

# ICES MIACO REPORT 2016

ICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ICES CM 2016/ACOM:03

## Report of the Annual Meeting between ICES, Advisory Councils and other Observers (MIACO)

14–15 January 2016

ICES, Copenhagen, Denmark



**ICES**  
**CIEM**

International Council for  
the Exploration of the Sea

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](http://www.ices.dk)  
[info@ices.dk](mailto:info@ices.dk)

Recommended format for purposes of citation:

ICES. 2016. Report of the Annual Meeting between ICES, Advisory Councils and other Observers (MIACO), 14–15 January 2016, ICES, Copenhagen, Denmark. ICES CM 2016/ACOM:03. 21 pp.

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.

© 2016 International Council for the Exploration of the Sea

## Contents

---

<b>1</b>	<b>Meeting between Advisory Councils and ICES .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Opening of the MIACO meeting.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Adoption of the agenda .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>ICES advisory process 2015-review .....</b>	<b>3</b>
4.1	Atlantic stocks .....	3
4.2	Pelagic stocks.....	4
4.3	North Sea stocks.....	4
4.4	Baltic stocks .....	5
4.5	Plenary summing up by chair.....	5
<b>5</b>	<b>Landing obligation .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Proposal from NWWAC on a rapid reaction process.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Ecosystem overviews.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Fisheries overviews .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Advice on fishing opportunities.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Management plans as basis for ICES advice .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>ICES Advisory workplan 2016 .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>Any other business.....</b>	<b>10</b>
12.1	Acoustic surveys .....	10
<b>Annex 1:</b>	<b>Participants list.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Annex 2:</b>	<b>Reflections of Work and Collaboration between the Long Distance Advisory Council and ICES .....</b>	<b>16</b>

## 1 Meeting between Advisory Councils and ICES

---

Prior to the MIACO meeting, there was a two hour morning meeting between the Advisory Councils and ICES.

The Chair of the ICES Advisory Committee (ACOM), Eskild Kirkegaard, explained that this meeting was set up to follow up a request from the ACs at the MIACO meeting 2015. The need for this meeting (outside MIACO) should be discussed. AC participants were welcome to add additional item for the meeting.

The NNWAC would like to discuss at this meeting:

- a) the changes under the new CFP. The ACs have additional responsibilities, as they changed from an “advice giver” to “a statutory advice provider”;
- b) the landings obligation, more specifically derogations and flexibility. There is a need for a more scientific input on this area. The current ICES advisory work with annual EGs is not helpful to cope and address the changes and to come up with practical solutions.

The ACs all welcomed ICES participation in meetings to present the advice. The ACs would like that the ICES role is extended to other areas, such as helping ACs to draft their advice. There were a few cases in the past where national scientists were invited to help the ACs on scientific aspects. Some participants felt that it would be beneficial if those scientists attended the meeting on behalf of ICES. Other members considered that this was not the role of ICES and that ICES should not be involved in AC work. The ACs would like to have more formal relations with the experts.

The ACOM Chair explained that the interaction between ACs and experts should take place essentially at the benchmarks. ICES should not interfere in the ACs scientific work. The main interaction of ICES with the ACs is to present the advice, but also the feedback to the presenters (usually the ACOM leadership) of how the advice is perceived, is very useful. ICES is an independent non-management organization and, as such, should not interfere with the advisory work of the ACs.

The experience from the web conference between PelAC and WGWiDE in 2015, prior to the WGWiDE meeting showed that the meeting was not effective and not well prepared. There were different expectations from that meeting; the scientist were expecting to get input from ACs on current perception of the stock and the ACs were not prepared to provide that feedback. On the other hand, the PelAC were expecting scientist to provide information on stock status but it was not possible to provide as the work had not been conducted yet.

ICES is available to work together with the ACs to make this type of meetings more efficient as the input from the ACs is very important to ICES. The data collected by the industry could be useful but need adequate quality checking. The forum for the exchange of data and factual information is the benchmark process (i.e. the data evaluation meetings and the benchmarks workshops). The benchmark process aims to be a true process (i.e. a project). The starting point is the data evaluation meeting and up to now the involvement of ACs has been very poor. This should be the appropriate forum to be considered and to do the quality checking of data/ information from the industry (even anecdotal information).

The ACOM chair, concluded that the pre-meeting with EGs, as requested by the ACs, should not be established on a routine basis, in order to prevent having those meet-

ings with no reason. It was suggested that ACs contact the ICES secretariat and request a pre-meeting only when there is a reason (i.e. important information available). The ACs should propose agenda items for those meetings.

A table with which members from the leadership shadow each ACs was presented.

All participants agreed that it was a very useful meeting and would like to continue with the meeting, named as MIRIA. ICES explained that they will continue with the current setup with a meeting with all ICES observers (MIACO). However, if ACs send agenda items for a MIRIA meeting well in advance (e.g. around September), ICES will accommodate such meeting. The ICES secretariat will approach ACs for possible agenda items.

## **2 Opening of the MIACO meeting**

---

The Advisory Committee Chair, Eskild Kirkegaard, opened the meeting and welcomed participants to Copenhagen. Representatives from the North Sea, North Western Waters, Baltic Sea, Pelagic and Long Distance Advisory Councils, as well as from EU-DGMARE, and eight different NGOs and Fishermen's Associations, the ACOM Leadership and ICES secretariat were in attendance. See list of participants in Annex 1.

One participant was unfortunately unable to attend at the last minute and sent their apologies.

## **3 Adoption of the agenda**

---

The agenda was adopted with the item of Acoustic Surveys added to pt. 11 any other business. This was suggested by the Pelagic AC.

## **4 ICES advisory process 2015–review**

---

Four subgroups (Atlantic, Pelagic, North Sea and Baltic Sea) were established in order to be able to cover more points. These then reported back to Plenary:

### **4.1 Atlantic stocks**

The subgroup identified the following key future issues:

- Choke species and landings obligations;
- MSY  $B_{trigger}$  relationship  $B_{pa}$ ;
- Mismatch between ICES areas and EC stock units.

## 4.2 Pelagic stocks

- It would be good to have the chair of relevant ICES expert groups participating in AC meetings where the ICES advice is presented by one of the ACOM leadership.
- The Pelagic AC had requested assistance by ICES when developing the proposal for a management plan for western horse mackerel. However, ICES had to apologize. The Pelagic AC wishes that assistance from ICES would be included in the MOU between EU and ICES.
- MSY values in the advice often seems to differ from what ICES working groups proposed and it seems that ICES definition of MSY is unclear. MSY values.
- Blue whiting advice seems to be a contradiction, on one hand the special requests could not be handled because of significant uncertainties and on the other hand there was a precise TAC advice.
- ADGs time schedule should be used to plan for stakeholder participation in the relevant part of the meetings.
- The pre-meeting held between the Pelagic AC and WGWIDE did not work out as wanted for various reasons. It should be put on a better footing and more formalized. Maybe as a half day meeting at the start of the WGWIDE meeting.

## 4.3 North Sea stocks

- Wish to have the possibility of pre-meetings between observers and assessment Expert Groups prior to meetings.
- Need for update for management plan for North Sea cod.
- No major issues with single stock assessment, advice has improved over last few years, it has provided good information regarding quota uplift related to landing Obligation.
- Liked further work on some minor stocks e.g. assessment of sole in the Kattegat informed 2015 decision.
- Need for discussion on how to include stakeholders' statements in advice.
- Would like an explanation of the rationale behind the evaluation of management plans e.g. Skagerrak Northern Shrimp.
- Does ICES follow a management plan or can they make recommendations outside of existing plans?
- Would like increased transparency of assumptions made in working groups. E.g. Norway pout and sprat in the North Sea.
- Cod in the Kattegat, does it need advice or improved management?
- Saithe in the North Sea. It has been managed according to MSY for the longest period and TAC is managed down each year. Concerns regarding information provided into the assessment from non EU countries (Norway). How to account for changes in stock distribution patterns.
- Mixed fisheries, we are moving into new grounds in setting TACs compared with existing single stock system. How to provide assessments for mixed fisheries that align with the Landing Obligation requirements?

- Presentation of ICES advice to AC meetings.
  - The AC to highlight the key stocks to be presented.
  - AC members to receive presentation 2–3 days in advance of meeting in order to consider advice and prepare questions in advance of meeting.
  - Present the advice at the start of the meeting, gather questions and try to respond to these by the end of the day / meeting.
- Commission requests for ICES advice is not always exactly what was required or asked for. Consider how requests can be communicated / quality checked.

#### **4.4 Baltic stocks**

- The 2015 Baltic salmon advice was not easy to understand. Back in 2012 the formulated advice was much clearer.
- ICES reports and advice are used as valuable source of trustful information. However, when it comes to MSC and other sustainability certifications, the ICES reports do not provide insights into the critical elements considered when certifying a fishery/stock. Particularly, trends in protected species and ecosystem issues are lacking in stock assessment reports and advice.
- The EU Landing Obligation takes much of the discussion nowadays in the Baltic but there are other urgent matters that need attention. In the Baltic the major problem is the lack of good data on which to base the stock assessments and the advice. Especially cod data are known to include errors. There has also been an overestimation of advised catch for herring in the in the NE Baltic and an underestimation of sprat in the Baltic. Things are improving and a good example is the plaice in Kattegat and Skagerrak where the move from stock category 3 to stock category 1 implied an 80% increase in advised catch.
- It is important for stakeholders to be present in benchmarks from the start of the process.
- It is stressed that ICES needs to have a lead position in the discussions regarding fisheries closed areas in the future.
- Highlights that the advice should be clear and neutrally worded.
- The best available quality is expected and found in ICES products. MSC does not commission advice from ICES but trusts and refers to its advice.

#### **4.5 Plenary summing up by chair**

- Generally, all observers present at the meeting expressed satisfaction with the advisory process in 2015.
- MSY an issue area which is covered under a separate agenda point.
- ICES noted that the ACs wanted ICES support to developing MPs.
- Pre-meetings were discussed at the separate meeting with the ACs and agreed it be on an ad hoc basis and it should be warned by the AC to ICES as early as possible.
- Benchmarks: It is important that stakeholders are active involved in data evaluation workshops stakeholders. It is very difficult to include new information later in the benchmark process.

- Mismatch between management areas and stock areas. In the MOU is clearly stated that ICES shall provide advice by stock.
- ICES took note of the wish to be more transparent about the assumptions used by ICES when assessing stocks and giving advice, more information about uncertainties and also of certainties.
- ICES agrees, that it is important that ICES wording is kept neutral in the advice. The stakeholders were asked to let ICES know when they come across cases of non-neutral wording.
- BSAC mentioned that it would be good if ICES could comment on closed areas to avoid fruitless discussion by managers.
- Blue whiting: Chair elaborated on the reasons for the apparent dichotomy of the blue whiting advices and advice on the special requests from NEAFC on evaluation an MP in 2016. However, still some unease by the stakeholders.

## 5 Landing obligation

---

- a ) Experiences with the implementation of the landing obligation.
- b ) Data issues.
- c ) ICES advice.

Baltic Sea AC comments. The Landing Obligation applied to the Baltic in 2015. The statistics will not be correct, at least for cod, because of mesh size regulations (T90/Bacoma).

Observer comments. To which extent are fishermen following the discard ban is still unknown. The implementation of the Landing Obligation does not mean that fishermen will discard more than before. How is ICES going to address the new situation?

ICES comments. There is an issue between the current technical measures (T90/Bacoma) and the implementation of the landing obligation. Currently ICES is not trying to predict what will happen, but is waiting to see the behaviour of the fishery. Besides fisheries-dependent data, ICES will hold fisheries-independent data to be able to track potential changes in catchabilities of the different gears.

North Sea AC. Data issues are already a worry for the N Sea Advisory Council. Is ICES seeing any change already? For the industry it is better to have a gradual transition until a full implementation of the landing obligation is in place so there is time to adapt.

ICES comments. The EU landing obligation may impact the behaviour of the fleet and change fleet catchabilities but we can't make assumptions before having data. We are now in a transition period and the 2016 advice will assume there are no changes in catchability until we have data that prove that there have been changes.

North Sea AC. Choke species will be a problem. The industry is concerned about data collection and assuring that the quality of the data ensures proper advice for the different stocks also considering mixed fisheries.

ICES comments. A more accurate assessment of choke species for some fisheries is needed and ACOM is aware of this issue.



ACs. The EU Landing Obligation is seen as a problem. Can ICES suggest alternative management strategies to TACs advice?

ICES comments. Many of the category 5 and 6 stocks are bycatch species. Currently ICES is requested to give catch advice. But wouldn't it be more appropriate to ask the scientist how not to catch these species? For example using mitigation measures. Advice based on Risk assessments instead of MSY approach may be also a better option in these cases.

Comments from ACs and observers. ICES should take the lead and not wait until the managers make requests for alternative advice approaches.

## 6 Proposal from NWWAC on a rapid reaction process

---

The NWWAC proposed that a task force of scientists could be set up by ICES to assist the ACs when a need appears.

The Commission mentioned that it would be good to have more concrete ideas about what questions it would be aiming for resolving. STECF might have a role to play as well. Choke species issue could be such a concrete case, if it is used as a reason to close a fishery. Then a quick scientific analysis of alternative and equally effective measures might be appropriate.

ICES informed that it is prepared to cooperate if that is called for, when the process has been resolved between the ACs and the EC and also member institutes of ICES, which cooperation is needed for the making the relevant experts available.

## 7 Ecosystem overviews

---

Presentation "ICES Ecosystem overviews" was given by ICES, highlighting an overview by ecoregions of the main ecosystem components, as well as the main pressures and state (trends variability). A wiring diagram that links activity–pressure–state, was presented as a way of showing that multiple pressures may affect state.

Question: quality assurance procedures of the large amounts of data to produce outputs was questioned, given the foreseen important use of the products. Is quality assurance done on an *ad hoc* basis?

Answer: It was assured that ICES has done and will do their best to assure the quality data from several sources, by highlighting caveats and referencing sources. As usual in the ICES procedure, the final data outputs have gone through several rounds of workshops and review groups to be scrutinized. However a certain degree of "*ad hoc*" quality assurance will always be required when synthesising information from several different sources, spatial scales and accuracy.

Question: Are the ecosystem overview outputs at a scale that is useful for management?

Answer: In general yes, however it depended on the output and the management question being asked. ICES ecoregions are in line with EU's MSFD regions.

Question: Do ICES ecosystem overviews feed into the ICES fisheries overviews?

Answer: Yes. More in next agenda item on ICES fisheries overviews.

Question: The boundaries of ICES ecosystem overview ecoregions was questioned as being in some places unusual, in terms of when a region stops and starts (i.e. Celtic Sea).

Answer: All boundaries are partly arbitrary, as are the ecoregions. ICES ecoregions are aligned with MSFD regions. It was highlighted that any boundaries drawn in water are always going to be strange choices.

Question: It was questioned how the presented wiring diagram that links activity–pressure–state had been created?

Answer: The diagrams are a result of several iterative processes involving senior scientists in workshops and peer reviewing, and that the process was ongoing to move from subjective expert judgement towards objectivity and real data so as to increase their accuracy.

Question: How deals ICES with missing data from countries?

Answer: ICES does its best to get all countries / missing data submitted for regional assessments. However, in cases where there is missing data it is clearly stated in the outputs caveats.

Question: How are data for fishing effort assured?

Answer: ICES is continuously evaluating the Q/A of data that it receives, and may look at other options (i.e. establishing own database) if Q/A cannot be assured.

Question: The colouring used the wiring diagram that links activity–pressure–state was questioned? As well as the abrasion maps and their usefulness?

Answer: Colouring in informative diagrams will always have trade-offs, and thus be a topic of debate.

ICES will be working with further interpretation of fishing abrasion maps as part of an advice request from the EU DG ENV.

Question: How often will the overviews be updated and will sources be referenced?

Answer: Graphs and figures with time-series data will be updated annually. A general review of the overviews will be conducted every three to five years. References to sources are included.

## 8 Fisheries overviews

---

Presentation “ICES Fisheries overviews” was given by ICES, highlighting the aims of fisheries overviews to illustrate who is fishing, status of resource, effects of fishing, and management measures.

It was commented that the overviews present a lot of information, that is mainly of interest to media and that effort should not be diverted from the core business of ICES in producing advice.

It was highlighted that overviews do not require much extra effort, and that by reaching media it was a useful way of providing more digestible information.

It was suggested to include effects of the landings obligation and mapping of shock species.

It was suggested to include information on ports and what species these ports are specialized in. This was considered an important point from the perspective of, not only mapping costs, but also being able to map out benefits to society.

Question: It was questioned whether in some cases it would be possible to provide a chronological overview of changes to reference points, dating back before 2012?

Answer: In some outputs a temporal aspects is already included but it may not be too resource demanding to include overviews of historical changes.

Question: It was questioned whether it would be possible to show how the distribution of stocks has changed within specific regions?

Answer: This was viewed as a possibility, for example, to show changes in a decadal perspective. A request to ICES will be looking at aspects of changes in distribution of stocks in relation to fish behaviours and/or climate change.

Question: What is the overlap of fish species distribution in relation to the stocks as assessment units?

Answer: ICES will consider if overlap of fish species distribution is in relation to the stocks as assessment units can be included.

Question: Will there be links to existing management plans?

Answer: A list of management plans/strategies used in advice and management is included.

Question: Will past advice and how it has been picked up be shown in the fisheries overviews?

Answer: The plan is to include an overview of latest advice on fishing opportunities.

Question: It was questioned if shortcomings of the data used in the fisheries overviews had been described?

Answer: ICES is aware of these issues and is working toward obtaining detailed data that can be used to evaluate quality over overarching data. It was highlighted that having data and producing maps was not enough, and that the accompanying caveats that ICES produces are an important part of the output.

## **9 Advice on fishing opportunities**

---

Participants were generally happy with the most recent format of ICES advice. Specifically, the references are a useful section. Further, it was noted that stakeholders should embrace the opportunity to provide feedback. Should consider the implications that happen with the following text: "No stakeholder information."

## **10 Management plans as basis for ICES advice**

---

Document 9 contained an overview of the Management plans and management strategies that ICES is aware of. This document will be circulated for all competent authorities for comments. The feedback from the competent authorities are very useful because only a management plan and strategies that are endorsed by all competent authorities for a given stock agree with using that MP/strategy as basis for the advice.

The PelAC raised concerns about not including the MP for the herring in Division 7a South of 52°30'N and 7g,h,j,k as basis for the advice since the plan was been the basis for the TAC in the last years. ICES explain that this is a request by DG-MARE.

ICES agreed to follow up with DG MARE on this particular case.

## **11 ICES Advisory workplan 2016**

---

The Head of Advisory Support presented the workplan for 2016 and where to find the information on the ICES website and ICES SharePoint. The document presented is a snapshot of the current workplan. Changes may occur during the year and MIACO participants should use the “Advisory Process view” available in the MIACO SharePoint.

## **12 Any other business**

---

One agenda item was added to pt. 11 at the suggestion of the Pelagic AC:

### **12.1 Acoustic surveys**

Western horse mackerel surveys have been carried out over the years that should be relevant to the stock. What is the best way to add these data to the ICES mechanism? It was suggested that the PelAC contact the ICES secretariat on this particular issue.

## Annex 1: Participants list

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX	E-MAIL
Søren Anker Pedersen	Marine Ingredients Denmark H.C. Andersens Blvd. 37, 1.th. 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	+45 33145800 +45 26240056	sap@maring.org
Bertie Armstrong NWWAC	Scottish Fishermen's Federation 24 Rubislaw Terrace Aberdeen AB10 1XE UK	+44	b.armstrong@sff.co.uk
Anne Christine Brusendorff	ICES Secretariat H.C. Andersens Blvd. 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark		anne.christine@ices.dk
Ghislain Chouinard	ICES Secretariat H.C. Andersens Blvd. 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark		ghislain@ices.dk
Sally Clink BSAC	Baltic Sea Advisory Council H.C. Andersens Blvd. 37 1553 Copenhagen Denmark	+45 21677248 fax +45 33 93 50 09	sc@bsac.org
Lorna Duguid NSAC	NSAC Secretariat Cammach Business Centre Greenbank Road East Tullos Aberdeen AB12 3BN Scotland, UK	+44	lornad@nsrac.org
Minna Epps	Marine Stewardship Council Skeppsbron 30 111 30 Stockholm Sweden		minna.epps@msc.org
Carmen Fernandez	ICES Secretariat H.C. Andersens Blvd. 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark		carmen.fernandez@ices.dk
Evangelia Georgitsi	DGMare 200 rue de la Loi 1049 Brussels Belgium	+32	Evangelia.GEORGITSI@ec.europa.eu

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX	E-MAIL
Nils Höglund	Coalition Clean Baltic Östra Ågatan 53 753 22 Uppsala Sweden	+46 708 679 249	nils@ccb.se
Anne Mette Bæk Jespersen	Marine Ingredients Denmark & EUfishmeal H. C. Andersens Boulevard 37 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	T +45 50 47 77 49/+ 45 33 14 58 00	ambj@maring.org
Reine J. Johansson BSAC	Baltic Sea Advisory Council PO Box 5105 471 15 Dyrön Sweden	+46 70 812 4591	rj.j@pelagic.se
Jan Birger Jørgensen	Norwegian Fishermen's Ass. PO Box 1233 Sluppe Havnegt 9 oppgang C 5.etg i Pirsenteret 7462 Trondheim Norway	+47 930 44 346	jan.birger.jorgensen@fiskarlaget.no
Helle Gjeding Jørgensen	ICES Secretariat H.C. Andersens Blvd. 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	+45 33386753	hgj@ices.dk
Eskild Kirkegaard Chair	ICES Secretariat H.C. Andersens Blvd. 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark		eskild.kirkegaard@ices.dk
Irene Kingma PelAC	Pelagic Advisory Council Cammach Business Centre Greenbank Road East Tullos Aberdeen AB12 3BN Scotland, UK	+44 1224 665 341	kingma@elasmobranch.nl kingma.irene@gmail.com
Julien Lamothe SWWAC	French Fish Producers' Org. 11 rue Félix le Dantec 29000 Quimper France	+33 298101111	julien.lamothe@pecheursdebretagne.eu
Sebastian Linke Observer	University of Gothenburg Post Box 200 405 30 Göteborg Sweden	phone: +46 31 7864754 mobile: +46 735 736703	sebastian.linke@sts.gu.se

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX	E-MAIL
Juan Manuel Liria LDAC	Spanish Fishing Confederation-CEPESCA Calle de Velázquez 41 4 C 28001 Madrid Spain	+34	mliria@iies.es
Javier Lopez	Oceana Plaza España Leganitos 47 28013 Madrid Spain	+34	jlopez@oceana.org
Jan Ivar Maråk	Norwegian Fishermen's Ass. PO Box 1233 Sluppe Havnegt 9 oppgang C 5.etg i Pirsenteret 7462 Trondheim Norway	+47 7354850	jan-ivar@fiskebat.no
Cristina Morgado	ICES Secretariat H.C. Andersens Blvd. 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark		cristina.morgado@ices.dk
Alexandre Mousseigne SWWAC	SWWAC Secretariat AGLIA Quai aux vivres 17314 Rochefort France	+33 783 41 92 11	amousseigne@cc-sud.eu
Conor Nolan NWWAC	North Western Waters Advisory Council Secretariat Ireland	+353	Cnolan@bim.ie
Miguel Nuevo EFCA	European Fisheries Control Agency Edificio Odriozola Avenida García Barbón, 4 36201 Vigo Spain		miguel.nuevo@efca.europa.eu
Verena Ohms PelAC	Pelagic Advisory Council PO Box 72 Louis Braillelaan 80 2719 EK Zoetermeer Netherlands	+31 62 820 7317 fax +31 70 399 9426	c.ohms@pelagic-ac.org

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX	E-MAIL
Sean O'Donoghue PelAC	Killybegs Fishermen's Org. Bruach na Mara St Catherine's Road Killybegs Co. Donegal Ireland	+353 749 731089	kfo@kfo.ie
Martin Pastoors	Pelagic Freezer-Trawler Association PO Box 72 2280 AB Rijswijk Netherlands	+31 631901027	mpastoors@pelagicfish.eu
Jean-Marie Robert SWWAC	SWWAC Secretariat AGLIA Quai aux vivres 17314 Rochefort France	+33	jmrobert@cc-sud.eu
Alexandre Rodriguez LDAC	Long Distance Fleet AC Secretariat Calle del Doctor Fleming 7 2° izquierda 28036 Madrid Spain	+34 91 432 36 23 Cell +34 696 87 57 37	akexandre.rodriguez@ldac.eu
Mogens Schou BSAC	Baltic Sea 2020 PO Box 50005 104 05 Stockholm Sweden	+46	mogens.schou@outlook.com
Henrike Semmler NSAC	OCEANA Nyhaven 16, 4., tv. 1051 Copenhagen Denmark	Cell +45 31 65 58 63	hsemmler@oceana.org
Kenn Skau Fischer NSAC	Danish Fishermen's Association H.C. Andersens Blvd. 37 1553 Copenhagen Denmark	+45 3336 6028 Cell+45 5119 9537	ksf@dkfisk.dk
Claus Reedtz Sparrevohn	DPPO H.C. Andersens Blvd. 37.1. 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	Tlf: +45 29 12 45 49	crs@pelagisk.dk
Charlott Stenberg	Marine Stewardship Council Skeppsbron 30 111 30 Stockholm Sweden	+46 (0)76 777 75 12	charlott.stenberg@msc.org
Björn Stockhausen LDAC	Seas-at-Risk Rue d'Edimbourg 26 1050 Brussels Belgium	Tel.: +32 2893 0968 • Mobile: +32 470 604 509	bstockhausen@seas-at-risk.org



NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX	E-MAIL
Esben Sverdrup- Jensen	Danish Pelagic Producers Organisation H.C. Andersens Boulevard 37.1. 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	Tel +45 61 66 09 78	es@pelagisk.dk
Mark Tasker	ICES Secretariat H.C. Andersens Blvd. 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark		mark@ices.dk
Liane Veitch NWWAC	Client Earth The Hothouse 274 Richmond Road London E8 3QW UK	+44	lveitch@clientearth.org



## **Annex 2: Reflections of Work and Collaboration between the Long Distance Advisory Council and ICES**

---

Author: Alexandre Rodriguez (Executive Secretary)

Date: 15 January 2016

### *DISCLAIMER:*

*This is a personal report stating own reflections of the author for the meeting. It is not intended to provide an accurate reflection of the views of the LDAC delegates or members nor summarise the meeting outcomes but give an idea of LDAC areas of interest with regard to ICES. A full and official report of the meeting will be drafted by ICES together and the meeting papers and presentations are available on the dedicated SharePoint site.*

### **1. General overview of work in 2015 and aspirations for 2016**

One of the LDAC work priorities during 2015 was to strengthen work and collaboration with scientists to improve understanding of the state of the highly migratory stocks (tropical tuna and tuna like species such as swordfish), deep-sea species (including deep-sea sharks) and demersal stocks (cod, Greenland halibut, redfish, hake, etc.) outside EU waters.

In particular, the LDAC looks for enhancing the communication with ICES and scientific bodies of RFMOs such as NEAFC (ICES client), NAFO or ICCAT in terms of provision of advice regarding key commercial stocks for the EU long distance fleet. The LDAC already provides technical evidence-based advice to the European Commission in preparation for RFMO annual meetings in which it also participates as part of the EU delegation. However, the LDAC would like to participate more actively in the scientific process, in observer capacity, and discussions on MSE and review/set up of multiannual management plans.

### **2. ICES participation in AC meetings**

The LDAC appreciates the sustained level of openness and transparency of ICES towards clients and external users that has inspired a frank and open dialogue between scientists, policy makers and stakeholders. Dialogue between scientists and stakeholders on several ICES on AC meetings in presenting the advice and explaining the advisory process as well as sharing ongoing work on ecosystem, fisheries overviews helps to achieve a deeper understanding of ICES work methods and strategy for the forthcoming years.

The LDAC is thankful of the opportunity catered in the annual MoU between ICES and EC regarding availability of prominent ICES scientists to attend 1–2 AC meetings yearly to present relevant ICES annual advice on stocks.

Due to the fact that ICES deals with few stocks outside Community waters, there was no direct participation of ICES scientists at LDAC meetings in the past. However, this changed in 2015 and the Head of ICES ACOM kindly accepted the invitation to participate at LDAC WG2 meeting on 23 April 2015. This group deals with North Atlantic agreements and RFMOs (namely NAFO and NEAFC). Discussions were held on the input and role of ICES in relation to stock assessment and advice for the North East Atlantic stocks and interaction with the Scientific Council of NEAFC.

We hope this will continue in the future and that ICES representatives can provide a year update (at least once a year) at future WG2 meetings. The LDAC Secretariat will be in contact with ICES and issue the invitation in due advance.

Finally, the LDAC held an International Conference on the Challenges and Opportunities for Implementation of the External Dimension of the CFP. This was a highly successful event held in Las Palmas on 16–17 September 2015 with high attendance rate and wide media coverage. ICES was invited to participate in the Science Panel to discuss about ecosystem approach to fisheries management and scientific underpinning to setting VMEs but could not make it for agenda constraints.

### **3. Presentation of ICES Advice and training programmes**

The LDAC is supportive of the continuation of training courses on basics of stock assessment for Commission officials and fishing stakeholders. These courses have proven to be fairly popular and successful amongst AC members and also the Secretariat staff! Positive feedback in helping daily work to dealing with scientific reports and extracting critical information from them to feed production of draft advices.

### **4. LDAC participation in ICES meetings**

The LDAC is committed to be involved in benchmarking process and nominate representatives to attend benchmark and data compilation (now called evaluation) meetings focused on stocks that are relevant for us, for example some of the Arctic stocks (such as redfish, Greenland halibut, etc.)

We also hope to be more involved and participate in the ICES advisory process and progress with thinking on discards, multispecies approach, mixed fisheries, etc. The ICES WG on Maritime Systems (WGMARS) might be a good platform and act as a “think tank” on this. This forum allows interaction and in-depth discussions between scientists involved in assessments and stakeholders with the aim to achieve a sustainable exploitation and conservation of fishing resources from a biological, social and economic perspective.

### **5. Research needs and areas for collaboration ICES–LDAC**

#### **5.1. Deep-sea species**

The LDAC wishes to improve knowledge and data quality for NEAFC Deep-sea species subject to catch limits in the EU TAC and Quotas Regulation and also under Annex I.B of NEAFC Rec. on Fishing Opportunities (*see table in Annex I*). These stocks are data poor in most cases (categories 36) and even may have unknown status with no reference points available. The LDAC wishes that ICES fine-tunes its assessment methods and concentrates effort in defining where possible precautionary reference points and MSY ranges for these stocks as this will have an impact on implementation of landing obligation for these stocks from 1-1-2017 (art 15.1.d) as most of them have very little or zero quota and they are currently being discarded. This is very important to benefit from flexibilities and exemptions to landing obligation provided for in the CFP Regulation, particularly for inter-species flexibility laid out in art 15.8 of CFP Regulation (this supedita using 9% against available quota only for no quota stocks only if they are within “safe biological levels”).

The LDAC will follow with interest current work and progress by ICES in developing methodology and template for providing advice for Western Waters stocks and to provide qualitative advice for Categories 3 and 4 (data poor) for determination of

stocks status relative to MSY proxies. We will also follow the risk based assessment methods for Categories 5 and 6 as many deep-sea species are within these categories.

## **5.2. Tuna selectivity for reduction of juvenile catches**

One specific area of collaboration mentioned in MIACO 2015 is in relation to the increase in selectivity to reduce catches of immature tuna and other associated by-catches (e.g. FAD). As you know, this year is particularly important for Bigeye Tuna Stocks in the Atlantic within ICCAT RA but also for other parts of the world, such as YFT and BET in the Indian Ocean or Western Pacific. This topic remains very relevant in 2016.

The LDAC looks forward to a reply from ICES on the two above requests. If needed, this could be channelled by sending special requests for advice submitted via the European Commission in accordance with the MoU ICES-EC.

## **6. Implementation of landing obligation outside EU waters**

The LDAC is only on the preconception or reflection phase as the LO at present does not apply to demersal stocks outside EU waters. Although in 2017, the LO will only apply to species defining the fisheries and we do not foresee problems, we are concerned for the period 2018–2019 as will show complex scenarios re bycatches of no target species in ICES stock areas that are shared both within the EU and NEAFC RA. It is likely that some of them will become choke species and currently there is patchy information on discards. We think it will be very important in this situation to establish/ set up a dedicated Member State Regional Group to deal with the concerned stocks.

The European Commission has made it available to the LDAC in December 2015 the final reports that form the study on "Advice on the management of discards in EU fisheries beyond EU waters" – Ref. MARE Contracts No 3 (PHASE I) and No 6 (PHASE II)/2015. This study was commissioned to a consortium led by MRAG (UK) including scientific partners such as IEO & AZTI (Spain), IPMA (Portugal), Wageningen UR (The Netherlands) and IRD (France). These reports deal with questions of legislative and technical nature in relation to the implementation of landing obligation outside EU waters. The methodology used for the study is based on discard estimates drawn from scientific campaigns. Its aim is to provide an overview of the existing international legal obligations in relation to discards at the RFMOs (with specific focus on ICCAT and NAFO) as well as at the Fisheries Agreements with Third Countries.

The LDAC will endeavour to make a critical review of this Study during the first quarter of 2016 and go into analysis of the potential "choke species" by fisheries, and also intends to inform Commission and the MS Regional Group if constituted.

## ANNEX I. Catch limits for Deep-sea Stocks in International Waters, ICES Vib, XII, XIVb (Extracted from TAC and Quota Regulation 2015)

### Summary description

- Annex IB NEAFC FO includes 49 species: 12 are subjected to TACs by the EU; 17 are deep-water sharks (coinciding with the EU Deep-sea Regulation); and the remaining 20 not subjected to catch limits (quotas).
- NEAFC Rec. 7/13 forbids direct fishery and retention on board of deep-water sharks.
- Unknown Stocks of wide distribution, without reference points.
- Limited data: only exploitation and stock trends (Increasing/Stable/ Decreasing).
- Recommendation made on catches, bycatches and discards.
- Little quota or quota cero in several cases (“Choke Species”).
- Catch and discard data insufficient, although improving in the last years.

**Table of deep-water species subject to catch limits in EU waters and NEAFC**

SPECIES NAME	CODE	AREAS	EU	ESP
Black Scabbardfish	BSF	V–VII and XII	3357	191
Greater Silver Smelt	ARU	V–VII	4316	0
Alfonsino	ALF	III–XIV	296	67
Tusk	USK	VI–VII	937	46
	USK	I, II and XIV	21	3
Grenadiers	RNG/RHG	Vb, VII	4078	66
	RNG/RHG	VIII–XIV	3279	2354
Orange Roughy	ORY	VII	0	0
	ORY	I–V and VIII–XIV	0	0
Blue Ling	BLI	Vb, VI, VII	4746	157
	BLI	XII	558	533
Ling	LIN	VI–XIV	8464	2332
Red Seabream	SBR	VI–VIII	160	128
Greater Forkbeard	GFB	V–VII	2434	706
	GFB	X–XII	65	0
Deep-water Sharks (17 Species)		V–X	0	0
Deanias (Bird Beak Dogfish)		XII	0	0

### New quotas for RNG 2016

Xb,XIIc,XIIa1 & XIVb1: 717 t

Vib,VIIc1,VIIk1,Vb1a: 2000 t

XIIb: 796 t