

ICES ConC Report, September 2008

ICES Consultative Committee

ICES CM 2008/CONC:04

REPORT OF CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE (CONC)

20, 28 AND 29 SEPTEMBER 2008

HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA, CANADA



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. 2008. Report of the Consultative Committee, 20, 28-28 September 2008, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada. CM 2008/CONC:04. 58 pp. <https://doi.org/10.17895/ices.pub.8722>

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.

© 2008 International Council for the Exploration of the Sea

Contents

Contents	i
1 Opening and practical arrangements	3
2 Adoption of agenda and timetable	3
3 Minutes of Consultative May meeting	3
4 General arrangements for Annual Science Conference 2008	4
4.1 Draft resolutions	4
4.2 Elections of new Committee Chairs	4
4.3 Requests to Science and Advisory Committees:	4
4.3.1 Theme Sessions in 2009	4
4.3.2 Key note speaker 2009	4
4.4 Preparation of Committee Reports	5
4.5 ASC Award Selection Committee	5
4.6 Other arrangements	5
5 ICES Strategic Plan	5
6 Reform of Science Structure	7
7 Training in ICES	10
8 Websites for Science Committees	11
9 Lessons learned from 2008 ASC	11
10 Development of programme for the 2009 ASC (Berlin, Germany)	12
10.1 Funding of young scientists and young fishermen	12
10.2 Meeting arrangements	13
10.3 Review of proposed Theme Sessions	14
10.4 Invited lectures and other special events	15
11 Development of programme for the 2010 ASC (Nantes, France)	15
11.1 Meeting arrangements	15
11.2 Review of proposed Theme Sessions	16
11.3 Invited lectures and other special events	16
12 2008 Draft Resolutions	16
13 Review the status of ICES Symposia	17
14 Progress reports from Publications, Science Committees and ACOM	18
15 Update from Awards Committee	32
16 Update from Working Group on Data and Information Management (WGDIM)	33

17	PUB proposal for update of guidelines for producing highlights (EGs and Theme Sessions).....	34
18	Review of ICES activities	35
18.1	Aberdeen Plus Partnership.....	35
18.2	Report from SGCC (Luis Valdes)	36
1983	Climate conference in Copenhagen.....	36
19	SciCom ToRs and date for mid-term meeting 2009.....	36
20	Any other business.....	36
20.1	Coding of ToRs	36
20.2	Proposal from ESSAS for ICES involvement	36
20.3	Funding of academics under the new science structure	37
21	Closing.....	38
	Annex 1: List of Participants.....	39
	Annex 2: ConC Draft Agenda and Timetable	41
	Annex 3: Draft Training in ICES: action plan 2009-2010.....	43
	Annex 4: Theme Sessions 2009.....	45
	Annex 5: Draft List of ICES SciCom Expert Groups dissolved, established, changed committee or renamed by virtue of the 96th Statutory Meeting.....	47
	Annex 6: Update from Awards Committee	51
	Annex 7: Proposed Terms of Reference for SciCom	53
	Annex 8: Artificial Markets for Quantitative Prediction in Ecology	54

1 Opening and practical arrangements

The Consultative Committee Saturday met 20 September and Sunday–Monday 28–29 September. Apologies for absence were received from the Chair of Publications Committee, Piere Pepin, Canada (20 and 28–29 September), and from the Chair of Consultative Committee, Harald Loeng, Norway (20 September). The HoS acted as interim Chair during the first session of the meeting and welcomed the Consultative Committee participants (see **Annex 1**). Two observers were introduced, Wojciech Wawrzynski, Professional Secretary for Scientific Cooperation in the ICES Secretariat, and Vasiliy Sokolov, the new Russian Delegate. A tour de table was conducted. On behalf of the Chair of Consultative Committee, thanks were extended to the local hosts and to the Science Programme Departmental Secretary, Vivian Piil, for their excellent meeting preparations.

In light of proposed recommendations on the Reform of the ICES science delivery process, this would assumedly be the last meeting of the Consultative Committee in its presents form.

2 Adoption of agenda and timetable

The agenda and time schedule for the meeting (see **Annex 2**) were introduced and adopted with no comments.

3 Minutes of Consultative May meeting

In response to the ConC Midterm Report, the Bureau made the following comments:

- Following-up on a request made by the President to have an extraordinary presentation at the ASC in Halifax on David H. Cushing who had passed away earlier this year. In the context of the ICES Recognition Programme, the general question was raised whether post mortem awards could be made. Bureau agreed that this question should be forwarded to the Awards Committee, scheduled to meet during this conference.
- 2009 ASC. Bureau proposed that the Secretariat should contact the German Delegates with a view to receiving theme session proposals with specific German interest.
- ICES participation in the Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen in March 2009 with two timeslots (covering input from the ASC 2008 and Gijon Symposium) was adopted by the Bureau and was thought to be an excellent opportunity to raise our profile in this area.
- Bureau accepted the foreseen procedure to set up a specialised ICES programme for training to be funded by SIF.
- Websites for SciComs. Bureau took note of this item and stated that this should come under the responsibility of the General Secretary.
- Bureau commented and endorsed the recommendations of the Bureau WG on the ICES Science Plan.

4 General arrangements for Annual Science Conference 2008

4.1 Draft resolutions

The latest incoming Committee Chairs were informed of the procedure for updating draft resolutions and were encouraged to make use of the ConC SharePoint site, and very importantly that Saturday 27 September will be the day for Secretariat and Committee Chairs to finalize the draft resolutions. Coordination between ACOM and SciComs would be made on a continuous basis.

4.2 Elections of new Committee Chairs

Further to the President's letter to the ConC Chair (ConC Doc 6), all current members are invited to serve for another year on the new Science Committee and consequently there would be no elections for new Science Committee Chairs this year. Following Council approval of the new setup, a process will be established to select up to five members in addition to the national members to ensure sufficient scientific expert knowledge on the SciCom. There is of course the option that current committee Chairs may become the nationally appointed members of the new SCICOM.

4.3 Requests to Science and Advisory Committees:

4.3.1 Theme Sessions in 2009

The Interim Chair reiterated the need to solicit further proposals. In line with last year's procedure for selecting a final theme session package, i.e. 18 theme sessions, a subgroup, based on consideration of geographical coverage, consisting of T. Noji (Chair of MHC), L. Valdes (Chair of OCC) and Y. Walther (Chair of BCC) were asked to make the first selection of theme sessions for final review by the committee.

4.3.2 Key note speaker 2009

The choice of speakers should be closely related to the topics of theme sessions selected for the ASC 2009. The following proposals for keynote speakers and potential topics were brought up and this item would be returned to during the last session of ConC.

- Thomas Lang. WGPBI/MHC had pointed out that Thomas has played a key role at looking at the effects of contaminants, parasites and diseases and has also played a key role in ICES.
- Pedro Martinez Arbizu of the German Center for Marine Biodiversity – Senckenberg Research Institute, leading the deep sea component of CoML. He would be a very good candidate, proposed by the First Vice-President.
- Keith Alverson, IOC, recommended by SGGOOS/OCC. Update of the oceanic GOOS, including tsunamis.
- High profile disciplines in Germany currently include polar research, tropical marine ecology and climate sciences. We should avoid overlapping though with this year's keynote by V. Smetacek.
- Jens Meincke, who has retired, was also found to be a good candidate to speak on oceanography issues.

Committee chairs were asked to solicit more proposals and ideas for 2009 keynote speakers.

4.4 Preparation of Committee Reports

Committee Chairs were reminded that the committee reports will be published on the ASC CD-ROM and on the ICES website. Chairs were encouraged to add graphs, and to make the reports concise and meaningful with a maximum of 5-6 pages. In addition to the committee report Chairs were asked to prepare a brief report of committee highlights of max. 15 minutes for the 29 and 30 September meeting.

4.5 ASC Award Selection Committee

All Science Committees were asked to each appoint one representative to join the ASC Award Selection Committee and inform representatives to meet at the conference registration desk on Monday at 15:00. Normally the selection committee will meet on a daily basis to discuss the best contributions. ACOM is also eligible to have a member on this committee. Chair of MCC, Ian Bricknell, was asked to lead/coordinate the work of the Award Selection Committee

4.6 Other arrangements

Travel support for young scientists. 10 young scientists were granted travel funds. Another three received funding from the Canadian Research Board.

Travel support for young Fishermen. Two young fishermen signed up for the programme (one has declined). Last year this was very successful. Given the low participation, it was suggested to merge activities with the young scientists. A mentorship for young scientists for suggested and some committee Chairs volunteered for this. Giving them a special welcome was thought to be a good idea.

7th Framework EC meeting. The seminar was requested by DG MARE to introduce the Research Framework Programme.

ConC Dinner. M. Sinclair announced the Annual ConC Dinner to be held on Sunday, 28 September. The interim Chair expressed his gratitude, also on behalf of Harald Loeng.

5 ICES Strategic Plan

First session, Saturday 20 September

The First Vice President, M. Sinclair, gave the highlights of the BWG Report and asked for the reactions of ConC members. The Science Plan is the foundation for all future structural activities. If there is room for interpretation it gives more flexibility for the new structure. No changes can be made to the science plan unless they are substantial and critical. The starting point will be to consider all new activities as delivering the science outlined in the science plan.

The RMC Chair pointed out that some topics are a huge move for ICES and found that this was an interesting mix. An amended text will be needed for the passage on social sciences as there are some language issues in there. RMC Chair was asked to make a new text proposal. Action was completed during the week.

Tour de Table, asking for feedback from ConC members to the Science Plan

The interim Chair held a tour de table, inviting views and comments from committee members.

Mariculture Committee (MCC): Enthusiastic about the New Science Plan. MCC would be a typical programme. We think the reform will be well met.

Marine Habitat Committee (MHC): Personally very much in favour. Some WGs will be concerned because they feel that they may be threatened in existence. Recommendations made in the past for Science and Advisory to get the ACOM and SCICOM to talk properly, much could be done via video conferencing.

Fisheries Technology Committee (FTC): Enthusiastic. Open up for FTC interests to better engage with the community. There has always been anxiety about this.

Resource Management Committee (RMC): Most concerns have been related to the Science Plan. Regards the restructuring, any reaction is based on inherent conservatism. RMC does not see a problem in the restructuring as long as people can be productive in their work.

Diadromous Fish Committee (DFC): Extremely positive and happy with the 17 recommendations. Amount of work is of concern, there will be more work for SCICOM than under ACOM. All these groups will be reformed. There is a huge opportunity for the DFC family of scientists, but they do not see it like that. They are seeing they are being spread very diffusely and therefore feel that their interests will be lost and they might not bother coming to the ASC anymore.

Baltic Committee (BCC): ICES will be a construction site for a while and the main concern is "how are we going to function during this time". We need to guide the people through this, perhaps a transitional planning group within BCC.

Advisory Committee (ACOM): It is normal for change to bring out fears. However, the priority science areas will serve both the science and advisory sides of ICES well, and the change in structure is necessary to put science on an equal footing with advice.

Living Resources Committee (LRC): Personally in favour of the plan and the fact that strategic capacity will be given to the new SciCom. Very few responses came in from committee members. It is already dead, which in some ways is frightening. They already know their structure has no future. LRC Chair would be in favour to give the committees a little work to do. They are dissolved and we do not expect anything else from you.

Oceanography Committee (OCC): Has been so involved, and cannot be objective. Afraid we are spreading the expertise of the committee across different programmes.

The interim Chair thanked for giving frank views. He pointed out that questioning participation in the ASC is a strange attitude. We need to point out that there will be continuity especially with respect to the key role and function of the ASC.

The First Vice President was pleased that the overall comments were supportive.

The interim Chair concluded that proper documentation will be made stating the questions and concerns. The First Vice President will make the presentation, and the plenary will be chaired by Luis Valdes. The purpose of the exercise will be 1) communication, and 2) to hear concerns. It is a process that has been going on since 2004, so most points have been heard and thus no major surprises anticipated. 3) ideas for how to make it work may be heard and noted. Luis will make these points in his introduction.

The interim Chair thanked members for constructive input and informed the meeting that items five and six would be dealt with in retrospective after the ASC.

The presentation of the First Vice President was introduced and ConC made comments with a view to communicate a clear and concise message. There was agree-

ment that the presentation of the Science Plan to all Science committees in plenary should convey a good understanding of the procedure that lead to it, and of the conclusions that were reached in the Bureau Working Group. Otherwise the discussion would risk focusing on detail, rather than providing a perception of the whole picture.

Second session, Sunday 28 September

The Chair reopened this item and invited the First Vice President, Mike Sinclair, to summarise the main points made by participants during the Science Committee Plenary held on Monday 22 September and Bureau and Council meetings:

- The science plan does not sufficiently emphasise the lower trophic levels and on physical oceanography
- Linkages to funding agencies is not pointed out clearly enough
- The plan needs a socio-economic evaluation with respect to its implementation
- Topdown structure may impede rapid responses to emerging issues.
- EU would like to see more input from ICES Science on the Maritime Strategy.

Different perspectives had been brought up during the ASC meeting by ICES Delegates. People seemed to be fairly comfortable with what had been achieved and thus the feedback on the plan was quite modest.

Mark Dickey-Collas had produced a rewording of the passage on socio-economics that was accepted by the Bureau. The rewording received from Doug Wilson would call for a new version to be approved to Bureau, and the conclusion was to settle for only the editorial rewording submitted earlier.

Modest changes would be made to the Science Plan to reflect the comments received during the ASC. The final document will be presented to Council in October.

6 Reform of Science Structure

A discussion in ConC about the future structure would be premature because the authority to decide on this rests with the new Science Committee. The existing Chairs will bring in their experience and ensure continuity.

There needs to be a high degree of flexibility on how to create activities over the next year, for instance. The main problem is to keep the ICES community informed about new developments while maintaining existing procedures. To ease fears it would be useful to provide guidance that the EG work for 2009 will proceed as planned at this conference. It will also be important for ConC members to give positive messages/impressions to their delegates to encourage their approval of the proposal.

It is legitimate to debate whether it is appropriate for ICES to emphasize socio-economics at this point and how a socioeconomic emphasis would be implemented under the new structure? Uncertainties regarding changes in the science committee structure are to be expected but it must be emphasised that ICES will most likely continue to support and encourage the full range of scientific activities that has exists at present. The situation was similar when the old advisory committees disappeared, but the system has continued to deliver the required products. The pressures and expectations for the science structure are different from the advisory services, but science is equally important, and the science community should understand that

most of today's scientific activity, like advisory activities, will continue regardless of structure.

The workplan for 2009 as described in the resolutions is the foundation for creating the minimum accountability. The Expert Groups will carry on doing their business as outlined in the draft resolutions. The SciCom will then, once approved, start developing the process for implementing the science plan in January. Expert Groups should be invited to develop their own, bottom-up initiatives to deliver the science in the plan, leading to new structures.

Second session, Sunday 28 September

The Chair reopened this item and invited the First Vice President, Mike Sinclair, to summarise the main points made by participants during the Science Committee Plenary held on Monday 22 September and Bureau and Council meeting

Comments from Council:

- Concern for loss of "homes" for Mariculture, Baltic and perhaps other groups. Presumably this has raised concern in the committees too;
- Bottom-up generation of future leaders could be impeded by new structure;
- Additional cost implications of the new structure?
- The honorarium for the SciCom Chair was felt to be too low. Should be left open and be settled as a business part, rather than as a specific part of the resolution.
- Lack of Council input in this new structure. Will they get to see them and how will they see them?
- How would we pick the five additional members? It should be clarified in the resolution that they would be picked by the new SciCom to fill gaps in science representation.
- Some delegates were a little concerned on the shift, which they see as radical. Lack of disciplines in ICES which cannot be filled readily.
- Concern that Council will no longer see and influence ToRs.

Next steps

The First Vice President asked whether ConC members would assist in producing an example illustrating how the Baltic and/or the Mariculture would be managed under the new structure. Those who are worried that disciplinary committees are disappearing should be aware that new structures will replace the old ones. Some feedback suggested misunderstanding about how the new SciCom would use its flexibility. It is the blank page part that is creating some concern and similar concern was raised when ACOM was introduced.

At the ConC midterm meeting different options for the new structure were discussed and the 'zero committee' option had not been recommended by ConC, but still this was proposed by the BWG. The Chair of OCC felt that the change in the ConC recommendations to the Bureau were not well articulated, there seemed to be a missing link on what had happened. The General Secretary responded that the new science committee will be free to institute structures and processes to ensure that science programmes, regional considerations, science disciplines, and publications are appropriately considered. The central framework for the science process will be a bal-

ance of “subcommittees”, programmes and expert groups. The First Vice President commented that there were no clear conclusions on this in the ConC report and the Bureau decided to have the chairs continue, but to eliminate the committees. The rationale in the Bureau was that if you are going to make a change, to make it a clear slate. This was a managerial decision with a view to provide flexibility. The Chair replied that ConC was not asked by the Council to give a clear recommendation, ConC was asked to produce options.

A tour de table reporting on the feedback received during ASC Science Committee meetings

Oceanography Committee (OCC): Comments and concerns from committee members saying that it is a bit crazy to destroy something to recreate it. ConC made a valorisation, giving different scenarios. The transition period will give rise to confusion and also more work in the coming year.

Mariculture Committee (MCC): Concerned what will happen subsequent to the interim period (after 2009)? If there is no room for mariculture, where will mariculture go? If ICES decides to loose mariculture and go back to pure fisheries and oceanography, it would be at risk of isolating itself. ICES would not be able to provide advice at a very high level.

Living Resources Committee (LRC): Next year is blank but the new science committee should not start from scratch. Could the documents produced this year by ConC and BWG be put forward to the new Science Committee to ensure that next year, the new science committee will not have to start from scratch?

Marine Habitat Committee (MHC): There was not much concern in MHC that the committee structure would dissappear, but rather concern that expertise would be lacking. It was felt that if there are disciplines, it is important that expertise is retained and expanded. As long as the general assumption is that disciplines will be maintained, this should take care of some of the concerns. With regard to national representation: each country should be asked to nominate three, four, five persons and thus there would be a list to choose from to cover the required expertise.

Baltic Committee (BCC): The general comment was “what is the hurry”? You could form the SciCom and have the same structure under the new science committee. We should fight for minority groups. Baltic countries make it a prerequisite that the Baltic has a home.

Publications Committee (PUB): The current membership in the Publications Committee is already national with one member per country. The reality is that not all countries participate. This committee is not to forget that it is scientific part of ICES playing an important role. There are two options for the Publications Committee: one that they be left alone and the second option is to establish a group to advise the SciCom.

The LRC proposes for groups not to be left behind to: 1) make a 100-word summary of each Expert Group’s expertise 2) create search engine with keywords of all EGs, allowing programmes a procedure to pick up groups and coordinate work, 3) set up steering groups that will steer on important issues (one on steering all survey groups, common aspects to all surveys and integration, another one about integrated assessments).

The Chair of OCC commented that one level of the discussion is centered on how to be operational in the new structure. The other level that needs to be addressed is the

one related to Council. We have to convince delegates that this change is good for ICES. Not to reinvent the wheel, but to pilot ICES in the next year.

DFC and FTC were also concerned about the interim period and the lack of certainty where they will be in the future. In response, the two Chairs explained that it was their understanding that the intention here was to allow flexibility for the new Sci-Com and not to advise them in advance, let them create the structure themselves. However, it will be important to get some clarity very early in the new year.

The ConC Chair reiterated that all committee Chairs have been invited to be part of the new SciCom and that this will be their chance to promote the science they represent. The outgoing Committee Chairs were encouraged to take on responsibility and action. Even more so for the 'minority groups' under the current ICES structure, it will be important for these groups to take active steps. On the other hand there will be new chances and opportunities to bring Expert Groups into new constellations and produce new bottom-up synergies with planning groups to coordinate.

The First Vice President thanked the Committee Chairs for their feedback and promised that the comments would be presented to the Council in October. Compared to the previous tour de table, when the chairs expressed their view, the tone seemed to have shifted and had not been as positive as during the first tour de table, assumedly since the Chairs had heard back from the members.

The First Vice President and the General Secretary will update the draft resolutions.

The ConC Chair thanked the First Vice President for his attendance in the meeting.

7 Training in ICES

Saturday 20 September

M. Pastoors informed the committee that a proposal had not been prepared. Instead, it was suggested to develop a proposal based on the contributions of all the Science Committees. There are several activities on training on national levels which may be utilized towards forging an ICES programme. In addition, it should be linked to the science plan and could potentially unfold into a new science programme under the new regime. It is not seen as a marginal activity but should be something very central in ICES.

The First Vice President mentioned that BIO is preparing stock assessment courses and a document describing this would be made available to M. Pastoors.

The General Secretary emphasised the importance of putting forward a firm proposal to Council. If ConC do not come up with a plan, it might be difficult to maintain the SIF funding for training in ICES.

Monday 29 September

The DFC Chair presented the subgroup's (Martin Pastoors, Mark Dickey-Collas, Ted Potter, Adi Kellermann) proposal for the Action plan 2009–2010 on Training in ICES, which had been prepared and sent to Committee Chairs on Wednesday 24 September for feedback and comments from Science Committees (see **Annex 3**). The subgroup had hoped for more specialised requests for courses.

The overall plan is a system that will make use of national expertise in universities and national institutes on courses relevant to the advisory process in ICES. The expenses related to the Secretariat tasks and to the training committee are covered by

the ICES Strategic Investment Fund (SIF). Participants in training activities pay a fee which shall cover the direct expenses of that activity. Training activities approved by ICES shall be open to participation by all members of ICES, by appointment by the relevant Delegate, and to participation from the partner institution involved in providing the expertise. Preparation of materials is an additional activity to be carried out by the participating institution and needs to be covered by the SIF. Material will have the ICES corporate design and will be prepared in close cooperation with the secretariat.

It was made clear that the ICES training program will not compete with existing national educational institutions but should take advantage of those and rather fill the gaps of knowledge of marine scientists operating in the advisory process. The OCC Chair pointed out that training courses should address the needs of the entire ICES community.

ConC **recommends** that, as a first step, Committee Chairs send their feedback to the DFC Chair. The Secretariat will prepare a work plan for a training programme for the rest of 2008 and 2009 on the basis of the document prepared by the Subgroup on training and feedback from science committees, along with a budget for SIF consideration including the necessary items. The proposal and work plan will then be submitted to the Bureau in fall 2008 for approval. The training committee will report back for the attention of SciCom. ConC recommends a part-time position in the Secretariat (50%) that will be needed to support and coordinate the process.

Action: The Secretariat was asked to prepare a work plan/budget based on the proposal, with a view to receiving SIF funding.

Action: Committee Chairs are asked to supply comments and suggestions for additional training courses.

8 Websites for Science Committees

The BCC Chair, Y. Walther, informed the committee that the website has been put on hold since much will depend on the new structure. The aim was and still is to have the public access site or perhaps a combination.

The General Secretary pointed to the fact that these websites need to be in line with the ICES web policy and it would also be useful to have this discussed by the future coordination body for publications and the SciCom.

9 Lessons learned from 2008 ASC

ASC statistics

Görel Kjeldsen provided some statistics on the ASC participation in the 2008 Annual Science Conference.

- 658 participants had registered for the ASC, 50 of which had registered on location in Halifax;
- The ASC attracted participants from 34 different countries; 46 participants had registered under the student's fee; 25 spouses and approx. 60 volunteers.
- We received 471 contributions to the ASC in April. 361 of these were papers and 110 posters. Later on 61 contributions were withdrawn, partly

due to lack of funding from home institutes. Conveners worked around the gaps in the programme.

Overall, the WTCC had been a very good venue for the conference. The technical arrangements, except for a couple of glitches, were good. Sessions were well attended and in particular all plenary sessions were able to produce a crowded plenary. The facilities in the poster and coffee area were excellent for personal networking and with wireless internet connection and many tables.

The following points were noted:

- The Chair of MHC had noticed that some sessions were quite overfilled and some were not that well attended and therefore suggested to ask registered people what sessions they are planning on participating. **Action:** Secretariat will develop a simple online questionnaire, linked to the online registration system, asking participants to indicate which theme sessions they are intending to attend.
- The quality of posters had gone down and some had too much wording to give a good overview. A lot of posters were oversized and people had found it difficult to find the text providing the right dimensions. It was there, but could be clearer. **Action:** The Secretariat will highlight the text providing the right dimensions in the Guidelines for presenters to make this absolutely clear and also to encourage scientists to make posters simple.
- Award Selection Committee. The ConC Chair thanked the MCC Chair, Ian Bricknell, for taking responsibility with the Award Selection Committee, no negative reactions noted.
- Awards Ceremony. The ACOM Chair felt that the Awards Ceremony during the ASC Opening Ceremony was perhaps too long.
- No cookies during coffee breaks. The local organisers had made the choice to offer refreshments/softdrinks, in addition to tea and coffee. However, this was done at the expense of serving cookies, which were missed by some.
- Welcome to young scientist and mentorship during the week should be made a recurring ASC event.
- Special efforts should be taken to welcome and mentor young scientists who attend the ASC. It would be useful to identify experienced members of the ICES community to serve as mentors throughout the ASC.

10 Development of programme for the 2009 ASC (Berlin, Germany)

10.1 Funding of young scientists and young fishermen

At the Bureau meeting in June, it was brought up that the sum allocated for young fishermen was higher than that for young scientists. Bureau agreed that this should be balanced and asked ConC to consider the option of creating a single pool for young scientists. Currently, young scientists are allocated DKK 50,000 per year and young fishermen are allocated DKK 125,000 per year.

The General Secretary informed the committee that ICES currently has a SIF onetime commitment for young scientists and in addition a budget line for the young fishermen would be needed, since the one we have is only for the next three years. ConC could recommend making a pool.

The current rules invite applications from ICES countries and countries in transition. In light of the growing trend to receive a high number of questionable applications from countries that are not associated with ICES, the Secretariat asked ConC to consider limiting funding to member countries only.

In conclusion, ConC **recommends** that for 2009, DKK 100,000 should be kept for students and young fishermen, and *at least* half of this amount should go to support young scientists attending the meeting. Furthermore, ConC **recommends** that funding should be limited to young scientists from ICES member countries. A certain amount, for example 25,000 could be set aside to organize teambuilding events such as joint excursions.

A **suggestion** was made for the new SciCom to consider funding of media persons to attend the Annual Science Conference and report in the media, which might increase the PR for the conference.

10.2 Meeting arrangements

G. Kjeldsen informed ConC that the 2009 ASC is scheduled from Monday 21 September to Friday 25 September with business meetings from Saturday 19 September to Monday 28 September. The venue will be the Estrel Convention Centre in Berlin <http://www.estrel-hotel.com/>. The Convention Centre is situated in the south-east corner of Berlin and there is a nearby S-train station

This year's conference was attended by three persons. Two were from the Ministry of Agriculture and Food and one from the Federal Agency for Agriculture and Food in Bonn. All tasks related to the organisation of the conference have been transferred to the division "Conference management" under this Agency.

A four-star hotel with 1000 rooms is integrated in the convention centre and the local organisers have negotiated a good price for the hotel rooms. The price will be Euro 130 for a standard room including breakfast. A block-booking of 500 rooms has been made, expecting most participants to stay here.

ICES has been informed that there will be a wireless internet connection.

Format of the conference

In light of a future structure, ConC discussed the pros and cons of an ASC setup with half a day allocated for Science Committee meetings and EG reporting in the middle of the conference versus a more compact setup. The Chair reminded the committee that the setup of the conference will provide a frame for how many theme sessions can be accommodated. The local organisers have agreed to postpone the signing of a contract to allow for changes, but there is little flexibility. ICES will try to get as many rooms as possible. The following points were made in the discussion:

- Many ACOM members had been disappointed they could not attend sessions and this also detracted from the Friday afternoon science sessions. Thus closing at 13:00 on Friday would be suitable.
- Comments in favour of keeping the half day for SciCom/EG reporting in the middle of the week: 1) In general this is where the scientists talk science and there is always room for important topics, 2) A good opportunity for attendants to be attracted to WGs and thus this is good publicity for ICES WGs, 3) Since next year will be a transition year, by ASC next year we will have a better basis for deciding whether to keep the setup in the future or not. 4) A lot of ideas for theme sessions, Category 1 and Category

3 resolutions come out of the SciCom meetings. In favour of the little session in the middle, where things can materialise after some incubation following the first day, 5) keep the slot, but have EGs report in a more topical way; this should rather be a question of implementation, 6) As people were expressing worry on distance between top and bottom, a time slot allowing discussion, mid conference, should be allowed.

- Generally committees had difficulty fitting their work into two half days. They would need a whole day and hold it before the science sessions started. Just being given half a day would not solve the problem.
- Suggestion to have theme sessions specifically constructed to host reporting of EGs. Suggestion to make a conscious effort to fit this into the theme sessions.

In conclusion, a majority of Science Committee Chairs were in favour of keeping a slot for EG reporting in the middle of the week and this is the ConC recommendation.

The final decision will be left with the new science committee which will meet in January.

The decision will impact the number of theme sessions for next year in that without this slot we could have expanded to 20 theme sessions instead of 18. Another option for the new SciCom to decide on is whether to stay on for an extra day and have meetings on the Saturday.

10.3 Review of proposed Theme Sessions

Very few proposals had come in before the conference started, but the number of proposed theme sessions had more than doubled during the conference, and thus the proposal from the Subgroup was based on a total of 35 theme session proposals. The Chair commented that it would have been preferable to have early submissions to allow more time for evaluation.

The ConC Subgroup (MHC, OCC, BCC Chairs) had prepared a list of 18 theme sessions and a few additional session on the reserve list in case the new SciCom wishes to cancel the Wednesday afternoon slot in order to accommodate more theme sessions. The Subgroup had tried to accommodate at least one theme session per committee in the proposal and some theme sessions had been combined to avoid large overlaps.

The final Theme Session package for ASC 2009 will be announced in December/January.

After some discussion in ConC, the suggestion from the subgroup was accepted with three changes. The final list of 18 Theme Sessions and two on the reserve list is given in **Annex 4**.

Action: Committee chairs are responsible for combining theme sessions as agreed by ConC. The maximum number of conveners is three per theme session, and thus combined theme session will, in some cases, have to be reduced from six to three.

Evening session

ConC agreed to transform the Theme Session on “Presenting scientific and advisory results: best practices” into a special evening session or an afternoon session in paral-

lel with the other theme sessions. The MCC Chair volunteered to join the organisers and also proposed having an ASC seminar on posters and oral presentations.

Number of conveners per theme session

The question was raised whether there is a rule that we cannot have four conveners for a theme session? The Chair and HoS replied that exceptions can be made. Once this list is finalised it will be sent to PICES for cosponsorship, and will thus leave us with four conveners in some cases.

The Chair listed various options for changing the structure of theme sessions. One option, instead of adding additional theme sessions, could be to consider allocating more time, or to make a selection for fewer presentations.

10.4 Invited lectures and other special events

New well qualified candidates were brought up on Monday meeting, both good speakers:

ConC agreed to invite the following three:

- **Mojib Latif of the Kiel Marine Leibnitz Institute** for the opening lecture. He is Germany's leading expert on climate change issues and able to speak on marine topics related to that. He can be expected to attract interest from the media, relevant to link to climate sessions. It may also attract the attention of scientists from outside the ICES community.
- **Elisabeth North from the University of Maryland** for a keynote and as fallback candidate for the opening lecture. Her talk will be related to the agreed modelling theme sessions.
- **Poul Degnbol of the EC, DG Mare**. He is a speaker representing the advisory/fisheries side of the theme sessions and link to the process of revising the common EU fisheries policy. **Olav Rune Godø, Norway**, was suggested by FTC Chair, and ConC agreed to keep the name as a fourth option, in case one of the earlier agreed candidates are not available. His talk will then be linked to sessions on new methodology.

The OCC also recommended having a young scientist give an ASC keynote every year, like Elisabeth North in 2009.

11 Development of programme for the 2010 ASC (Nantes, France)

11.1 Meeting arrangements

ICES has received a verbal invitation from the French Delegates to host the 2010 ASC and a prebooking has been made at the Nantes Convention Centre during the week 20–24 September 2010. A formal letter has not yet been received. The meeting was informed that the ICES President has asked that we take this as confirmed.

On 5 September 2008, ICES General Secretary received a formal invitation from the Polish Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development to host the 2011 ASC to be held either in Gdansk or alternatively Warsaw. ICES Secretariat has suggested the following dates of the 2011 ASC: the Opening day would be Monday 19 September and the Closing day Friday 23 September.

The General Secretary has received information that ICES could expect an invitation from Russia to host the 2012 ASC. The venue would be Kaliningrad.

11.2 Review of proposed Theme Sessions

13 theme session proposals had been received and several theme sessions transferred from 2009, which will give a good basis for the new science committee to set up the programme for 2010.

11.3 Invited lectures and other special events

No names suggested at this stage.

12 2008 Draft Resolutions

Committee Chairs were asked to combine Items 12 and 14 in their presentations.

Overall, the ConC Chair found that draft resolutions were in good shape. However, some meeting venues and dates were missing. The importance of setting dates and venues was emphasised, since this has a lot of focus from the delegates.

A table of Expert Groups that were dissolved, established, changed committee or were renamed is attached as Annex 5.

The ConC Chair and the Head of Science suggested to add a generic ToR to all Expert Groups as follows:

“Explore the potential of the group for delivery of the new science plan and review different options for how this can translate into the new science programme under SCICOM.”

There was no unanimous view among committee Chairs on this ToR. Some saw it as additional workload, others did not want this to happen because the committee had decided to install a planning group for the transition. It was felt to be more beneficial to have a list of all Expert Groups including their expertise and capacities. This inventory then should be communicated to the new SciCom.

Action: In response to the wishes of the Committee Chairs, an EG definition and capacity list will be developed to brief the new SciCom when they start working in January. It will be the job of the present Science Committee Chairs to work together with existing EG chairs to create that list. Deadline 15 December 2008.

The General Secretary suggested that a specific set of resolutions with financial implications be drafted to see if these are line with the budget for next year. He pointed out that there is a discrepancy between the planning in ConC and budgeting in the Finance Committee and Council. In an optimal world ConC should plan for 2011. This holds especially true for the planning on symposia. The ConC Chair replied that during his first year in office he was invited to attend the Finance Committee meeting but this practice was not continued and he did not see it as his obligation to accommodate science based activities into the ICES budget.

Transition Groups

ConC agreed to transform the committees, where appropriate and desirable, to: “Transition Group on.....” [TG...]. Regarding the activities currently under the Publications Committee, there was a decision to appoint Pierre Pepin as Chair of the Transition Group for ICES Publications (TGIP).

The ConC Chair stated that the fate of the Transition Groups after one year will be decided by the new SciCom.

13 Review the status of ICES Symposia

The Head of Science Programme presented the meeting documents, ConC Doc 9 and 10. Andy Payne as representative of PUB went through the list from a PUB point of view:

Concerns raised by Publications Committee:

Conveners not delivering papers

Conveners of recent symposia have not been delivering the expected number of papers to convert to 250 pages for a full proceedings volume. This makes management of the journal output extremely difficult. PUB proposes that conveners commit to delivering the required number of pages by encouraging rather than awaiting submission of manuscripts, i.e. more proactivity. A paragraph to this effect should be included in the letter sent to conveners.

Action: The Head of Science Programme, in cooperation with the Chair of PUB will update the letter to conveners accordingly.

Qualifications of Guest editors

Failure to employ suitable-qualified guest editors and this is causing problems. Names of qualified guest editors should be stated in the supporting information in the draft resolutions. Establishment of clear and firm rules for being granted a symposium will help ICES and the editorship of the Journal in the long term. Proposals that are incomplete in these areas should be returned to the proposers for correction.

Recommendation to withdraw the offer to publish in IJMS

The World Conference on Biodiversity is now five weeks away and there has not been clear communication/feedback from the symposium conveners regarding publication of the proceedings. Especially, a clear commitment to nominate a guest editor, to cover the respective costs or to present a publication schedule for the proceedings has not been communicated and is by no means perceivable. The ICES conveners, Heye Rumohr and Jake Rice, have agreed to identify abstracts but they need a guest editor and a system to submit papers. PUB recommends withdrawal of the offer to publish in IJMS. The suggestion is to close the door on a proceedings volume, but to keep it open for a suite of papers in a regular issue of the IJMS. IJMS has three symposium issues per year, and there are four scheduled in 2010. If we agree to withdraw our offer to the World Conference on Biodiversity, we will have no problem accommodating the remaining requests for IJMS. It is very regrettable given the topic and its significance but ICES would run into serious problems if we carry on with this lack of commitment on the organizer's side.

ConC **recommended** withdrawal of the offer for the IJMS for the World Conference on Marine Biodiversity.

All other proposals for cosponsorship of symposia can be associated with IJMS and were recommended by the Publications Committee. Some requests for cosponsorship were discussed in more detail.

Bioinvasions Symposium 2009. The Head of Science Programme raised concern if this would produce new and good science, given that the last ICES symposium was held in 2007. The ACOM Chair commented that one of the areas for good environmental status' indicators for marine strategy directive is dealing with invasive species. During 2009 ICES will be asked to do work related to this. The Chair of MHC pointed out

that the fact that this comes up every two years does not necessarily render it to redundancy. **ConC approved this Symposium.**

CIAC (cephalopod), CIAC holds a symposium every three years on different topics. They are an independent committee and many are engaged in the ICES WGCEPH. They normally publish everything in one volume, and asked this time if ICES could support a specific theme session.

The Chair commented that this has been submitted at a very late stage, and makes it difficult for ICES to be involved in the planning process. We prefer to receive draft resolutions two years in advance. Scientifically there were no objections to this symposium.

Recommendation: ConC agreed to the list of symposia put forward for ICES cosponsorship as specified in the draft resolutions. ConC notes that in doing so, the publication schedule for JMS is filled until 2012. The addition of further symposia to JMS schedule will involve costs from either the organizers or the Secretariat.

14 Progress reports from Publications, Science Committees and ACOM

Publications Committee

ConC took note of the following points:

The ICES Journal of Marine Science (IJMS) is doing well. Subscriptions to receive the Journal have increased slightly. Open online access can lead to loss of subscriptions, but this has not happened to the Journal. ICES JMS impact factor has increased rapidly in the past three years. OUP electronic manuscript submission and processing program "Manuscript Central" will be adopted by the ICES JMS from 1 January 2009.

The submission rate of CM documents for the conference CD dropped again in 2008, to 69%. ICES can only raise awareness of the value of having the papers on the CD

"ICES Style Checker" will be made available (by the next ASC) to chairs, conveners and secretariat to check phrases and style in ICES documents for public release.

More rigour in process of approval of ICES publications. CRRs and TIMES are proposed and produced continuously by Expert Groups, though process slowed by the need for resolutions each time. System can only accommodate a finite number annually, so agreements on resolutions can result in delays in publication.

ConC supported the following **recommendations**:

- **Blanket resolutions** drafted for publication of the IROC (ICES Report on Ocean Climate) from WGOH (annually for five years) and of the Status of Zooplankton from WGZE (for three issues biennially for six years).
- **Interim approval process for CRRs and TIMES.** CRRs and TIMES are proposed and produced continuously by Expert Groups, though process slowed by the need for resolutions each time. PUB recommends that resolutions be prepared according to current template, submitted to HoS, assigned by him to chair of PUB or SciCom-designated leader of the Publications planning group, six-monthly, for consideration by a small task group.
- **PUB (TGIP) sharepoint site to be established.**
- **Guidelines for sponsorship of symposia** revised by HoS should be revised further. PUB *recommends* that ICES symposium conveners wishing to

have their material published in the ICES JMS be encouraged to solicit in advance of their event good papers for consideration for the proceedings, rather than to simply “see what happens”.

- **ICES Wikipedia entry:** to draft a revision to the current uninformative Wikipedia entry for ICES. PUB *recommends* that it be uploaded after the General Secretary has vetted the final text for accuracy.
- **Digitization of all ICES Marine Science Symposia published prior to 1991,** with immediate effect. The estimated cost of this task is US\$15 000.

ICES website: to help place ICES in a position to outline some of the key needs of the ICES website, including access to data and publications, strategic information about ICES, news and ongoing events. Need and *recommend* mandate from ConC for PUB (or TGIP) to get this started. The General Secretary replied that input and suggestions from PUB (TGIP) would be needed. The mandate was given already in May so the Secretariat is awaiting the input.

Free distribution of CRRs: The OCC has recommended that distribution of the two prominent CRR products, the IROC and Plankton Status CRR should be free of charge. The question of whether all paper publications should be distributed free of charge was raised. The Secretariat replied that in principle, TIMES and CRRs are already freely available for downloads on our webpage but the annual income from sales of hard-copies is still about 15,000 DKK. ConC concluded that priority should not be given to the two OCC status reports; either all CRRs should be free or none.

The workload for CRRs was discussed on the background that numerous requests have been made over the past months that may lead to an unhandable timeline for publication. At the same time, this can be regarded as a peak activity, expected to get better. The CRR Editor, Emory Andersen, is currently feeling the effect of getting flooded. The solution to this will be good timing and a realistic plan based on timelines for manuscripts. ICES could do more for CRRs in terms of a business model.

Action: TGIP tasked to prepare a business plan, including cost implications, for the future of ICES publications, leaving out the symposia. The plan will be tabled at the first meeting of SciCom.

Plans for Communication Department. PUB *recommends* the development of a Communications Department in the Secretariat. The proposal should be based on the challenge for action contained in the *ICES Strategic Plan 2008* and should include a remit for an oversight committee/panel/ board, consisting of members of the proposed new Science Committee and experienced members of the ICES community experienced in such matters. The plan will have financial consequences. ICES hierarchy to identify components in the plan that it feels should or could be implemented in near future.

Establishing a Communication Department may be a vision worth sharing. The new Strategic Plan features this as a major task, but it is not quite clear where this should be allocated. The ConC Chair suggested it could be a job for TGIP to elaborate on a communication strategy to be produced. There were, however, reservations that TGIP should not spend time on something that might not be considered.

Action: TGIP was tasked to outline the details of plans regarding Communication Department to be presented to ACOM, SciCom and Secretariat for comments.

EG chairs will be approached for true timelines for each of these draft resolutions. Furthermore, all SciCom Chairs will be asked to police the quality of Executive Summaries.

The Publications Committee recommended approval of the package of draft resolutions for publications (Category 1). Category 3 (Symposia) resolutions are addressed in Section 13.

Marine habitat Committee

The Marine Habitat Committee (MHC) met for two half-day sessions during the Annual Science Conference in Halifax. The sessions were well attended with 23 and 29 participants, respectively. Few problems are anticipated to address 2009 Terms of Reference, however deficiencies in some areas of expertise have not been resolved. The MCWG will need support of chemical oceanographers to deal with ToR's. The chair will attempt to recruit the expertise, but national delegates are requested to communicate this need to their science community. BEWG requires more support by N. American participants but can address ToRs. More problematic is the need for experts to support WGSAM. The MHC agreed that statistical expertise on environmental monitoring is needed in ICES, and possible actions to secure this include (1) invitational travel for key experts; (2) intellectual and stimulating challenges for statisticians by (a) giving them research-oriented ToR's, (b) reduction in the service-provider nature of their work, and (c) integration of WGSAM in subcommittees or programs; (3) establishment of a methods working group. Amongst these options, the second is considered to be the most promising. WGBEC also noted that member states should encourage institutes to submit data on biological effects to the ICES database.

Scientific products, which may have particular relevance for current ICES activities include guidance on habitat condition indices (WKBEMET) in support of spatial management; guidance on monitoring of chemicals and biological effects (WGMS), benthic response to climate change (BEWG).

Three overarching themes crystallized from reports and ASC discussions - spatial management, biodiversity and contaminant effects. Several EGs (WGICZM, WGMHM, BEWG, WGMS, WGBEC, MCWG) will likely contribute to a response to a Commission request to its members for inventories of coastal activities. Biodiversity is considered to be a good candidate as an overarching theme for ASC in 2010. International biodiversity programs currently in a synthesis stage and which would likely contribute to this theme include CoML and MARBEF. This theme also supports developing international policy requesting member states to "protect vulnerable marine ecosystems [VME], including seamounts, hydrothermal vents and cold water corals, from destructive fishing practices, recognizing the immense importance and value of deep-sea ecosystems and the biodiversity they contain (e.g. UNGA Resolution 105/61)".

MHC feels strongly that current ICES science expertise should be retained under a new SciCOM. Further, EG members expressed extreme concern that national support to participate in EGs was inadequate and declining. One action to promote support of scientists to EG meetings may be to increase ICES' role as reviewer of deliverables from large research initiatives thereby fostering communication between ICES science and funding agencies. This might be handled by subcommittees / programs, in which planning for follow-up research may result.

The need to anticipate advisory requests (Commission, national, ICES) is recognized as being critical to timely implementation of ICES science. Along with direct communication with regulatory agencies, an important mechanism will be strong communication between SciCOM and ACOM. Through information from the Commission, MHC anticipates contributing to advice on marine food webs, seafloor integrity indices, effects of energy (e.g. acoustic) on ecosystems and contaminant effects.

Comments and questions:

The enhanced focus on biodiversity work is welcomed. There will be more biodiversity issues in the future and ICES may take on a role in coordinating work in the north Atlantic. At the same time, the Census of Marine Life (CoML) will end its first phase in 2010 and it is open yet what will follow. Some good work was done by MARBEF, but there has been poor coordination.

The problem of participation in this year's meeting of WGSAAEM and the continuation of the group was discussed briefly. No solution was visible on the short term but there was unanimous agreement that the work is indispensable for ICES, thus calling for a continuation.

The request from OSPAR asking for the revision of the JAMP monitoring guidelines was discussed. The main problem, besides the difficulty of WGSAAEM holding its meeting, is the lack of a group dealing with phytoplankton as well as the workload and timeline for some other groups. ACOM and the new SciCom will need to closely coordinate the work.

Fisheries Technology Committee

In addition to the long-standing Working Groups on Fisheries Acoustics, Science and Technology (WGFAST) and Fisheries Technology and Fish Behaviour (WGFTFB), a new working group, WGQAF (Working Group on Quantifying All Fishing Mortality) was convened for the first time in 2008.

For WGFAST, the highlight of the year was the ICES SEAFACETS Symposium (Symposium on the Ecosystem Approach with Acoustics and Complementary Technologies) held in Bergen, Norway in June. The sixth in a series of ICES-sponsored acoustics symposia held over a 30-year period, SEAFACETS was noteworthy for its high level of participation (~400 participants, 124 oral and 100 poster presentations), and the substantive advances which were reported. SEAFACETS provided new insights into ecosystem structure and function and provision of quantitative information for ecosystem and fisheries assessment models. Behaviour of animals was a dominant theme throughout the symposium. Technological advances in a number of areas were reported including long range low-frequency aggregation assessment, scientific sonars, and multifrequency assessment tools. Publication of the proceedings in JMS will occur in 2009. SGFOT (Study Group on Fisheries Optical Technologies) and SGFARV (Study Group on Fish Avoidance by Research Vessels) also met in Bergen in association with SEAFACETS and each is making good progress in addressing its terms of reference and preparing manuscripts for publication as CRRs.

WGFTFB, together with SGPOT (Study Group on Development of Fish Pots for Commercial Fisheries and Survey Purposes) met in Torshavn, Faroe Islands in April 2008. SGPOT, together with the other WGFTFB-linked study groups (SGEM (Study Group on Combining Gear Parameters into Effort and Capacity Metrics) and SGSTS (Study Group on Survey Trawl Standardisation)) continue to make good progress. Reports and discussions of particular note from the well-attended WGFTFB meeting focused on: applications of fish behaviour for species separation in demersal trawls; incorporation of fishing technology issues/expertise into management advice; developing a structure and timetable for drafting an ICES Static Gear Selectivity Manual; assessing the efficacy of technical measures for reducing bycatch of protected species; and provision of input to WGECC with respect to the OSPAR QSR2010. Links with FAO were strengthened by the simultaneous hosting of a meeting of national coordinators of an FAO tropical shrimp trawl bycatch reduction project.

WGQAF also met in Torshavn and addressed its terms of reference through presentations and discussion of; inclusion of escape mortality in stock assessment; industry/science solutions in a data poor elasmobranch fishery; ghost fishing in static gears; and purse seine slipping mortality in north Atlantic mackerel fisheries.

All three working groups and most study groups will meet during the same week in Ancona, Italy in May 2009. Of particular interest will be a joint WGFAST/WGFTFB session on fish behaviour, a joint WGQAF/WGFTFB topic group on definitions of bycatch and associated terms, and the first meeting of SGTCCOD (Study Group on Turned 90° Codend Selectivity).

A Transition Group for Technical Expert Group Coordination will be established to address the ongoing need for coordination among WGFAST, WGFTFB, WGQAF and other associated EGs, and to facilitate communication with SciCom, ACOM and other entities within and outside ICES during the transition to the new ICES Science Plan and Science Delivery System. This Transition Group will meet in Ancona in May, 2009 and will also work by correspondence.

Comments to FTC:

The question was raised how WGFTFB will be involved into the request from OSPAR on acoustics and its impacts. It is a topic that was identified as area for WGFTFB to review. There will be a topic session at the annual meeting.

There was a discussion about the structure and work procedures of FTC which seems to lead the way into prototypes of science programmes. The topic groups are large and work well together. Their weakness is that they tend to be isolated from the rest of the community which could be met with in a new structure. How relevant is the work of FTC to Advice? The ACOM Chair replied that most is not directly transformed into advice, but work done in FTC influences the science that is done for advice.

Mariculture Committee

The committee session yielded several proposals for theme sessions at the ASC 2009 with WGAGFM, WGEIM, WGMASC and WGPDMO sponsorship. It was noted that it is difficult to attract purely mariculture people to ICES ASC's, but that there may be more willingness of people who study mariculture and ecosystems to attend as we move to address the new ICES priority areas of carrying capacity and ecosystem interactions. The location of the meeting may be important and that session organizers will have to actively invite speakers, not just wait for people to send in abstracts.

There was a lively discussion of the new ICES Science programme. There was concern that no mariculture may be represented in the new SciCom on the long term. It had been pointed out that an initial draft of the restructuring plan included only an impact-based role for mariculture; the current model sees priorities for both carrying capacity and environmental interactions, i.e., managing mariculture in an ecosystem way. WGEIM reviewed the previous one and sent back a strong note to the planners. The focus of mariculture should be on sustainability. The reason mariculture exists is because fisheries management has been so erratic. The turnaround time for non-fisheries advice from ICES is currently 12 months or longer. More clients might want mariculture advice from ICES if the turnaround time was faster. The sea lice problem is a good example; ICES missed an opportunity to have an impact there. ICES mariculture role should be to figure out, on an international consensus basis, how to "fit" mariculture into ecosystem management. The strategic goal should be to reiterate where mariculture can be a positive for ICES, particularly in the WGEIM themes of marine spatial planning, sustainability, and climate change, and look for places where MCC WG ToR's will fit into the new themes.

The relevance of MCC for ICES advice was discussed. Especially WGEIM and WGMASC had actively contributed to the OSPAR request on climate change impacts in the North Sea. It was pointed out that on national levels MCC scientists are asked for advice to a large extent so this could also be channelled on ICES level, even if not requested.

Part of discussions focused on the role socio-economics may play for future work with some examples from national labs discussed.

ICES may need to cooperate with other organizations (like WAS) to co-sponsor symposia or conferences on mariculture in the future.

ConC commented on the report and the First Vice-President said that there is great potential for MCC work to integrate with coastal issues and spatial planning. The

ACOM Chair pointed out that although MCC is not frequently asked for providing advice, its work is certainly relevant for the advisory side.

Baltic Committee

The Baltic Committee has managed five Expert Groups during 2008.

The Workshop on Developing and Testing Environmentally-Sensitive Stock-recruitment Relationships of Baltic Herring and Sprat stocks (WKSSRB). It will continue and develop in 2009 under the name Workshop on Combining Climatic Scenarios and Medium Term Predictions for herring and sprat stocks.

The ICES-IOC-SCOR Working Group on GEOHAB Implementation in the Baltic (WGGIB). Dissolved, and the Baltic work should feed into the ICES - IOC Working Group on Harmful Algal Bloom Dynamics (WGHABD).

ICES/HELCOM Working Group on Integrated Assessments of the Baltic Sea (WGIAB) will continue in 2009.

The Group on Baltic Productivity (SGPROD) will continue in 2009.

The Study Group on Ecosystem Health (SGEH) will continue in 2009 with new Chair

The Baltic Committee (BCC) has successfully conducted in bringing the Baltic marine science community together, a further requisite for developing ecosystem-based management cannot be further pursued without it. Another concern is that regionalisation in science activities is presently a very low priority in ICES, as opposed to the view of major funding agencies (e.g. world bank and EU).

It is a strong general wish that the BCC should be a subcommittee in the new structure. BCC member suggests that the Baltic delegates of ICES should make this a pre-requisite for accepting the new ICES structure.

The workflow within the new structure is of concern to the BCC. It is a wish that ICES Science can continue during reconstruction with out losing momentum. BCC introduced the idea for a Transition Group of Integration Activities in the Baltic [TGBALT]. The aim is to carry over important issues with regards to the Baltic Science and integration between groups within and beyond the ICES sphere. The group will be dissolved as a new body for Baltic Science is formed under the SciCom.

Comments and questions

The ConC Chair was pleased to see the suggested planning group. He also noted that a couple of WGGIB ToRs have been transferred to the WGHABD, and it is important that BCC scientists will show up at this meeting.

Resource Management Committee

RMC showed consensus to establish a group on the science of governance, advice and management under the new science structure. This should account for the need for a group that pushes forward the science dealt with by RMC and also integrate the work of SGRAMA, SGMAS and WGFS.

Highlights from RMC groups in 2008 included the Science publication by SGFIAC, the new work of WGSAM who have new runs of multispecies models and studies of size based indicators (carried out for WGECON) and the new work of WKHIST. It was proposed and agreed by ConC to accept SGHIST as a follow on from WKHIST and also to the creation of WKBLUR to look at the recruitment of blue whiting. 5 groups under RMC have yet to meet in 2008, and will report to SciCom early in 2009.

The issue of the appropriate surveys for Redfish in the North Atlantic was raised at RMC and LRC and discussed by CONC. It was concluded that the ToRs for a planning group for redfish surveys should be set up. This group should work with the assessment and advisory groups of ICES to determine the best strategy for the surveying of redfish.

Discussion then proceeded on the relative role of WGDIM and it was made clear that groups that are stimulated by the needs of users should be encouraged by WGDIM, e.g. the IBTS datras users.

Oceanography Committee

Chair of OCC, L. Valdes, Chair of OCC, L. Valdes summarised the different products delivered by the committee during 2008, these include:

All the 10 expert group meetings related to the OCC were well attended, the ToRs well addressed and the reports sent in time. The WGRP have worked by correspondence.

Responses to OSPAR were delivered in time to ACOM (via ACE) from several OCC expert groups. Results were compiled in a volume and will be published in a CRR.

The OCC has managed the following publications:

- Proceedings of 4th Zooplankton Production Symposium [ICES JMS, vol 65 (3)]
- ICES Brochure on Climate Change
- IROC (WGOH, CRR)
- Zooplankton Status Report (WGZE, CRR)
- Handbook on Modelling (WGPBI, CRR)

The five Theme Sessions proposed by the OCC in 2008 (TS #A, B, F, L, Q) gathered a high number of contributions (except A, all the others were above the average).

The OCC had promoted two highly successful major symposia:

- Effects of Climate Change on the World's Oceans (Gijón, Spain, May 2008)
- Eastern Boundary Upwelling Ecosystems: integrative and comparative approaches (Las Palmas, Spain, June 2008).

The highlights of expert groups were presented. The zooplankton status report prepared by the WGZE was improved this year including 13 new sampling sites, 5 of them in the Mediterranean, and a total of 37 sites. CPR data shows that copepod abundance (1950-2005) with a general downward trend in those regions where warming was the strongest (northeast North Atlantic). Within the 37 individual (near shore) sites the responses were mixed. One possible explanation is that local hydrographic conditions may be countering or masking the trends seen in the more open-ocean (CPR) sites. For example, while the Baltic is experiencing warmer temperatures, it is also experiencing changes in salinity and/or stratification and/or anoxic regions.

The WGOH also published the IROC with new additions, one of most relevant is the collaboration of Coriolis Center (France, in charge of the ARGO data) which prepared new plots for the entire North Atlantic including temperature, salinity fields, and mixed layer depth. The upper layers of the North Atlantic and Nordic Seas remained exceptionally warm and saline in 2007 compared with the long-term average. The trend in the past decade (1996-2006) has been of warming and increasing salinity in the upper ocean. Temperature and salinity have been relatively stable since 2004.

The WGHABD remarked the increasing concerns on aerosolized toxins, with more often events in EU and USA on respiratory irritations affecting coastal populations. Southern Europe victims sometimes up to 100 in number requiring medical assistance. Associated with toxic aerosols from epibenthic *Karenia* and *Ostreopsis* species. The work of this group will be more focused on “dynamics” in the future instead of focusing on recording list of HAB events.

The WGPBI stated that a new era in modelling physical-biological interactions has begun. Simulations are being reported that integrate from physics to adult fish populations. The simulations are largely exploratory in nature but they represent a substantial increase in what is possible and the beginning of comprehensive ecosystem modelling. The real example “Oyster Restoration Optimization” model demonstrates that ecosystem characteristics (hydrodynamics, phytoplankton growth, oyster filtration, oyster population dynamics) and social objectives (water quality, harvest, spawning stock sanctuaries, and economic considerations) can be linked in an optimization framework that supports ecosystem-based management decisions in Chesapeake Bay.

WGRP has almost completed the work plan for the period 2006-2010. They had a long reflection on the options for reorganization of WGRP. The point is that in spite of the importance of this group and the clear scientific justification for ICES to maintain the group, the poor attendance is jeopardizing its existence. The new SCICOM should follow with attention the evolution of this group and will try to engage it with new topics of work in order to make it more attractive.

The ICES/IOC SGGOOS will be renamed as ICES GOOS Steering Group (IGSG) and will continue its role as an ICES steering group promoting cooperation between IOC, GOOS and ICES Working Groups. ICES may be represented at IOC-GOOS bodies (GSSC, IGOOS).

The WGCCC met in conjunction with WKCFCC. The observed changes in all cod stocks were analyzed in order to determine the influence of climate, however even in well-studied areas such as the North Sea the cause of distribution changes are not clear and therefore not predictable. Cooperative work is needed to produce regional climate models with appropriate structure and output. Meanwhile impact assessments have to use plausible “what if” scenarios.

WKOOP discussed the need for concerted action on bringing the producers of operational oceanographic products together with the potential users from the ICES community. Communication between producers and users is needed to enable products to be tailored to users needs. The ICES users are expected to be engaged in both the scientific and advisory roles of ICES. There are many products already available of which most of the wider ICES community still seems unaware. Thus, WKOOP recommended the formation of a new ICES working group to bring both the producers and users of operational oceanographic products together. The name of the group should include elements from the producers and users, thus the ICES Working Group of Operational Oceanographic products for Fisheries and Environment [WGOOFE] was chosen.

Louis Legendre introduced the plans for a scientific cooperation between EUR-OCEANS (EU funded NoN) and ICES in the OCC meeting. The discussion in OCC expressed the coincidence in the goals and strategy of EUR-OCEANS with the new ICES Science Structure, which evidences that there are common interest and likely the cooperation with ICES will be possible.

Establishment of WGFCCIFS: It was suggested to add ToR f) Take into consideration the work by WGPBI.

WGRP is in trouble and has not met in two years. They have worked well and produced good quality reports, following the plan that was given to them. 20 years ago, this was one of the biggest WGs because the topic was cutting edge and relevant. The focus has changed as a natural consequence that science has evolved.

ConC considered making a clear recommendation to improve the work of this group by adding a ToR to make specific suggestions for their future in terms of the science plan. However, after some discussion it was felt that it can be left to the group to do that, for instance along the lines of establishing a series of workshops.

Living Resources Committee

LRC has more than 15 expert groups under its remit, which deal with ecology and life cycles, stock identification and surveys. During the Committee meetings the activity of the expert groups were presented and reviewed, the new science structure was debated, and new resolutions were discussed and adopted.

Main issues in reports of expert groups. For the working groups on Fish ecology (WGFE), Sea bird ecology (WGSE) and Life cycle and ecology of small pelagic fish (WGLESP), the major topics of their 2008 activity were:

- Answering to the OSPAR resquest on climate change. This request has been a major effort over the last two years. The Steering group on Climate Change (SGCC) is now taking the follow up on the topic.
- Spatial issues. Spatial issues are growing in concern due to changes in species occurrence but also due to habitat conservation plans. Methods are being developed to analyse data as well as model distributions including behaviour.
- Indicators of population and community status. The development of indicators is a continued concern as well as the use of models to test their performance.

The working groups on invertebrates, Cephalopods (WGCEPH), Crangon (WGCRAN) and Crabs (WGCRAB) share common issues:

- Recurrent lack of data collection plans and undefined stock limits.
- Non-classical assessment tools. Life cycles and biological characteristics are used to assess stock status and detect trends if any.
- Interest to use invertebrates as indicators in the ecosystem. This could lead to work together with the Steering Group on Climate Change (SGCC).

Certification of practices in fisheries (by-catch of fish in shrimp coastal fisheries or by-catch of seas birds) has been mentioned as a topic of potential growing concern. A technologically advanced electric beam trawl to prevent by-catch in shrimp fisheries has been presented. Also, liason with Mediterranean teams has been made by WGSE, which may become more regular.

The Working Group on Stock Identification Methods (WGSIM) has been working within a network of collaborators. It has liased with assessment working groups under ACom, which have identified stock identification problems. It has formulated protocols for collecting tissues. This can lead the way to develop international data bases of biological material (e.g., tissues, otholiths, morphometrics, ...) in complement to the current data bases on fish concentration (biomass).

The working groups dealing with the coordination of surveys (PGHERS renamed PGIPS, WGBIFS, PGNEACS, WGBEAM, PGEGBS, WGMEGBS, WGACEGG, and WKNEPHBID) have reported their activity in a common session joint with the Resource Management Committee that also oversees survey groups (IBTSWG, PGNAPES, SGRS). Although the survey groups are diverse in the types of surveys (bottom trawls, acoustics, ichthyoplankton) and areas/systems, they all have common issues. The coordinated surveys are part of international survey programs. Intercalibration of methods and expertise of the teams involved, data combination procedures, regional data bases are among the most recurrent and cross-cutting topics. The need for larvae identification was identified by PGHERS as species occurrence in the ichthyoplankton is changing. Most of the fisheries surveys are evolving towards ecosystem monitoring platforms. This may require to define protocols for the different types of data to be collected as well as rethink the survey designs. Transforming current fisheries surveys into ecosystem surveys may not be achieved by just adding more data to be collected. It may require rethinking the survey designs to accomodate the different space-time scales in the different components of the ecosystem. Although there was consensus on the utility of egg surveys to map spawning areas and cross-validate biomass estimates obtained with other surveys, the maintenance of egg surveys in the North Sea on a regular basis is difficult. Solutions need be found for implementing what is seen as additional ichthyoplankton surveys by member countries. Underwater TV surveys for Nephrops is building capacity. In a given area/system survey data are becoming diverse in nature and thus requiring procedures to combine them. Deep sea surveys have been growing in concern. A group to coordinate deep sea bottom trawl surveys along the shelf break (PGNEACS) was established last year. The group proposed a plan for the coordination of existing surveys. Extending the coordination to the deep sea surveys in the nordic seas is a possibility to be further analysed.

Two groups will meet after the ASC: WGACEGG on combined acoustic and egg surveys in ICES areas VIII and IX, and WKSPCLIM on small pelagic fish and climate change.

Two manuscripts are expected to be submitted for publication in the ICES Cooperative Research Report series (CRR): Cephalopod Biology and Fisheries in Europe (pro-

duced by WGCEPH), and Life cycle spatial patterns of small pelagic fish in the North East Atlantic (produced by WGLESP).

The working group on Introductions and Transfers of Marine Organisms (WGITMO) currently under ACom requested that in future they should report to the Science Committee so as to continue long-term work on life cycle and life history strategies and report on these topics, which were presented to be of less interest to ACom.

Debate on the new science structure. The new science structure and the new science plan were presented in plenary to all committees by the first vice-president before the committee meetings. During the committee meetings time slots had been reserved in the agenda to debate the new plans. It was unclear to committee members how expert groups would work in relation to programmes/sub-committees and concern was about how the expert groups would work and report in the future. The new science plan was otherwise well received and the discussions were on how to be pro-active in implementing the new science plan in the new structure.

For implementing new multi-disciplinary programmes/sub-committees, it was thought that communication and reporting between expert groups was key. To increase communication the following recommendations were made:

- 1) Expert Groups (under LRC at least) should write summaries (100 words or a list of key words) describing their skills and activity (topics and methods) to contribute to implement the programmes of the ICES Science Plan
- 2) A search engine should be implemented under the guidance of WGDIM to search the TORs and summaries of Expert Groups to contribute to implement the programmes of the ICES Science Plan.
- 3) TORs should be coded to reflect the origin and type of request to allow for tracking expert group activities and evaluating the balance between requests and self-generated activity.

There was consensus that the expert groups under LRC contributed significantly to collecting survey data and developing state indicators of populations and communities. Based on that evidence, two cross-cutting issues were identified to which expert groups under LRC could significantly contribute to. It was suggested that the new multi-disciplinary programmes/sub-committees could act as steering groups on cross-cutting issues. The following steering groups were thus proposed:

- 1) A steering group for coordinating and integrating surveys in support of the ecosystem approach. In effect, LRC oversees most of the Expert Groups that coordinate surveys.
- 2) A steering group for integrated ecosystem assessments. In effect, groups under LRC provide a lot of information on ecology, traits, patterns, indicators and changes thereof, which could be integrated with other information in support of the ecosystem approach.

Resolutions for establishing these new steering (transition) groups were prepared.

There will be a recommendation for all EGs under LRC to write a summary of their expertise, and for WGDIM to build a search engine to search for keywords. LRC Chair invited comments from ConC members on this proposal.

Diadromous Fish Committee

The DFC was keen to support the proposals for the new ICES Science Plan and Science Structure and agreed that many of the research topics in the Plan were highly relevant to their work on diadromous fish. However, members noted that there were still many uncertainties about the proposals, not least concerning the mechanism for providing a focus for particular disciplines within the new Structure. The main responsibilities of most DFC members relate to the conservation, restoration and rational management of freshwater and diadromous fish species, and they were therefore keen that ICES should continue to provide a forum through which they could discuss and co-ordinate relevant research. DFC therefore proposed the formation of a Transition Group which would meet by correspondence and at the next ASC to identify research activities and stimulate international co-operation for work on diadromous fish species.

Reports from three ACom Working Groups on eels, North Atlantic salmon, and Baltic salmon and trout all highlighted continuing concerns about the depleted state of stocks and the requirements to develop or update management and/or recovery plans. Two other Expert Groups, investigating the availability and quality of data being used for the assessment of Baltic sea trout and the analysis of historic tagging data for Atlantic salmon, reported making good progress, and the committee recommended that their work should continue for another year. The DFC also proposed the formation of three new Expert Groups to address recommendations from the Working Groups relating to (i) the use of estuarine habitats by eels, (ii) assessment and forecast models for Atlantic salmon, and (iii) relationships between biological characteristic and mortality trends in salmon.

The Committee noted that the 2008 Theme Session on “Problems and solutions for the assessment, conservation, and restoration of rare, threatened, and endangered fish species” had been well attended and had been very successful in bringing together scientists working on diadromous and marine fish species. They therefore proposed two new Theme Sessions in collaboration with MCC, on interactions between wild and farmed fish, and with LRC/RMC, on ‘m’ in fish, for 2009 and 2010 respectively.

An update was provided on the SALSEA research programme investigating marine mortality of salmon. New programmes including extensive marine surveys for salmon have been initiated in the North East Atlantic (with the aid of EU-FP7 and private funding) and North America, and work is now proposed for Icelandic waters. It is hoped that these studies will provide valuable new insights into salmon mortality that will be reported to the joint ICES/NASCO/NPAFC Symposium on this topic planned for spring 2011.

ACOM

The Advisory Services in 2008, which is its first year of operation, had provided advice as requested and at the agreed deadlines with a few exceptions. The advice has largely been adopted by ACOM through a series of web conferences and ACOM has achieved significant expertise in conducting the form of meeting effectively. He pointed to increases in number of advice products, and that these requests are becoming more ecosystem-oriented, e.g. advice on Baltic salmon management plan. He considered that the ICES portfolio is broad and that ecosystem considerations in the advice are moving forward. In 2008 a rough and ready calculation on the work on advice side indicates that the EG meetings, review and formulation of advice alone represent a substantial investment including 3-400 people and about 50 person-years.

ACOM met in the fringes of the 2008 ASC for one and a half days and concentrated on planning of 2009 while a number of general topics would be discussed at the planned ACOM meeting 1-4 December 2008. The plan for 2009 includes standard advice based on the MoUs with Management Commissions and agreed workplans with ICES Partner Commissions most of which is continuation of ongoing work. As in 2008 ACOM will in 2009 address a wide-ranging agenda, involving about 40 expert groups and about 30 review and advice drafting groups.

ACOM will develop a strategic plan for the ICES Advisory Services. This plan will take the form of a strategic action plan focusing on outputs it will not be a general strategic plan. A keypoint in the plan is actions for dialogue between Science and ACOM; overall system that fit the advice and the science needs is something to work on together. Also, there is a need for a review of the form of the advice in particular the fisheries advice, this topic includes the development of integrated advice.

The ACOM Chair noted five specific topics which ACOM and the new Science Committee might work on together in 2009:

- Observing systems: There is a number of problems with the data quality and the amount of data. In cooperation with initiatives within LRC and RMC on general observation system (ecosystem surveys), ACOM and SciCom could work together to define an integrated system to serve both science and advice needs.
- Fisheries management strategy evaluation. There is clearly a need to step up capacity but also a need to standardise and streamline the protocol and tools for such evaluations. Concerning the work on the form of the fisheries advice the ACOM Chair said that there is a link to the discussion of reference points in the context of fisheries management plans and he noted the changes in Baltic Sea that led to abandon Baltic cod biomass reference points in 2008. SciCom could help to advance methodologies for management plan evaluations, and consideration of environmental and ecological factors in reference points.
- Increase in call for area based management, MPAs, Natura 2000 sites: ACOM have asked Mark Tasker to put together a plan for a 'facility' for area based management evaluation, including specialised databases and models. Again, SciCom could help to advance methodologies for management plan evaluations, and consideration of environmental and ecological factors in reference points.

- Assistance for EC DG Env on establishing criteria and methodologies for Good Environmental Status in the context of the EU Marine strategy framework directive . This will be an opportunity for a lot of scientists to get involved and covering some areas where ICES have not given advice before. The ACOM chair saw this as a unique challenge for ICES, inter alia because we are going to be looking for the involvement of scientists outside the usual ICES network including scientists working in the Mediterranean and Black Sea.
- Benchmarking. Starting out with data compilation workshops involving stakeholders, ACOM want to use the same process to challenge the science groups and new science committees. Workshops have been agreed and will start in the first half of the new year.

ConC was interested in better understanding the work on “good environmental status indicators” and the ACOM chair provided some details (see power point presentation). A particular area of interest for ConC was on biological effects from contaminants that are temperature dependent and how this would link to changing climate. The ACOM Chair hoped that the science expert groups would response positively to wishes for assistance from the groups that address this request. It will be very difficult to answer the DG Env request without such inputs. The ACOM chair noted that the final agreement has not been signed and that the structure that ICES shall work within is still under discussion with DG Env and EC JRC.

15 Update from Awards Committee

The Chair gave a brief update from the Awards Committee. See **Annex 6**.

Developing guiding principles for posthumous memorial sessions

Inspired by the theme session proposal for 2010 “Standing on the shoulders of Giants: The living legacy of the work of Rodney Jones”, the **Awards Committee recommends** theme sessions that would recognize the contributions and influence of a deceased, outstanding scientist on the evolution of marine and fisheries science.

The Awards Committee **did not recommend** future posthumous memorial sessions at the ASC.

The Awards Committee **did recommend** that a moment of silence be included in the Opening Session to recognise deceased colleagues, but without identifying the individuals who had passed away.

Awards Committee membership

The Council-appointed members (Ed Houde and Carmela Porteiro) can continue to serve as Awards Committee members but, after 31 December 2008, there will be no formal members from the Consultative Committee.

Action: The Secretariat will request that appointment of new members to the Awards Committee be on the agenda of the new Science Committee.

ConC noted the report from the Awards Committee and the recommendation related to posthumous memorial sessions.

16 Update from Working Group on Data and Information Management (WGDIM)

Helge Sagen, Co-Chair of WGDIM, presented the WGDIM highlights. He explained that WGDIM is still struggling to maintain being a user-oriented data group. The group originates from a merger between the Marine Data Management WG (WGMDM) and Study Group of Management of Integrated Data SGMID. The first meeting saw a higher number of data managers than users, and in comparison at this year's meeting almost 50% of the participants were data users.

WGDIM has made a recommendation for the Data Centre to develop GIS and associated user-focused data products.

ConC had tasked WGDIM to make a multiannual workplan to attract more users. Theme Session R is aiming to attract active users and get feedback on the proposed workplan.

WGMDM had provided guidelines for good data management practice which now are taken over and updated by WGDIM. This year a bookmark has been prepared for inclusion in the conference bags to promote the WG and the guidelines.

Future work includes 35 action points to complete. Next meeting scheduled for May 2009 at ICES HQS.

The question was raised whether there is an overlap with the Working Group on Operational oceanographic products for fisheries and environment [WGOOFE]. The OCC Chair, Luis Valdes, suggested that Helge Sagen should join the OCC Committee to see if there should be a merger.

The LRC Chair pointed to the fact that different countries have different preferences, some have national databases, and some don't. At the European level data base integration is an issue. The EU wants to have regional databases. What is the strategy of WGDIM to deal with this? The WGDIM Chair replied that all national members handle the national data. Running distributed systems while integrating different databases is one possible system. It would need a common interface to allow compatibility. The ICES Data Centre is discussing how to use distributed systems. There is also a question of duplication. Integrated systems are connecting several types of data into one database, like the ICES data centre does in the Ecosystem Database. Distributed systems on the other hand are connecting separate databases usually on different geographic locations. This is an ongoing process. An example is Seadatanet, (<http://www.seadatanet.org>), joining 35 countries in a virtual data centre where each country can manage their own data within the same virtual database system.

The question of maps as much asked-for products and whether the ICES data centre should develop facilities to produce them was raised by the General Secretary. The WGDIM Chair replied that if we look at how countries are working, there are more and more requests for maps as part of the data management services. Many institutes demand data centres to disseminate their data as GIS products on the internet. This is often achieved by making a WMS Web Map Services layer on top of the database system. Certain GIS skills are required for this. WMS capable systems are not only available through expensive GIS analyses systems. Open Source systems are also available. They make it possible to put GIS products on the web at a reasonable cost. It is necessary to develop geographical products before they can be disseminated by using WMS systems.

The interim Chair asked for direct input from ConC members to the list of proposed workshops. There are crosscutting themes that would require input from several groups and committees. OCC Chair commented that reconstruction of time series / data assimilation could be added to "Demonstration of cases to show possibilities".

The ACOM Chair pointed to implications for advisory needs with one major theme on the advisory side being the expectation of managers to have evaluation of spatial planning activities on the EU level. Data base applications would make such an evaluation much more operational. VMS and other fisheries data would need to be visualized to see conflicts or impacts.

RMC suggested to add one additional ToR for WGDIM to work towards making the "ICES Year of the Stomach" datasets for North Sea and Baltic more readily available to the ICES community. This will require the creation of a standardized and quality-controlled version of the data including an updated look-up key for prey codes. ConC agreed to this suggestion

17 **PUB proposal for update of guidelines for producing highlights (EGs and Theme Sessions)**

Andy Payne, representative for Publication Committee, presented the recommendation from the Publication Committee for producing highlights, including recommendation that this be circulated to all EG Chairs and TS conveners:

Guideline for the Production of Executive Summaries

ICES Working, Study and Advisory Groups, as well as ICES-supported Workshops, produce a large number of valuable documents each year. Many of these are very long (up to 1000 pp.). As much of the target audience will not have time to read a full report, it is *imperative* that these documents open with a clear, succinct, and factual Executive Summary that presents the key issues addressed in the main report.

Executive Summaries should not exceed 500 words (1 page), unless the report is very complicated and lengthy, when up to 1000 words (2 pages) is acceptable. The latter is, however, the exception rather than the rule.

Executive Summaries *should* include:

- the name and the date of the meeting (the latter is very important in terms of meetings held regularly);
- the name of the chairperson, the number of participants, and the number of nations represented;
- the formal mandate and objectives of the meeting (in brief; about 50 words);
- the approach taken at the meeting;
- a description of the structure of the report;
- the main message in terms of:
 - what was achieved
 - progress towards overall objectives
 - implications of the findings
 - limitations of the findings, especially in terms of uncertainties
 - future perspectives as a consequence of the findings.

- key recommendations and, where necessary, the timeframe for action or decision.

Executive Summaries *should not* include:

- vague statements;
- self-congratulation;
- point-form lists without adequate context;
- pasted in full terms of reference;
- chronological descriptions of the action being summarized;
- jargon and acronyms (write for the general reader and use full titles and wording);
- lists of the complete membership of the Working Group/Panel or the name of the rapporteur;
- lengthy descriptions of methodology;
- lengthy background introductions.

Comments:

The highlights of Expert Group reports are a central element especially as most reports are difficult to read for non-experts and bulky. Highlights are used by our customers, busy decision-makers, and among the ICES community. Some Committee Chairs were surprised to learn that some groups are not producing them. The Secretariat should inform these groups and make sure they are included. The ConC Chair commented that this has been an issue in ConC for many years. Letters are sent to all EG Chairs, but the guidelines are not always followed. Therefore it was to be very appropriate to do the exercise again from another angle.

In terms of communication, it may be useful to have a link on ICES website to all Executive Summaries. From the Executive Summary it will link to the report.

ACOM raised the question of including the name of the EG Chair in the summary? On the advisory side it is counterproductive to have the name of the Chair in the Executive Summary as advice is provided in the name of ICES. These should be guidelines, but there could be good reasons not to follow them strictly.

Recommendation and action: ConC approved the guidelines. The Secretariat was tasked to phrase a letter, explaining the importance of producing good guidelines and attach the guidelines recommended by Publications Committee.

18 Review of ICES activities

18.1 Aberdeen Plus Partnership

HoS updated ConC on the activities of the Aberdeen Plus Partnership. The kick-off meeting of the Task Force was held at the ICES Headquarters in June as a continuation of the Aberdeen process. The Chair will be rotating among members, currently the partnership is chaired by ICES. The ESF Marine Board will coordinate the response to a call for a CSA released by the EC, for a platform to act as permanent structure to coordinate the network of networks representing the Aberdeen plus partnership. The Task Force decided to continue its work based on the mandate given during the meeting in Brussels 2008.

The issue of representation of partners in the Task Force was discussed. ICES was asked by EUR-OCEANS, SeaDataNet and ESONet to represent them in the partnership. Others, for example Marbef and Marine Genomics Europe are represented by MARS, the network of litoral research stations in Europe. During the last meeting in August, the Task Force noted that some networks were not in the partnership, such as the oil and gas industry, tourism, regional cooperation and urban areas. This needs completion over the coming months. On the other hand, other organization have duplicate representation though several networks.

18.2 Report from SGCC (Luis Valdes)

Luis Valdes presented the SGCC Report and proposed ToRs for 2009. The list of contents is the result of recommendations from the Oceanography Committee proposed at the last ASC, supported by ConC and approved by Council, committing the Chair of OCC to prepare a draft plan. First step was to select the members, i.e. Chairs of EGs who were involved in producing the response to the OSPAR request on climate change and change in distribution patterns. The Chairs of SciCom and ACOM are welcomed as *ex officio* members.

The preliminary list of items (the discussion will continue by email) was addressed during the ASC, allocating the items listed below to appropriate EGs. Some theme sessions were proposed for next year's ASC. The ToRs endorsed for different EGs will be worked on this year. SGCC will prepare a final draft for the ASC.

18.3 Climate conference in Copenhagen

A letter was sent by the General Secretary in response to the invitation to the event and as recommended by ConC. ICES has asked for two slots at the climate conference to present the main conclusions from the Gijon ICES Climate Change Symposium and from the 2008 ASC, respectively. ConC decided to appoint two speakers: the Chair of SGCC for the former and the ConC Chair for the latter topic.

19 SciCom ToRs and date for mid-term meeting 2009

ConC proposes the second or third week for the first meeting of the SciCom. Conc agreed on a proposed set of Terms of Reference for SciCom, since the Council will have the final word. The proposed Tors are given in **Annex 7**.

20 Any other business

20.1 Coding of ToRs

The LRC Chair had suggested to code the ToRs given to Expert Groups to allow for a better tracing. The LRC was sceptical towards the proposed thesaurus, but liked the idea of coding the different types of requests.

ConC felt it would be a good idea to introduce a coding system but at the same time felt that this should be dealt with and elaborated by the new SciCom.

Action: SciCom should consider preparing a coding system for ToRs

20.2 Proposal from ESSAS for ICES involvement

During the ASC the First Vice President and the Head of Science were approached by ESSAS representatives, suggesting better and stronger involvement of ICES in ESSAS work. The Head of Science Programme explained the background. The next couple of

years will see dramatic changes in the Arctic ocean as indicated by 2008 seeing the second lowest level in summer ice coverage on record. Some of the key areas such as the overflow ridge and the Siberian shelf are strictly ICES territory but ICES is not involved in Arctic research. An IPY initiative in 2004 out of WGOH did not make it to fruition. At the same time the Arctic, the polar bridge is an ideal vehicle to bring the ICES and PICES science communities closer together.

ESSAS is a subarctic regional initiative of GLOBEC. They organize their work in four workshops with a series of activities each, culminating in a symposium in 2012. ESSAS is the lead consortium of the IPY initiative. So it would also bring us back into the IPY activities. The proposal foresees travel money for ICES scientists to join ESSAS events. The proposal can be developed into a work plan over three years for consideration by the SIF. The anticipated volume is 98,000 U\$ over three years.

Positive comments were made by the FTC Chair. They already see strong benefits of cross regional collaboration in an ad hoc way and making cooperation more formal was considered to be desirable to communities. The costs of facilitating this was seen as being modest.

The General Secretary had critical remarks. Cooperation is fine but is likely not to go through. Council bases its decisions on how ICES works. What travel is funded by member states and what travel is funded by Council, that is through the SIF. So granting funding to meetings other than ICES could be an issue. We should show our interest, make clear this is a kickoff and apply for funding to make the start. This was supported by the ConC Chair.

Recommendation: ConC is positive to develop closer cooperation with the ESSAS community and recommends that an ESSAS representative be invited to the SciCom meeting to present the proposal and that ICES be represented in the ESSAS steering committee. The plan and proposal shall be mentioned to Council and the presentation for consideration for SIF funding will be postponed until 2009.

20.3 Funding of academics under the new science structure

Initially, this item goes back to a request received from the Chair of the Study Group on Biodiversity Science (SGBIODIV). Due to the nature of the subject, the work of the group depends partly on participation of academics who are in need of funding for travel and subsistence during the meeting. The issue was raised here by the Head of Science Programme, because the problem may emerge in future groups related to areas in the science plan which are new to ICES. In principle, ICES cannot fund participation in Expert Groups, unless they are explicitly invited by the secretariat. It would be good to have some thinking now and perhaps a general policy on how to deal with the problem in the future.

Lack of support for participation in ICES activities by academics has been identified as an area of concern by the US. Even if additional funding is not available, it is important that we focus on developing ways to make ICES more attractive to the academic community.

LRC commented that academics do not generally receive recognition for authorship of ICES publications (such as CRRs and CMs) so this discourages them from participating in ASCs and EG meetings.

Conclusion: ConC is concerned about the participation of academics. ConC recommends that the new SciCom takes on the problem and find ways to better attract academics into the ICES community.

20.4 Artificial Markets for Quantitative Prediction in Ecology

The Chair of RMC presented ConC Doc 22 “Artificial Markets for Quantitative Prediction in Ecology” proposed by Daniel C. Reuman, Simon Jennings, Laurence Kell. (see **Annex 8**).

Action: The RMC Chair was tasked to draft a letter to the proposers thanking for the interesting idea and inviting them to submit a more detailed and budgeted proposal.

21 Closing

The Chair thanked all Committee Chairs for attending and contributing actively to this meeting and expressed his satisfaction that Consultative Committee has reached agreement on a number of recommendations for the new Science Committee. Thanks were also extended to the HoS for his support during the ASC and before the meeting and to the Supporting Secretary for her support during the last four years. Through the four past years, the changing members have always been very positive and constructive. The Chair had enjoyed his work as Chair of ConC and would always have good memories of this committee and period of his life.

The General Secretary thanked Harald Loeng for serving on the ICES Consultative Committee for four years and commented on his pleasant way of running the show, always allowing discussions and then wrapping up with conclusions. Although we are not quite sure what we will get, we look forward to working with the new Sci-Com, but we will also look back to the good old days in ConC.

Annex 1: List of Participants

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX/EMAIL
Ian Bricknell, Chair of Mariculture Committee (MCC)	University of Maine at Machias 9 O'Brien Avenue Machias ME 04654-1397 United States	Phone +12073564119 or +12075814315 Email ian.bricknell@umit.maine.edu
Mark Dickey-Collas, Chair of Resource Management Committee (RMC)	IMARES, Wageningen UR P.O. Box 68 NL-1970 AB IJmuiden Netherlands	Phone +31 255 56 46 85 Fax +31 255 56 46 44 Email Mark.dickeycollas@wur.nl
Bill Karp, Chair of Fisheries Technology Committee (FTC)	National Marine Fisheries Services Alaska Fisheries Science Center 7600 Sand Point Way N.E., Building 4 Seattle WA 98115 United States	Phone +1 206 526 4000 Fax +1 206 526 4004 Email bill.karp@noaa.gov
Harald Loeng, Chair of Consultative Committee	Institute of Marine Research P.O. Box 1870 N-5817 Bergen Norway	Phone +47 55 238466 Fax +47 55 238687 Email harald.loeng@imr.no
Tom Noji, Chair of Marine Habitat Committee (MHC)	National Marine Fisheries Services Northeast Fisheries Science Center 74 Magruder Road Sandy Hook Highlands NJ 07732 United States	Phone +1 732 872 3025 / 24 Fax +1 732 872 3068 Email thomas.noji@noaa.gov
Andy Payne, representing Publications Committee (PUB)	Andrew Payne Centre for Environment, Fisheries & Aquaculture Science Lowestoft Laboratory Pakefield Road NR33 0HT Lowestoft Suffolk United Kingdom	Email andy.payne@cefas.co.uk
Ted Potter, Chair of Diadromous Fish Committee (DFC)	Centre for Environment, Fisheries & Aquaculture Science Lowestoft Laboratory Pakefield Road NR33 0HT Lowestoft Suffolk United Kingdom	Phone +44 1502 562244 Fax +44 1502 513865 Email ted.potter@cefas.co.uk
Pierre Petitgas, Chair of Living Resources Committee (LRC)	IFREMER Nantes Centre P.O. Box 21105 F-44311 Nantes Cédex 03 France	Phone +33 240 37 40 00 Fax +33 240 37 40 75 Email pierre.petitgas@ifremer.fr

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX/EMAIL
Mike Sinclair, First Vice President	Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans Bedford Institute of Oceanography P.O. Box 1006 Dartmouth NS B2Y 4A2 Canada	Email sinclairm@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Mike Sissenwine, Chair of the Advisory Committee (ACOM)	500 Harborview Drive Baltimore MD 21230 United States	Phone +1 508 566 3144 Email m.sissenwine@ices.dk
Luis Valdés, Chair of Oceanography Committee (OCC)	Instituto Español de Oceanografía Centro Oceanográfico de Gijón Avenida Príncipe de Asturias, 70 bis E-33212 Gijón, Asturias Spain	Phone +34 985 308 672 Fax + 34 985 326 277 Email luis.valdes@gi.ieo.es
Yvonne Walther, Chair of Baltic Committee (BCC)	Swedish Board of Fisheries Institute of Marine Research Utövägen 5 SE-371 37 Karlskrona Sweden	Phone +46 455 362 852 Email yvonne.walther@fiskeriverket.se
Gerd Hubold, General Secretary	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	gerd@ices.dk
Adi Kellermann, Head of Science Programme	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	adi@ices.dk
Vivian Piil, Departmental Secretary, Science Programme	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	vivian@ices.dk
Wojciech Wawrzynski, Professional Secretary for Scientific Cooperation (Saturday, 20 September)	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea	wojciech@ices.dk
Vasiliy Sokolov, Russian Delegate (Saturday, 20 September)	Vasili Sokolov Russian Federal Research Institute of Fisheries & Oceanography 17 Verkhne Krasnoselskaya RU-107140 Moscow Russian Federation	Phone 499-2648374, Fax 499-2649387 Email vsokolov@vniro.ru

Annex 2: ConC Draft Agenda and Timetable

Venue: Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada

Saturday, 20 September: 10:00–17:00, Room 302

Sunday 28 and Monday 29 September: 09:00–1800, Rooms 201 and 2

- 1) Opening
- 2) Adoption of agenda and timetable (**Doc 1**)
- 3) Minutes of Consultative Committee May meeting (**Doc 2**)
 - 3.1) Response from the Bureau
 - 3.2) Follow-up on actions agreed at the Consultative Committee May meeting
- 4) General arrangements for Annual Science Conference 2008
 - 4.1) Draft resolutions
 - 4.2) Elections of new Committee Chairs
 - 4.3) Requests to Science and Advisory Committees:
 - 4.3.1) Theme Sessions in 2009
 - 4.3.2) Key note speaker 2009
 - 4.4) Preparation of Committee Reports
 - 4.5) ASC Award Selection Committee
- 5) ICES Strategic Plan (**Doc 3**)
- 6) Reform of Science Structure (**Doc 4, 5, 6, 7**)
- 7) Training in ICES (**Doc 8 and 9**)
- 8) Websites for Science Committees
- 9) Lessons learned from 2008 ASC
- 10) Development of programme for the 2009 ASC (Berlin, Germany) (**Doc 10**)
 - 10.1) Funding of young scientists and young fishermen
 - 10.2) Meeting arrangements
 - 10.3) Review of proposed Theme Sessions (**Doc 11**)
 - 10.4) Invited lectures and other special events
- 11) Development of programme for the 2010 ASC (Nantes, France) (**Doc 10**)
 - 11.1) Meeting arrangements
 - 11.2) Review of proposed Theme Sessions (**Doc 12**)
 - 11.3) Invited lectures and other special events
- 12) 2008 Draft Resolutions (see ConC Sharepoint)
- 13) Review the status of ICES Symposia (**Doc 13, 14 and 19**)
- 14) Progress reports from Publications, Science Committees and ACOM
- 15) Update from Awards Committee (**Doc 15**)
- 16) Update from Working Group on Data and Information Management (WGDIM) (**Doc 16**)
- 17) PUB proposal for update of guidelines for producing highlights (EGs and Theme Sessions)
- 18) Review of ICES activities
 - 18.1) Aberdeen Plus Partnership

- 18.2) Report from SGCC (Luis Valdes) (**Doc 17**)
- 18.3) Climate conference in Copenhagen
- 19) ConC ToRs and date for mid-term meeting 2009 (**Doc 18**)
- 20) Any other business
 - 20.1) Coding of ToRs
- 21) Closing

Annex 3: Draft Training in ICES: action plan 2009-2010

By: Martin Pastoors, Mark Dickey-Collas, Ted Potter, Adi Kellerman

Background

At its October 2006 meeting, ConC discussed the subject of training of scientists who do work in support of the ICES advisory system. A paper presented by the Chair of RMC in 2006 pointed out, having discussed the report of the WKAFAT, that ICES needs to ensure that scientists who do work related to the advisory process, have the necessary skills. ICES has an obligation to ensure that training and education is available as needed.

Objectives

The overall objectives of ICES involvement in training is quality assurance in the advisory process. Specifically the training program should:

- ensure that participants in WGs and other parts of the advisory process have the skill needed to deliver high quality advice,
- ensure a common understanding of ICES advisory practise,
- disseminate insight throughout and outside the ICES community,
- intensify cooperation with expertise from other organizations to bring in new disciplines and perspectives in ICES science and advice.

Proposed system

The ICES training system should be a distributed system that links in to national expertise on teaching (national institutes, universities) and will be additive to existing training programs. The ICES training program should not compete with existing national educational institutions but should rather fill the gaps of marine scientists operating in the advisory process.

The ICES training program will consist of an administrative core placed in the Secretariat and a "Training Committee". The individual courses will be developed and taught by experts recruited from the national laboratories, universities and other institutions like FAO or research networks. The task of the (half time) administrative core is to assist in the organizations of courses and to supply guidance on the maintenance of information for the courses. The Training Committee will oversee the training program and set up guidelines to identify the appropriate educational partners that should be involved in specific courses.

Training courses can be either held at the ICES headquarters or at another location to be organized by the educational partners.

All training courses should be made available through internet, so that distributed learning could also be an option.

Courses for 2009 and 2010

The training committee has identified the following courses for 2009 and 2010 **but is open for further suggestions by the ICES Scientific Committees:**

- Advice context, content and communication (writing and presentation skills, reaching out to the wider public)

- Chairing of advisory (expert) groups (handling stakeholder participation, conflict resolution)
- Management Strategy Evaluation (including FLR?)
- Stock assessment (introduction)
- Stock assessment (advanced)
- Bayesian techniques for stock assessment (including communication of results)
- Survey design and evaluation

Involving potential partners

After acceptance of the Action Plan on Training by CONC and the Council, a letter of invitation will be sent to ICES delegates to ask for contributions by different national or international partners to organize the different courses outlined above. The training committee will select the appropriate partners to organize the courses in 2009 and 2010.

Financial implications

The expenses related to the Secretariat tasks and to the training committee are covered by the ICES Strategic Investment Fund (SIF). Participants in training activities pay a fee which shall cover the direct expenses of preparing and teaching of that activity. Training activities approved by ICES shall be open to participation from all members of ICES, by appointment by the relevant Delegate, and to participation from the partner institution involved in providing the expertise.

For a long-term operation, funding will be sought from partner organizations and from the EC.

Budget: to be done

Annex 4: ASC Theme Sessions 2009

THEME SESSION	CONVENERS
Biochemical, biogeochemical, and molecular approaches to the study of plankton ecology and species diversity	Steve Hay (UK), Janna Peters (Germany), and Ann Bucklin (USA)
Beyond geolocation: Inferring and explaining the behavior of tagged fish	Uffe Høgsbro Thygesen (Denmark), Molly Lutcavage (USA)
Advances in marine ecosystem research: what we have learned from GLOBEC and what we can carry forward in future climate related programs.	Geir Ottersen, Norway, Keith Brander, Denmark and Mike Fogarty (US)
Trends in Chlorophyll and Primary Production in a warmer North Atlantic	Antonio Bode (Spain), two more to be determined
Climate Impacts on Marine Fishes: Discovering Centennial Patterns and Disentangling Current Processes	Brian MacKenzie, Corinna Schrum, Myron Peck, plus one convener from PICES (to be nominated)
How does fishing alter marine population's and ecosystem's sensitivity to climate?	B. Planque (Norway), NN
Comparative study of climate impact on coastal and continental shelf ecosystems in the ICES area: assessment and management	Juergen Alheit, Germany; Stephen Brown, USA; Ken Drinkwater, Norway
What do fish learn in schools? Life cycle diversity within populations, mechanisms and consequences	Dave Secor (USA), Pierre Petitgas (France), Ian McQuinn (Canada), Steve Cadrin (USA)
Monitoring requirements, observation technologies and methods (e.g. acoustics) for pelagic organisms at local and basin scales for input into ecosystem based fisheries management assessments	Olav Rune Godø (Norway), Verena Trenkel (France), Martin Dorn (US)
Integration of individual based information into fishery and environmental management applications	David Somerton, (US), and David Righton (UK)
Habitat Science to Support Stock Assessment	Thomas Noji (USA), Pierre Pepin (Canada), Geir Huse (Norway)
Bringing collaborative science – industry research data into stock assessment and fishery management: evaluating progress and future options.	Mike Armstrong, UK, and Bill Karp, US
Avoidance of Bycatch and Discards: Technical Measures, Projects and State of Data	Lisa Borges, (EC), C. Zimmermann (vTI-OSF, Germany)
Quality and Precision of Basic Data Underlying Fish Stock Assessment and Implications for Fisheries Management Advice	E. Jardim (Portugal), Philippe Moguedet (Belgium), and David Balfour (Canada)
Experiences in including economic and social information to fisheries analysis and advice: Why, How and by Whom ?	Sakari Kuikka (Finland), Doug Wilson (Denmark), Rita Curtis (US)
Ecological foodweb and network analysis: a tool for ecosystem-based management?	Andrea Belgrano, Christian Möllmann and Ulrich Brose
Interactions between Aquaculture and Wild Stocks: Comparative Experiences for Atlantic Cod and Atlantic Salmon	Edward Trippel (Canada), Terje Svåsand (Norway) and Einar Nielsen (Denmark)
Potential changes in the EU Common Fisheries Policy: Implications for science	Poul Degnbol, European Commission and Martin Pastoors, Netherlands

Reserve List:

THEME SESSION TITLE	CONVENERS
Death in the sea - Mortality in the zooplankton and early-life stages of marine fish (estimates, processes and outcomes).	A. Gallego, E. D. Houde, E. W. North
Monitoring biological effects and contaminants in the marine environment: where do we go from here?	John Thain (United Kingdom), Catherine Couillard (Canada), Dick Vethaak (The Netherlands).

Special evening session:

THEME SESSION TITLE	CONVENERS
Presenting scientific and advisory results: best practices	Sarah Kraak (Ireland) and Martin Pastoors (Netherlands)

Annex 5: Draft List of ICES SciCom Expert Groups dissolved, established, changed committee or renamed by virtue of the 96th Statutory Meeting

Type of Action	Name	Chair – Outgoing	Chair – Incoming
<i>Change of Chairs</i>			
<i>Expert Groups</i>			
MCC	Working Group on Shellfish Aquaculture [WGMASC]	Peter Cranford, Canada	Pauline Kamermans, the Netherlands
MCC	Working Group on Environmental Interactions of Mariculture [WGEIM]	Francis O’Beirn, Ireland	Chris McKindsey, Canada
OCC	Working Group on Zooplankton Ecology [WGZE] (Astthor Gislason, Iceland	M. C. Benfield, USA
OCC	Working Group on Oceanic Hydrography [WGOH]	Sheldon Bacon & Penny Holliday, UK	Glenn Nolan, Ireland, and Hedinn Valdimarsson, Iceland
RMC	Planning Group on Northeast Atlantic Pelagic Ecosystem Surveys [PGNAPES]	Alexander Krysov, Russia	Sytse Ybema, the Netherlands
LRC	Planning Group on North Sea Cod and Plaice Egg Surveys in the North Sea [PGEGBS]	C. Fox, UK	Cindy van Damme, The Netherlands
LRC	Working Group on <i>Crangon</i> Fisheries and Life History [WGCRAN]	Andy Revill	Ingrid Tulp, The Netherlands
LRC	Working Group on Fish Ecology [WGFE]	Daniel Duplisea, Canada	Dave Kulka, Canada
LRC	Working Group on Mackerel and Horse Mackerel Egg Surveys [WGMEGS]	Paula Alvarez, Spain	Jens Ulleweit, Germany
MHC	Working Group on Marine Sediments in Relation to Pollution [WGMS]	Foppe Smedes, The Netherlands	Patrick Roose, Belgium and Lucia Vinas, Spain
MHC	Working Group on Marine Habitat Mapping [WGMHM] (C	David Connor, UK	J. Populus, France
MHC	Benthos Ecology Working Group [BEWG]	Heye Rumohr, Germany	S. Degraer, Belgium
BCC	Study Group for the Development of Integrated Monitoring and Assessment of Ecosystem Health in the Baltic Sea (SGEH)	E. Andrulowicz, Poland	Kari Lehtonen, Finland
<i>Established/ Re-established</i>			
DFC	Group on Anguillid Eels in Saline Waters [SGAESAW]		David Cairns, Canada
DFC	Study Group on Salmon Stock Assessment and Forecasting [SGSSAFE]		Gerald Chaput, Canada
DFC	Study Group on the identification of biological characteristics for use as predictors of salmon abundance [SGBICEPS]		Ian Russell, UK
DFC	Workshop on Learning from Salmon Tagging Records [WKLUSTRE]		Lars Petter Hansen, Norway

Type of Action	Name	Chair – Outgoing	Chair – Incoming
DFC	A Transition Group on the Science Requirements to Support Conservation, Restoration and Management of Diadromous Species [TGRECORDS]		Ted Potter, UK
FTC	Joint Workshop of the ICES-FAO Working Group on Fishing Technology and Fish Behaviour [WGFTFB] and the Working Group on Fisheries Acoustics Science and Technology [WGFAST] [JFATB]		Paul Winger, Canada, Emma Jones, New Zealand and Julia Parish, USA
FTC	A Study Group on Turned 90° Codend Selectivity, focusing on Baltic Cod Selectivity [SGTCOD]		Bent Hermann, Denmark and Waldemar Moderhak, Poland
FTC	Transition Group for Technology Expert Group Coordination and Planning [TGTECH]		Bill Karp, USA
OCC	Working Group on Operational oceanographic products for fisheries and environment [WGOOFE]		Morten Skogen, Norway, Mark Dickey-Collas, the Netherlands
OCC	Joint PICES/ICES Working Group on Forecasting Climate Change Impacts on Fish and Shellfish [WGFCCIFS]		A. Hollowed, USA, Manuel Barange, UK, Suam Kim, Korea, and Harald Loeng, Norway
RMC	Study Group on the History of Fish and Fisheries [SGHIST]		Bo Poulsen and Martin Pastoors, The Netherlands
LRC	Study Group on <i>Nephrops</i> Surveys [SGNEPS]		Ewen Bell, UK
LRC	Transition-Group on Integrating Surveys for the Ecosystem Approach [TGISUR]		D. Reid, UK
LRC	Transition-Group on Holistic Ecosystem Assessments and Diagnostics [TGHEAD]		C. Mollmann, Germany, P. Petitgas, France
BCC	Transition Group of Integration Activities in the Baltic (TGBALT)		Yvonne Walther, Sweden

New Workshops

OCC	Workshop on Understanding and quantifying mortality in fish early-life stages: experiments, observations and models [WKMOR]		A. Gallego, UK, E. North, USA, and E. Houde, USA,
DFC/ACOM	Workshop on Age Reading of European and American Eel [WKAREA]		Françoise Daverat, France, Hakan Wickström, Sweden, Russell Poole, Ireland, and John Casselman, Canada
RMC	PGNAPES Scrutiny of Echograms Workshop [WKECHOSCRU]		Alexander Krysov, the Russian Federation

Type of Action	Name	Chair – Outgoing	Chair – Incoming
----------------	------	------------------	------------------

New Workshops (continued)

RMC	Workshop on Blue Whiting Recruitment [WKBLUR]		Mark Payne, Denmark
LRC	Workshop on Mackerel and Horse mackerel egg staging and identification [WKMHMES]		Cindy van Damme*, The Netherlands)
LRC	Workshop on the Identification of Ichthyoplankton, especially Clupeid Larvae [WKIDCL]		Norbert Rohlf*, Germany
LRC	Workshop on Edge Effects in Nephrops Surveys [WKNepEdge]		Ewen Bell, UK
MHC	Workshop on Climate related Benthic Processes in the North Sea [WKCIBNS]		H. Reiss, Germany
BCC	Workshop on Combining Climatic Scenarios and Medium-Term Predictions for Baltic Herring and Sprat stocks [WKCSMPB]		M. Cardinale*, Sweden and Piotr Margonski*, Poland

EGS renamed

OCC	ICES-IOC Steering Group on GOOS [SGGOOS] will be renamed the ICES GOOS Steering Group [IGSG]	Antonio Bode, Spain	Jon Hare, USA
RMC	Study Group on Redfish Stocks [SGRS] will be renamed the Planning Group on Redfish Surveys [PGRS]	Andrey Pedchenko, Russia	A. Pedchenko, Russia and Benjamin Planque, Norway
LRC	Planning Group for Herring Surveys [PGHERS] will be renamed as the Planning Group of International Pelagic Surveys [PGIPS]	Norbert Rohlf, Germany	Norbert Rohlf, Germany

Dissolved Committees

	Consultative Committee [ConC]	Harald Loeng, Norway	
	Publications Committee [PUB]	Pierre Pepin, Canada	
	Fisheries Technology Committee [FTC]	William Karp, US	
	Oceanography Committee [OCC]	Luis Valdés, Spain	
	Resource Management Committee [RMC]	Mark Dickey-Collas, The Netherlands	
	Marine Habitat Committee [MHC]	Tom Noji, US	
	Mariculture Committee [MCC]	Ian Bricknell, US	
	Living Resources Committee [LRC]	Pierre Petitgas, France	
	Baltic Committee [BCC]	Yvonne Walther, Sweden	
	Diadromous Fish Committee [DFC]	Ted Potter, UK	

Type of Action	Name	Chair – Outgoing	Chair – Incoming
----------------	------	------------------	------------------

Disolved Expert Groups

MHC	ICES-IOC-SCOR Working Group on GEOHAB Implementation in the Baltic [WGGIB]	Markku Viitasalo, Finland	
MHC	Working Group on the Statistical Aspects of Environmental Monitoring	Richard Duin, The Netherlands	

Annex 6: Update from Awards Committee

21.1.1 Description and criteria for the Prix d'Excellence

The distinction between the Prix d'Excellence and the Outstanding Achievement Award should be emphasised. The Prix d'Excellence is the highest award, made every three years, and should be listed first in the description of awards on the ICES website. The Chair of Awards Committee will amend and clarify the description to better distinguish the two awards.

21.1.2 Good ideas to encourage nominations?

A discussion was held about how to encourage more nominations, especially for the Outstanding Achievement Award. The Awards Committee is hopeful that this year's presentations may encourage more nominations and might also set a benchmark for the expected standards.

21.1.3 For how long is a nomination active?

ICES will accept nominations for the next Prix d'Excellence Award in the period October 2008 to 1 June 2011. Requests to resubmit and reconsider a nomination for the Prix for the next award presentation can be made by communication with the Secretariat and Awards Committee.

ICES will encourage an annual presentation of the Outstanding Achievement Award. Requests to resubmit and reconsider a nomination in the following year can be made by communication with the Secretariat and Awards Committee.

There was a question about the proper route for submitting nominations for the Prix d'Excellence and Outstanding Achievement Awards. It was agreed that nominations can be made by individuals, including self-nominations, or by Expert Groups/Committees within ICES.

Developing guiding principles for posthumous memorial sessions

Inspired by the theme session proposal "Standing on the shoulders of Giants: The living legacy of the work of Rodney Jones", the Awards Committee recommends theme sessions that would recognize the contributions and influence of a deceased, outstanding scientist on the evolution of marine and fisheries science.

The Awards Committee did not recommend future posthumous memorial sessions at the ASC.

The Awards Committee did recommend that a moment of silence be included in the Opening Session to recognise deceased colleagues, but without identifying the individuals who had passed away.

21.1.4 Using SharePoint to better advantage

The Awards Committee agreed that the tool is useful and it would be even more useful in the future if there were numerous candidates. The Chair of the Awards Committee, together with the Secretariat, will consider ways to improve the tool to increase its utility.

21.1.5 Overall review and critique of our working procedure for the awards with an eye to improvement

During evaluations of candidates, we encourage better dialogue among Awards Committee members on the qualifications and relative strengths of candidates prior to the final votes.

21.1.6 Other business

The Council-appointed members (Ed Houde and Carmela Porteiro) can continue to serve as Awards Committee members but, after 31 December 2008, there will be no formal members from the Consultative Committee. The Secretariat will request that appointment of new members to the Awards Committee be on the agenda of the new Science Committee.

Annex 7: Proposed Terms of Reference for SciCom

2008/2/SCICOM01 The **Science Committee** [SCICOM] (Chair: to be announced) will meet at ICES Headquarters, Copenhagen, in January and May 2009, and in connection with the ASC 2009, to:

- a) Establish strategy and the structure for implementation of the ICES Science Plan:

By overseeing the scientific interests of the Council and its scientific work:

- b) identify the key areas for the ICES contribution to advances in marine science;
- c) review progress of activities of Expert Groups with a view to identifying key scientific issues;
- d) ensure that key scientific issues are addressed by the Expert Groups and that there are appropriate interactions between scientific disciplines;
- e) receive information and advise on the effectiveness of the information, dissemination and communication (specifically publications) functions of ICES.

By strengthening relations between Science and Advice:

- f) develop approaches for interaction between science and advice in order to collectively deliver the advisory and science programmes;
- g) communicate research results for inclusion in the advisory work at the strategic as well as the operational level.

By facilitating international work:

- h) develop plans for cooperation on issues as identified under b), c) and i) and identify durable working relationships with relevant organizations;

By initiating and supporting scientific conferences:

- i) review and update the arrangements for future Annual Science Conferences;
- j) review status of suggestions for ICES Symposia and prepare resolutions;

SciCom will make its report available for consideration at the October 2009 Statutory Meeting.

Annex 8: Artificial Markets for Quantitative Prediction in Ecology

Daniel C. Reuman, Simon Jennings, Laurence Kell

Introduction

The need to improve the predictive capacity of ecology, generally, and fisheries science, specifically, becomes ever more pressing as human impacts increasingly influence complex ecosystems and the services they provide. Recent research has demonstrated that artificial markets have the capacity to aggregate information, providing predictions superior to those that can be provided by any individual market participant. Competitive processes, including markets, are also well known to stimulate innovation, leading to measurable improvements in outcomes. The purpose of this document is to assess the interest of funders to support efforts to use artificial online artificial markets and competitive processes to test and improve quantitative ecological predictions, first of fisheries recruitment and later expanding to other ecological variables.

Background: markets can predict the future

Markets can aggregate incomplete and qualitative information held by multiple market participants: market-based predictions can be superior to those available from any individual participant or independent group. For instance, odds ratios on horse races and point spreads in ball games are excellent predictors of race or game outcomes, although individual bettors have incomplete knowledge of the complex physiological and sociological systems that determine winners (Hoerl & Fallin 1974). The Iowa Electronic Market, a futures market based on real-world events, has been shown to outperform political polls as a predictor of American presidential elections (Berg et al. 2008). A small-scale artificial market among sales clerks and other employees of the Hewlett-Packard Corporation was a better predictor of a variety of sales statistics than traditional methods used by the company (Chen & Plott 2002). A large and growing number of theoretical and experimental studies exist in addition to these examples (e.g., Forsythe & Lundholme 1990; Plott et al. 2003, Roust & Plott 2005, Axelrod et al. 2007).

Markets for predicting fisheries recruitment

We propose to establish online artificial markets on future cod and herring recruitment, as determined by ICES Working Groups following the 1st quarter (February) North Sea International Bottom Trawl Survey (IBTS). For cod the IBTS Q1 log-abundance index for 1-group cod may be used and for herring the index of 1-ringer recruitment in the North Sea. Markets will be constructed according to recent economic research (e.g., Roust & Plott 2005; Axelrod et al. 2007) and in consultation with fisheries scientists and economists to maximize predictive power and the potential commercial and intellectual value of market predictions. We here sketch one possible arrangement.

Markets may be opened annually in November, and closed in December, perhaps at a random time to help eliminate strategic last-minute betting that does not contribute to prediction (Plott et al. 2003; see also Axelrod et al. 2007). Separate markets may be constructed for predicting recruitment one, two, three, or more years in the future. Participation will be open broadly to all interested researchers and post-graduate students in marine science, ecology, or any related discipline, and perhaps also to members of the fishing industry active in the North Sea. Participants will be recruited

as broadly as possible, but will be required to have relevant expertise. An artificial market in a business setting with 20-30 participants had superior predictive performance to the state of the art (Chen & Plott 2002); we will seek to substantially exceed that number of participants.

Participants will be issued online accounts containing a quota of artificial money, here called ecodollars. The range of possible values of the future recruitment variables to be predicted will be divided into intervals, with contracts available for trade corresponding to each interval. Trading will utilize ecodollars. The distributions of market positions held by participants at the close of markets will furnish predictions for the future values of recruitment variables. After market closure, when recruitment variables are ultimately measured, contracts associated with the interval containing the true measured value will pay out (in ecodollars); other contracts will have zero value.

It is crucial to provide incentive for thoughtful market participation. After market resolution (after a market closes, the recruitment variable is measured, and payouts in ecodollars are made) ecodollars will be convertible to real currency, provided by the funder, at a fixed conversion rate. Ecodollars may also be transferable to still-open recruitment markets. Total liability of funders will be strictly limited by the number of ecodollars issued and the fixed conversion rate.

Mathematical models and prizes

A parallel system of direct prizes for researchers providing mathematical models will also be implemented. The prize system will provide further motivation for the thoughtful participation of researchers with expertise, while also implementing a simpler form of direct competition for comparison with the artificial markets.

Many predictive fisheries models cannot be compared directly and quantitatively to each other because they were created for different contexts. Researchers will be asked to produce predictive, reusable mathematical models of the specified future recruitment variables (or to adapt existing models to the specific context). It will be required that models be described in a short document and coded in the R programming language. Submitted models will be compared to each other and to reality as ultimately measured. Cash prizes will be awarded to the researchers whose models are most closely borne out by measurement. In addition to the cash prize, motivation in the form of prestige will be substantial, particularly for repeated success in an annual competition. Researchers submitting models will also be given a larger initial allocation of ecodollars for use in the markets. Competition may encourage participation by researchers not traditionally working in fisheries, stimulating innovation and challenging fisheries researchers to further improve the predictive nature of their research.

The predictive ability of models entered in the direct competition will be compared to market-based predictions to find out whether markets can predict recruitment better than individual experts. This will be new research, valuable to economists, and valuable to ecologists as a proof of concept before expanding the idea of market-based predictions to other ecological variables.

Long term vision

Markets could potentially be extended to a host of future ecological and environmental variables including variables describing: future population levels and recruitment of commercially valuable species other than cod and herring; biodiversity and extinction patterns in coming years; future deforestation rates in the Amazon

and elsewhere; damage that will be caused to a region by extreme weather events; future extent of sea ice (in possible shipping lanes north of Canada, in Greenland, and in polar regions); future population levels of threatened species such as the polar bear; water levels in heavily tapped rivers such as the Colorado River in future dry seasons; future extent of wildfires in dry, populated regions such as southern California; extent, location and timing of future outbreaks of specific insect pests.

Artificial markets could become self-sustaining in two ways. First, predictions may have commercial value, and could be sold to generate the prize money distributed to market participants. Second, if interest in markets is very substantial, participants could be required to place bets in real currency, rather than in ecodollars, and operational costs could be subtracted from total bets before distributing the remainder to winners (as in standard betting arrangements). Both alternatives for sustainability, and combinations thereof, will be carefully examined.

Level of support

Desired support for the project includes a small amount of salary support for the administrative, research, and technical personnel that will be required to construct and run the markets; prize money; and travel costs for the authors to give seminars to help publicize the markets for widespread participation. This support may be obtained from more than one source.

References

- 22) Axelrod, B.S., Kulick, B.J., Plott, C.R., Roust, K.A. (2007) Design improved parimutuel-type information aggregation mechanisms: Inaccuracies and the long-shot bias as disequilibrium phenomena. California Institute of Technology Social Sciences Working Paper 1268.
- 23) Berg, J.E., Nelson, F.D., Rietz, T.A. (2008) Prediction market accuracy in the long run. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 24, 283-298.
- 24) Chen, K.-Y., Plott, C.R. (2002) Information aggregation mechanisms: concept, design, and implementation for a sales forecasting problem. California Institute of Technology Social Sciences Working Paper 1131.
- 25) Forsythe, R., Lundholme, R. (1990) Information aggregation in an experimental market. *Econometrica*, 58, 309-347.
- 26) Hoerl, A.E. & Fallin, H.K. (1974) Reliability of subjective evaluations in a high-incentive situation. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, A*, 137, 227-230.
- 27) Plott, C.R., Wit, J., Yang, W.C. (2003) Parimutuel betting markets as information aggregation devices: experimental results. *Economic Theory*, 22, 311-351.
- 28) Roust, K.A., Plott, C.R. (2005) The design and testing of information aggregation mechanisms: A two-stage parimutuel IAM. California Institute of Technology Social Sciences Working Paper 1245.