is in most cases an informal dialogue between ICES and the Clients before the request is formally agreed. For special requests (non-recurrent requests), the dialogue also includes agreement on the ICES costs of providing the requested advice.

ICES considers that this request dialogue in general works satisfactory but is interested in hearing the Clients opinions and Clients are invited to comment on the current process.

5) ICES advisory frameworks

a) Advice on fishing opportunities

i) ICES MSY approach for category 1 and 2 stocks.

ICES MSY approach was discussed at the October meeting of NEAFC's Permanent Committee on Management and Science (PECMAS) and critics were raised that the approach is not in accordance with international agreements and results in a conservative advice on fishing opportunities.

ICES will give a short presentation of the approach and invite MIRIA to discuss the approach including the risk criteria applied by ICES in the approach.

ii) ICES MSY approach for category 3 and 4 stocks.

ICES will present the initiatives to develop an MSY approach for category 3 and 4 stocks.

iii) Frequency of assessments.

The possibilities of reducing the frequency of assessments for category 1 and 2 stocks characterised either by having a zero catch advice or by being in good states with fishing at levels consistent with MSY and relative low catch of the recruiting year class was discussed at the 2017 MIRIA meeting. The conclusion of the discussion was that the issue should be further discussed at bilateral meetings between ICES and Clients.

The issue has as agreed been discussed at bilateral meetings with so far no clear conclusions been reached. ICES is still keen on moving forward on this with the aim of getting a better balance between workload and available resources

iv) Reopening of advice.

When ICES moved most of the stock assessment work to the first half of the year to be able to provide the advice on fishing opportunities before July as requested by the clients, ICES developed protocol for reopening of advice for a number of North Sea stocks when new information from fisheries independent surveys become available after the advice has been issued.

MIRIA discussed at the 2017 meeting a proposal from ICES for changing the timeline for release of advice for stocks currently addressed in the reopening process. It was agreed that ICES should await feedback for EU and Norway before implementing any changes to the advice process. EU indicated that for 2017 advice for the North Sea stocks would still be needed before July.

ICES would still prefer to avoid giving advice for the same stock twice in a year and invite the Clients to consider changing the current process.

b) Management plans.

A table of management plans known to ICES is presented and MIRIA is invited to provide their wishes regarding specific management plans being the basis for ICES advice in 2018. Advice recipients are also asked to provide information on any agreed management plans which may not be included in the list.

The management strategy evaluation forming the basis for ICES advice on a long-term management strategy for mackerel did for several reasons not use the results of the 2017 assessment as the starting point for the simulations. This made it difficult to use the advice to explore short-term consequences of different harvest rules. Norway, the EU and Faroe Islands commended on this in a response to ICES. ICES is planning a Workshop to review recent developments in Management Strategy Evaluation and address the short-term issue raised by Norway, EU and the Faroe Islands.

c) Frameworks for ecosystem advice

ACOM has developed a comprehensive framework for assessing the state of fish stocks and their exploitation and for providing advice on fishing opportunities. ICES does not have a similar framework for providing ecosystem advice.

To ensure that ICES ecosystem advice is consistent with international agreed objectives and developed in a transparent process ICES is currently developing a set of frameworks for ecosystem advice. As part of this work ICES is planning a dialogue meeting for late 2018 or early 2019.

ICES will give a short presentation of the work to develop the frameworks.

6) Advisory deliverables

a) Single stock advice

The current format of the single stock advice sheets was introduced in 2015. ICES has initiated a work to create an interactive web-based platform for presenting advice.

ICES will in 2018 include a column in the catch option table showing the change in the predicted catch compared to the advice for 2017.

MIRIA is invited to review the current format and advice on possible changes.

b) Fisheries and Ecosystem Overviews

Fisheries overviews have been published for the Baltic Sea and the Greater North Sea ecoregions. ACOM agreed in November 2016 to aim at releasing four overviews (Baltic Sea, Celtic Seas, North Sea and Norwegian and Barents Seas).

ICES has until September 2017 published six ecosystem overviews (Barents Sea, Bay of Biscay and Iberian Coast, Celtic Seas, Greater North Sea, Icelandic waters, Norwegian Sea).

The resources allocated to the overviews by ICES Member Countries have, with a few exceptions, been relatively limited and the production of the overviews has taken substantially longer time than anticipated. ICES is now aiming at publishing in 2018 fisheries overviews for the Norwegian & Barents Seas and the Celtic Seas and ecosystem overviews for the Baltic Sea and the Azores.

ICES is interested in feedbacks on the overviews and MIRIA is invited to review the overviews and comment on possible improvements.

7) ICES Advisory Work-plan 2018.

The meeting will be updated with information on the Work-plan for ICES advice and relevant science initiatives in 2018 including the plan an Economics Expert Group in ICES. Clients are invited to comment on the plan including the timing for release of recurrent advice.

8) Any other business.

The meeting will be invited to discuss any other issues as raised by the Advice Recipients.
