

ICES MIRIA REPORT 2013

ICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMMITTEE

ICES CM 2013/ACOM:02

Report of the Meeting between ICES and Recipients of ICES Advice (MIRIA)

15–16 January 2013

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. 2013. Report of the Meeting between ICES and Recipients of ICES Advice (MIR-IA), 15–16 January 2013, ICES HQ, Copenhagen Denmark. ICES CM 2013/ACOM:02. 22 pp. <https://doi.org/10.17895/ices.pub.8301>

For permission to reproduce material from this publication, please apply to the General Secretary.

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

© 2013 International Council for the Exploration of the Sea

Contents

1	Opening of the meeting.....	1
2	Adoption of the agenda	1
3	Tour de table of experience in 2012.....	1
3.1	OSPAR.....	1
3.2	NEAFC	1
3.3	NASCO.....	2
3.4	Russia	2
3.5	Norway	2
3.6	EU	3
3.7	Spain	3
3.8	Sweden.....	3
4	Requests for advice and workplan 2013	4
4.1	Request and workplan	4
4.2	Steps in the advisory process	4
4.3	Resourcing the advisory process	4
5	New developments of ICES advice in 2013	4
5.1	Ecosystem overviews and status report / ICES core indicators	4
5.2	Data limited stocks	5
5.3	Mixed / multispecies advice development.....	5
5.4	Reference points.....	6
5.5	Updating advice.....	6
6	Management plans to form basis for advice in 2013	6
7	External review and strategic planning.....	6
8	Data developments.....	7
8.1	Regional data bases	7
8.2	Data access issues	8
8.3	ICES estimated landings	8
9	Stakeholder contact	8
10	Dissemination documents	8
11	Research priorities and EG recommendations.....	8
12	Agenda item 12 - MSFD developments.....	9
13	MoUs in 2013 and cooperation with other international bodies.....	10

14	Financial aspects of ICES advice.....	10
15	AOB.....	10
	Annex 1 - List of participants	11
	Annex 2 – Expert Group recommendations to MIRIA	1

1 Opening of the meeting

The Chair, Jean-Jacques Maguire, opened the meeting and welcomed participants to the ICES Secretariat. A warm welcome was also made by the ICES General Secretary, Anne-Christine Brusendorff. In addition to feedback on 2012 experiences and information on 2013 requests the General Secretary was also looking forward to feedback on new ICES initiatives.

Participants introduced themselves and the organisations they belong to. The meeting was attended by 21 participants representing the European Commission, NASCO, NEAFC, OSPAR, Norway, Russia, Spain, Sweden, ICES and the ICES Secretariat. See Annex 1 for a list of participants.

2 Adoption of the agenda

The draft agenda was adopted with the addition of a presentation on the renewal of the EU Common Fishery Policy (CFP) and another one on the status of MSFD assessment reports.

3 Tour de table of experience in 2012

3.1 OSPAR

OSPAR is very happy with the relationship they have with ICES and the ICES Secretariat. The easy communication with the Advisory Programme to make sure requests are successful as well as good contact to the Data Programme on data issues was mentioned. It was highlighted that good contact between ICES Expert Groups or the ICES Secretariat and OSPAR on requests is important to clarify uncertainties on specific requests.

The process set up by ICES to respond to seabird related requests had led to some concern when at some point it was unclear if the relevant Expert Group would meet to collect and assess the needed material. At the end this had been solved by creating a Joint OSPAR/ICES Ad hoc expert group to respond only to the OSPAR request.

The need for ICES to respond as to whether or not it will be able to reply to statistical matters was also highlighted. If ICES cannot help OSPAR has to find another way. ICES confirmed that a response on this matter will be completed in the near future.

OSPAR asked ICES to engage as observer to OSPAR meetings and not only as advice providers. The OSPAR participation in the ICES WKBEMIA and WKECOVER was found very useful, it is important for ICES and OSPAR to share information on management/science. Both organizations have clear mandates, a lot of shared challenges and can support each other. ICES agreed that attending OSPAR meetings would be beneficial and the Secretariat will look into areas and meetings in which it would be useful for ICES to participate. ICES also suggested OSPAR to strengthen the participation in the ICES regional expert group meetings.

3.2 NEAFC

As NEAFC rely on the advice from ICES, the cooperation with ICES and the ICES Secretariat is of high importance and NEAFC welcomes the existing cooperation with ICES.

In 2012 NEAFC had to ask for clarification for some of the advice that ICES had delivered, the clarifications had been helpful but it was not clear what status such clarification letters have, especially because it was felt that the explanation went beyond the advice.

ICES should inform when new scientific evidence emerges without being requested. An example is that when advice of relevance also to NEAFC is provided to OSPAR, advice to NEAFC should be provided as well.

It was highlighted by the Chair that NEAFC, as all other recipients of advice, is welcome to attend the Advice Drafting Groups, this may be useful and might prevent such situations, where advice needs to be clarified after release.

NEAFC will contact ICES before the November to discuss which way is the best to present the ICES advice at the Annual NEAFC meeting. In November the advice is almost known to everyone and therefore a very detailed presentation on all stocks might not be needed. Some kind of presentation will be needed as well as it is important that ICES is present at the meeting to respond to specific questions.

3.3 NASCO

NASCO welcomes the ICES input to NASCO work. It works very well having the WGNAS chair presenting the advice to NASCO. The presentations have been clear and concise. The advice has been released according to the time table, but NASCO is asking to have advice released a little earlier but this is not possible given the dates of the WGNAS meeting (linked to when data become available).

It is possible that NASCO will not ask for stock advice in 2013 but other requests have been given to ICES, one issue will be what to do for areas where there are no fisheries but where the stock continues to decline.

The 2011 co-sponsored ICES/NASCO symposium was highlighted, 2 reports from the meeting are now available. NASCO was very happy that the symposia presentations had been published in a prestigious journal like the ICES Journal of Marine Science.

3.4 Russia

The Russian Federation noted that the Joint Russia Norway Commission (JRNC) agreed on a cod TAC higher than ICES advised and on a haddock TAC lower than ICES advised, but that both were in accordance with a precautionary approach and with a sustainable fishery. This may be interpreted as the JRNC not following the ICES advice, but that is not the case, because several options are presented in the body of the ICES advice. ICES clarified that providing only one piece of advice on the first page of the document from among the several in the option table, was requested by MIRIA (then called MICC) a few years ago. The ICES introduction (section 1.2) provides a description of the basis ICES uses to select the single option that forms the ICES advice.

Russia and Norway will need to agree if they want only one TAC advice on the first page of the advice, but ICES may try to find a way of saying on the first page, that there are other TACs consistent with the PA.

3.5 Norway

Norway echoed the kind words of others noting that ICES is an important organisation in the management of fisheries on transboundary fishery resources. Norway sees

a need to sort out the recurrent and non recurrent request for advice, some of which can be very time consuming. Some special requests are straightforward while the processes for others could be improved. From Norway's perspective, the JRNC is happy with the ICES advice, and they will attempt to reconcile the views within JRNC. Norway thanked the ICES Secretariat for its help in organising a successful seminar in May 2012. Norway also noted the big change in ICES advice for redfish in the Irminger sea and found it difficult to cope with such a large change from one year to the next. ICES has discussed this point, and agreed that, when there is confidence in the assessment, ICES would not introduce a smoother to reduce the magnitude of changes in assessment results.

3.6 EU

DGMARE noted the progress made on mixed fisheries, on multispecies, on the data limited stocks and on the regional databases. DGMARE funded travel of non-EFARO scientists to be involved in the preparation of ICES advice. ICES advice is analysed by the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee on Fisheries (STECF) of the EC and very few discrepancies were noted, less than 1%. More importantly, the quality of ICES advice was recognised by all stakeholders in TACs and quotas negotiations. Discussion of the MOU will include the timing of the advice and on the advice for Baltic Salmon. DGMARE asked the report of the Ad Hoc group on the distribution of mackerel be published as soon as possible. Special requests from the EU will be channelled through a single contact point, including requests from DGENV and DGR&I. Training provided by ICES at DGMARE was found very useful and the two trainers were thanked (Jan Jaap Poos and Ciaran Kelly). DGMARE thanked ICES and its network for their support.

For DGMARE, ICES will see what can be done for Baltic salmon, and the report of the Ad Hoc Group on mackerel migration should be available soon. ICES is looking forward to further cooperation with DGENV on the MSFD and continued cooperation with DGR&I.

DGENV appreciated the work ICES did on D3+ and thanked ICES for its support for an MSFD workshop last April in Paris. All participants thought ICES should continue its activities on the MSFD. DGENV would also like ICES to work on data collection. DGR&I noted that the ICES repository of FP project is set up, but would welcome more visibility. DGR&I will conduct an impact assessment and would appreciate feedback from ICES. The symposium on small pelagics (FACT) in Nantes was a success. DGR&I cooperates with Canada, Australia and New Zealand on the ecosystem approach to fisheries and ICES participated in a workshop in Vigo last June. There is likely to be another workshop, next July in Australia, and training on the implementation of the EAF in Europe.

3.7 Spain

Spain is taking action to resolve the data problems experienced in 2012. They suggested that reference points for hake, monkfish and megrim should be revised. They were also concerned that the ICES advice on vulnerable marine ecosystem could be interpreted as a criticism of some of their work on the subject.

3.8 Sweden

Sweden enjoys a sustained and productive dialogue with ICES, including with the Secretariat, and congratulated ICES for its exemplary openness. While the more quantitative advice on data limited stocks was welcomed, it was not universally re-

ceived positively. There are still problems with resourcing the advisory process and annual assessments may not be required for all stocks. Sweden would like to see more representatives of national fisheries ministries in the MIRIA meeting.

4 Requests for advice and workplan 2013

4.1 Request and workplan

The chair reminded participants that ICES will generally need 6 months to answer special request. Participants were asked to send special requests as soon as possible with reasonable deadlines. Special requests sent in June asking for a reply in September are totally unrealistic.

Participants were also informed that the sandeel advice will now be reviewed in the Herring Assessment Working Group instead of North Sea. Advice on Icelandic capelin will also be moved earlier, though in the future the timing of this advice might be better linked with the availability of survey data which becomes available simultaneously with publication of the advice and therefore cannot be included.

4.2 Steps in the advisory process

The ICES advisory process maintains the principle of peer review of all ICES advice but the process is streamlined so that a distinction is made between issues requiring a full academic review of data, methodology, analysis and conclusions and an audit type review which builds on a prior full review(s) of data and methodology and thus focuses only on the specific implementation (audit type review). For fish stocks assessments this approach will be implemented from 2013: The stock assessment working groups will be charged with performing peer reviews by asking members of the expert group to make audits of the assessments done by other expert group members. This applies for stocks for which a stock annex exists and for data limited stocks where reference is made to the general approach which is grounded in publications or simulations. For those data rich stocks where no benchmark has been done, the audit will consist of documenting that the data and methods are the same as in the previous assessment and explain/justify deviations.

4.3 Resourcing the advisory process

Concentrating the advice in the first half of the year is creating serious problems and the current system cannot be maintained. ICES understands that recipients of advice do not want to change the date at which they want to receive advice. ICES will seek ways to streamline the process and make it more efficient. Streamlining the process will be discussed further under agenda item 5.5.

5 New developments of ICES advice in 2013

5.1 Ecosystem overviews and status report / ICES core indicators

The item was introduced by Mark Dickey-Colas. The ecosystem overviews will be more closely linked to the advice, and will highlight factors or changes that would be expected to have an impact on the assessment. OSPAR found the work interesting and noted the need to communicate this well so that OSPAR and ICES work is not seen as overlapping by the production of two state of the seas reports.

5.2 Data limited stocks

ICES will establish target categories for stocks (for the definition of the categories, see <http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Expert%20Group%20Report/acom/2012/ADHOC/DLS%20Guidance%20Report%202012.pdf>). The intention is to set reasonable expectations of what could be done given the information and data available. It is not the intention to have age - based assessment for all stocks. Participants were invited to read Section 1.2 of the ICES Advice, the introduction to ICES advice to understand the basis and rationale for ICES advice. The introduction to ICES advice is a mix of basis for advice and technical information. It may be re-worked either this year or next year to remove the technical material, the technical material would go in a Methods document that would be based on the current methods document for data limited stocks.

Norway agreed that the objective should not be to have elaborate quantitative stock assessment for all stocks. In many cases, common sense and experimental fisheries management would help learn by experience.

DGMARE noted a joint statement by Council and EC on 21 stocks on data limited stocks with a proposal to maintain for 5 years the TAC decided in 2013.

5.3 Mixed / multispecies advice development

Henrik Sparholt introduced this topic drawing attention to the recent decrease in fishing mortality for several predator species which would be expected to have consequences for the prey species. Multispecies considerations were presented for the Baltic Sea in 2012, but stakeholders had little appetite to implement this approach because of implications of allocations of fishing opportunities. In 2013, multispecies advice is expected to be presented for the North Sea.

Sweden noted that member states may be more enthusiastic than stakeholders in implementing multispecies advice for the Baltic. A workshop organised jointly by ICES and the Nordic Council of Ministers will be held 27 February, 2013 to develop guidelines for the provision of multispecies advice.

Norway suggested that we will never have perfect data and that we should ask ourselves if we can do better by using multispecies knowledge rather than assuming that there are no multispecies interactions.

In some aspects, the present system assumes zero interactions, which we know is not true. Current fisheries management initiatives aim at rebuilding stocks to biomasses (calculated under single species assumptions) capable of producing MSY. This may actually not be possible and, collectively, we are going to have problems if we set targets that are not achievable. But in other aspects, interactions are taken into account, e.g. forecasts take into account current growth rates, maturity, and recruitment, updated M values from multispecies models (in the Baltic and in the North Sea). The spatial dimension of multispecies interactions also needs to be better taken into account.

Sweden is of the view that whether to take multispecies into account or not is no longer an issue - countries agreed to implement an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries which implies taking multispecies interactions into account as a pre-requisite to progressively implement an EAF.

DGMARE would like to receive the updated roadmap for the implementation of multispecies and mixed fisheries interactions, explaining what it will be possible to do where and when and what resources will be needed.

5.4 Reference points

Participants were informed of the terms of reference and dates of WKMSYREF. Participants agreed that ICES will identify a range of F consistent with MSY and that the phrase FMSY proxy will be used when applicable to avoid giving the impression that FMSY has been calculated when a proxy is used.

5.5 Updating advice

Participants were informed of the plans to update advice in 2013 and in the medium term.

In the longer term, the proposal is to update assessments and advice only if the perception of the stock has changed significantly. This implies technical work on a stock by stock basis to choose what stock indicators to use and agree on threshold % change for each stock to trigger a new assessment and possibly new advice.

In implementing the proposal from 2014 onwards, stock indicators will be examined every year and if the change is less than the agreed threshold % change, the advice will be presented as same advice as last year (SALY).

This approach to stock assessments and advice renders irrelevant the discussion on frequency of assessments and advice. Stock indicators are looked at every year and the assessments and advice are updated only if the indicators differ by a pre-agreed percentage. This may also help take into account the uncertainty in the assessments.

Participants agreed with the approach, and requested that the impact be evaluated by showing what this approach would have meant if it had been applied for a 5 year period, e.g. 2008 - 2012.

Implementing this approach may mean that fisheries management plan will need to be re-evaluate as they were based on new advice being provided every year.

6 Management plans to form basis for advice in 2013

As in previous years, ICES will send a list of management plans known to ICES and ask competent authorities to indicate which ones should be used as the basis for ICES advice. ICES also noted that several management plans evaluated in 2012 contained several harvest control rules that were judged to be consistent with the MSY and PA approaches. To be able to provide advice in 2013 according to agreed management plans, competent authorities should let ICES know which HCR they have selected.

7 External review and strategic planning

An overview of the recommendations of the external review of the ICES advisory services was presented, including an outline produced by the ICES Secretariat of activities undertaken and proposed to address the recommendations (document 7a).

The recommendations can be divided into operational issues; to be dealt with by ACOM and for which several were already work in progress, and strategic; to be discussed at the February meeting of Bureau.

Some of the strategic recommendations should be considered as part of the review of the ICES Strategic Plan, while others will have to be dealt with by Council separately. It is a timely and fortunate situation to have a review of the advisory services at the same time as the development of a new ICES Strategic Plan, and the associated SCICOM, ACOM, DATA, and Secretariat Plans.

Action Point: Comments were invited from management authorities and international organizations, to the report of the external review publicly available on ICES website.

Bill Turell presented the work in progress to renew the ICES Strategic Plan for the period 2014 to 2018. A renewal process has been initiated also for the associated plans: Science, Advice, Data and Secretariat. These plans have all covered different time periods, and are soon to expire or have already. To ensure that the overall ICES strategic plan guides the renewal of the four associated plans, synchronization between all the plans in terms of timing and substance will be necessary. This harmonization will also ensure full implementation of the ICES Strategic Plan.

The renewal of the SCICOM and ACOM plans, have been centered around a proposal to have integrated ecosystem assessments/advice as the core issue and link between the work of SCICOM/ACOM, supported by joint Expert Groups. To implement this idea the process and dynamics, and the human pressures and impacts of/on ecosystems needs to be better understood. Integrated ecosystem surveys will improve this knowledge and will feed into integrated ecosystem assessments/advice.

A Bureau Working Group on the renewal of the ICES Strategic Plan (ISP) is leading the renewal process with the following Terms of Reference:

ToR 1 - To prepare a renewed ICES Strategic Plan (2014–2018), in accord with the schedule agreed by the Council and consistent with both 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 renewed ICES Strategic Plan (2014 – 2018).

ToR 3 - To guide the development of the associated plans (2014 – 2018) for ICES Advisory Services and, Science.

The time schedule for the process is outlined in document 7b; the new ISP will be ready for discussion and adoption by Council in October 2013 and the associated plans (SCICOM, ACOM, Data, and Secretariat) ready for adoption by Bureau in February 2014.

Action point: Comments on and suggestions for priority areas to be included in the renewal process of the ICES Strategic Plan and associated plans were invited from national management authorities and international organizations.

8 Data developments

8.1 Regional data bases

Participants were provided with an update on the status of databases held at ICES. DGMARE noted that regional databases were linked to DC-MAP. They are ready to pay for things they are asking, but not for those they are not asking for, and they are not willing to pay for the whole thing when others are using the products.

8.2 Data access issues

The issue of access to detailed VMS data to answer requests e.g. on vulnerable marine ecosystems was raised, a proposal for a solution was available¹.

8.3 ICES estimated landings

ICES has used various approaches and methods to derive ICES estimated landings. Some are very elaborate and documented, others are less so. In the spring of 2012, DGMARE indicated that they were willing to press Spain for the data normally received by ICES IF ICES could demonstrate that these data were of superior quality to those submitted by Spain in 2012. ICES was not in a position to do that. ICES will therefore need to develop and adopt standardised and documented approaches to the estimation of ICES catches/landings. This may involve cooperation with control agencies.

9 Stakeholder contact

Participants were informed that the intention was to extend the MIRAC meeting, which until now had been restricted to stakeholders from the European Union, to all stakeholders. Participants will be contacted to ask for stakeholders in their jurisdiction that should be involved in MIRAC and other ICES workshops.

10 Dissemination documents

Last year for the first time popular versions of the ICES fish stock advice was produced. This publication is available from the ICES Web-site (LINK) associated with a disclaimer with a link to the actual advice text. ICES should extend the advice to the public, it has been requested by EU and it expected that other recipients will find it useful as well. Feedback on the new product is welcome.

An ACOM sub-group has been working on how to improve the popular advice. A new template for the 2013 advice has been developed and the plan is that Expert Groups will be involved in providing input to the product.

OSPAR is also trying to increase the contact to a wider audience and suggested that ICES and OSPAR should talk about how popular versions of the environmental advice could be delivered.

11 Research priorities and EG recommendations

Participants were introduced to the system where ICES records recommendations from Expert Groups.

Participants were asked to take a close look at the recommendations made by EGs (see Annex 2 for a list of EG recommendations to MIRIA).

Specific Expert Group recommendations related to study proposals were presented. DGR&I noted that, to reduce administration costs, EU will in the future support only bigger research projects and that it would be important that the DGR&I work pro-

¹ Subsequent developments revealed that further work is needed on this issue

gramme and the ICES plan are developed along the same lines, there is a mutual interest to cooperate.

12 Agenda item 12 – MSFD developments

Bill Turell, newly appointed chair of the Council Steering Group on the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (CSGMSFD) presented work carried out in the group and plans for future work.

The role of the group was to review the current work of ICES in support of the MSFD to both summarize relevant current work, as well as identify potential work required to meet the needs of Member States, stakeholders, and clients. While this was partly to be accomplished through a strengths and gaps analysis it became evident that outreach and communication would also be important. This was evident from the fact that stakeholders in the group were not aware of the integrated assessments that have been carried out by ICES Expert Groups.

Bill Turell highlighted the following CSGMSFD outputs:

- A document synthesizing the [ICES science and advisory services available](#) for the ongoing implementation of the MSFD;
- Several outreach activities, including a brochure “[ICES and the Marine Strategy Framework Directive – Providing the science needed for implementation](#)”, an article in [ICES Insight](#), the co-sponsoring of an MSFD symposium and, presentations on ICES related MSFD work;
- A document on integration of fisheries surveys and environmental monitoring;
- A scoping exercise on relevant ICES outputs and recommendations, tailored to the objectives of the MSFD, with the aim to identify issues that could be further addressed by Expert Groups (EG) and thereby effectively support with implementation of the MSFD;
- Participation as lead/ partner in various project proposals of which some have been successful,
- Suggestions for training courses, highlighting their relevance to the ecosystem approach and the MSFD.

It was stressed that while the group was established to focus on the MSFD, it does relate more widely to an application of an ecosystem-based approach and ICES is in a unique position to incorporate experience from outside Europe; with integrated assessments being one specific example. An important connection between the outputs of the Steering Group to the proposed central theme (Integrated Assessments; see Agenda item 7) for the review of the SCICOM and ACOM plans was noted.

While Council has accepted that the CSGMSFD will work on strategic areas identified in document CM 2012 Del-04.2 (document 12a), ICES is mainly interested in entering into a dialogue with competent national authorities and international organizations to identify their needs for the implementation of the MSFD, taking into account upcoming tasks and the outcome of the Article 12 assessment and requirements for the second implementation cycle.

13 MoUs in 2013 and cooperation with other international bodies

All MoUs are ongoing except the ICES-EU MoU for which details on the 2013 version are currently being discussed.

14 Financial aspects of ICES advice

Gregers Juel Jensen presented this information to the meeting noting that sharing cost issues should be discussed directly between those who are requesting advice.

15 AOB

- a) DGMARE made a presentation on the renewal of the CFP
- b) Presentation on the MSFD by DGENV

Annex 1 – List of participants

Name	Address	Phone/Fax	Email
Jean-Jacques Maguire Chair	1450 Godefroy Sillery Quebec G1T 2E4 Canada	Phone +1 418 554 6074 Phone +45 3126144 Fax +1 418 688 7924	jj.Maguire@ices.dk
Rolf Åkesson	Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries SE-103 33 Stockholm Sweden		rolf.akesson@rural.ministry.se
Stefan Asmundsson	The North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission 22 Berners Street W1T 3DY London United Kingdom		stefan@neafc.org
Anne-Christine Brusendorff	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	Tel: +45 33386701	anne.christine@ices.dk
Anna Cheilari	European Commission DG Environment - Unit D.2 Marine B-1049 Brussels Belgium	Tel : +322 2965348	Anna.CHEILARI@ec.europa.eu
Emily Corcoran	OSPAR Commission 48 Carey Street, New Court WC2A 2JQ London United Kingdom	Phone +44 (0) 2074305200	emily.corcoran@ospar.org
Poul Degnbol	ICES Secretariat H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 DK-1553 Copenhagen V Denmark Phone +45 33386763 Fax +45 3393 4215	Phone +45 33386763 Fax +45 33934215	poul.degnbol@ices.dk
Gilles Doignon	European Commission Directorate for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries rue Joseph II, 79 B-1049 Brussels Belgium		Gilles.DOIGNON@ec.europa.eu

Konstantin Drevetnyak	Federal Agency for Fisheries of the Russian Federation 12 Rozhdestvensky Boulevard RU-107996 Moscow Russian Federation	Phone +7 8152 472 231 Fax +7 8152 473 331	drevetnyak@bbtu.ru
Carmen Fernandez	ICES Secretariat H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 DK-1553 Copenhagen V Denmark		Carmen.fernandez@ices.dk
Enrique De Cardenas Gonzalez	Secretariat General del Mar Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y Medio Rural y Marino Velázquez, 144 28006 Madrid Spain		edecarde@magrama.es
Peter Hutchinson	North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization 11 Rutland Square EH1 2AS Edinburgh United Kingdom		hq@nasco.int
Sverre Johansen	The Norwegian Ministry of Fisheries and Coastal Affairs P.O. Box 8118 0032 Oslo Norway	Phone +47 22 24 64 47	sverre.johansen@fkd.dep.no
Yuri M. Lepesevich	Knipovich Polar Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography (PINRO) 6 Knipovitch Street 183038 Murmansk Russian Federation	Phone +7 8152 473 282 Fax +7 8152 473 331	lepesev@pinro.ru
Philippe Moguedet	European Commission Directorate General for Research SDME 7/15 Square de Meeus B-1049 Brussels Belgium	Phone +32 2 298 68 17 Fax +32 2 295 78 62	philippe.moguedet@ec.europa.eu
Michala Ovens	ICES Secretariat H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 DK-1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	Phone +45 33386738 Fax +45 33934215	michala@ices.dk

Per Sandberg	Directorate of Fisheries Department of Fishery Economics Sentrum P.O. Box 1 5804 Bergen Norway	Phone +47 55238050	per.sandberg@fiskeridir.no
John Simmonds	Netherby West End Kirkbymoorside YO62 6AD North Yorkshire United Kingdom	Phone +44 1751 430695	simmonds@ices.dk
Mark Tasker	Joint Nature Conservation Committee Inverdee House Baxter Street AB11 9QA Aberdeen United Kingdom	Phone + 44 1 224 266551 Fax + 44 1 224 896170	mark@ices.dk
Bill Turrell	Marine Scotland Science Marine Laboratory P.O. Box 101 AB11 9DB Aberdeen United Kingdom	Phone +44 1224 876544 Fax +44 1224 295511	bill.turrell@scotland.gsi.gov.uk
Johan Williams	Ministry of Fisheries DEP P.O. Box 8 NO-0032 Oslo Norway		johan.williams@fkd.dep.no

Annex 2 – Expert Group recommendations to MIRIA

ID	Year	EG	Recommendation	Recipient
2	2012	HAWG	The North Sea Herring Short term forecast has the potential to perform stochastic forecasts. It is yet unclear however if the customers would benefit from estimates including 95% prediction interval. It is recommended to all HAWG members and the ICES secretariat to investigate the wish of stochastic forecasts with their customers, managers and fishers.	MIRIA
5	2012	HAWG	The timing of benchmarks of stocks and the revision/creation of LTMP for those stocks must be coordinated to avoid situations where a benchmarked assessment with potentially new perceptions of the stock is used to give advice according to a LTMP which was preconditioned on the previous assessment and perception of the stock	ACOM;ICES Secretariat;MIRIA
6	2012	HAWG	HAWG recommends ACOM to discuss moving the NSAS and WBSS back to the ADGNS as the link with the North Sea eco-system has been strengthened after the benchmark in 2012 of NSAS implementing a natural mortality based on the multi-species outputs from the North Sea.	ACOM;MIRIA
38	2012	WGBAST	The WG notes that internationally coordinated landing inspections are necessary to minimise the substantial mis- and unreporting of catches in the longline fishery.	EU Commission
90	2012	WGDEEP	WGDEEP reiterates previous recommendations that funds be made available by countries and funding agencies for fisheries independent surveys in deep water, particularly as there are now additional requirements for ecosystem monitoring in EU waters under the Marine Strategy Framework Directive.	ICES Clients;ICES Member Countries (through the delegates);EU Commission

ID	Year	EG	Recommendation	Recipient
94	2012	WGDEEP	WGDEEP recommends that all data collected by on-board observers in EU and international waters under the EU deep-water licensing regulations and under the regulations applying to the blue ling protection areas to the west of Scotland be made available to WGDEEP and WGDEC on a regular basis. These data, from 2009 onwards, should include information on the maturity composition of blue ling catches. Data should be stored and made available to ICES in the same way as data collected under the DCF, i.e. COST format.	ICES Data Centre;MIRIA;EU Commission
104	2012	WGBEAM	WGBEAM recommends that as the Adriatic survey has met the full set of criteria to be coordinated by our group, it be included in the list of coordinated surveys.	ACOM;MIRIA;SSGESST
154	2012	WGMME	WGMME strongly supports the proposal for a cetacean absolute abundance survey in all European Atlantic waters in 2015 and recommends that it is supported by all range states and by ICES, ASCOBANS and the European Commission. Continuation of these surveys is essential for accurate population estimates, essential for reporting requirements of both the Habitats Directive and the Marine Strategy Framework Directive.	EU Commission;ICES Secretariat;National Administrations;ASCOBANS

ID	Year	EG	Recommendation	Recipient
378	2012	WGWIDE	<p>The WG members would like to highlight that the DCF data table categories provided to describe the data supplied are ambiguous and not appropriate for all situations. For example, it is still unclear to the stock coordinators which national catches should be accompanied by sample data and which should be considered too small to be sampled. The stock coordinators of WGWIDE aim to be as consistent as possible and used a comment field on the report to explain why a particular category was selected and to provide additional information. The working group thus urges any potential users of these tables to consider any comments carefully.</p> <p>The WG is of the opinion that the data tables are only of minor use for the actual evaluation of data quality and recommends that the lay-out of the data transmission tables is revised in order to assist stock coordinators in accurately reporting data availability and quality. A format restricted to annual failures in data provision (i.e. data that was required by the WG to conduct the assessment but was ultimately not available) may be more appropriate and easier to complete.</p>	National Data Submitters;PGCCDBS;ICES Secretariat; MIRIA
382	2012	WGWIDE	<p>NEA mackerel: WGWIDE recommend that the Norwegian initiated radio-frequency identification (RFID) tagging project on NEA mackerel should include all parties involved in NEA mackerel assessment work. It is important that as many parties as possible participate on tagging and screening of NEA mackerel catches. The new RFID tagging project is an automatic and cost-effective system, with opportunities to screen the bulk part of the catches. The tag-recapture data from the RFID tagging system can be used to improve the estimation of: spawning stock biomass (SSB), natural mortality (M) and better reveal distribution and migration patterns of NEA mackerel.</p>	MIRIA

ID	Year	EG	Recommendation	Recipient
405	2012	WGEEL	Countries should put in place a system that can determine the quantity of glass eel which are classified as destined for aquaculture but are in fact subsequently stocked.	EU Commission;ICES Member Countries (through the delegates);CITES;ACOM