

2014/MA2/SSGIEOM01 The Planning Group on Data Needs for Assessments and Advice (PGDATA), chaired by Mike Armstrong*, UK, and Marie Storr-Paulsen*, Denmark, will meet in Lysekil, Sweden, 30 June to 3 July 2015, to work on ToRs and generate deliverables as listed in the Table below.

	MEETING DATES	VENUE	REPORTING DETAILS	COMMENTS (CHANGE IN CHAIR, ETC.)
Year 2015	30 June – 3 July	Lysekil, Sweden	Interim report by 15 August 2015 to SSGIEOM, SCICOM & ACOM	
Year 20XX			Interim report by "DATE" to SSGIEOM, SCICOM & ACOM	
Year 20XX			Final report by "DATE" to SSGIEOM, SCICOM & ACOM	

ToR descriptors

ToR	DESCRIPTION	BACKGROUND	SCIENCE PLAN		EXPECTED DELIVERABLES
			TOPICS ADDRESSED	DURATION	
a	Design and test a Quality Assurance Framework for assessment EGs to evaluate data quality and its impact on assessments, particularly within the benchmarking process, and test this in regional case studies.	The ACOM/SCICOM assessment and advisory process needs to be based on a better understanding of the impacts of data quality. Build on experience in PGCCDBS, WKPICS, SGPIDS and other EGs; Establish close working with case study benchmark workshops; consult with WGCATCH, WGBIOP, WGISDAA, ICES Data Centre, other relevant SSGIEOM EGs & ACOM.		Year 1-3	Review of processes and outcomes of previous ICES benchmark data compilation and evaluation meetings, particularly in relation to data quality and how this was addressed in the subsequent assessment benchmark meetings. Draft Quality Assurance Framework for ICES benchmark assessments, with associated guidelines, examples and tools; Reports on case study evaluations.
b	Develop and test analytical methods for identifying improvements in data quality, or collections of new data, that have the greatest impacts on the quality of advice	Objective procedures are needed to identify where data quality improvements will have greatest impact on quality of advice. Build links with statistical experts within and external to ICES; establish workshops to develop and test methods. Consult with the intergrated assessment working groups		Year 2	Workshop Methods & software Case study results
c	engage with end users to	Assessment and advisory		Year 1 - 3	Consultation reports

	raise awareness of what types and resolution of management decisions (e.g. by fleet or area) can realistically be supported by present or proposed data collections	groups need to understand the limits imposed by the quality and resolution of data. Consultation needed with ICES EGs & SSGs, RCMs/RCGs; stakeholder Advisory Committees, European Commission and other RFMOs.		Documented guidelines
d	Advise on objective methods for evaluating requests by end-users for new or amended data collections within the new DCF/DC-MAP	Essential to prevent wastage of resources on inappropriate data collection. Consultation with ICES EGs & SSGs, STECF, RCMs/RCGs; stakeholder Advisory Committees, European Commission and other RFMOs. Establish workshops to develop / test methods.	Year 1 - 3	Consultation reports Documented guidelines
e	Plan workshops and studies focused on specific methodological development needs	Workshops and studies are effective for attracting people with specific skills.		Workshop reports

Summary of the Work Plan

Year 1	<p>Consolidate 3-year workplan; establish membership & skills needed; consultation within SSGIEOM on broader QAF implementation (e.g. surveys); establish links and working procedures with ICES EGs, ICES Data Centre, external bodies, external experts; develop draft QAF guidelines for benchmarks; work with test case benchmark in autumn 2015 (Irish Sea); first PG plenary meeting summer 2015. Specific ToRs for the plenary meeting will be to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Review all or a representative selection of previous ICES benchmark and associated data compilation and evaluation meetings to determine how these were implemented, focusing particularly on how (if at all) data quality was evaluated, how this information was utilised at the benchmark assessment meeting, how proposals for new work or data collection were arrived at and prioritised, and where there were shortfalls that need to be addressed through establishing a clearer framework for each type of benchmarking process. Review the responses to the data-quality questionnaires for discards estimates included in the 2015 data call for stock assessment EGs, and how the information was used by the EGs. Using the planned benchmark meeting for the Irish Sea (WKIRIS) as a test case, work with the assessment team to identify the data needed, and use this as a test case to develop an initial draft framework and guidelines for compilation and evaluation of relevant data for benchmark assessments, including provision of time series of data quality indicators (bias and precision) that can be incorporated directly in assessment models or used as supporting information. Clearly define the scope and working practices of PGDATA and identify the working relationships that PGDATA should establish within ICES (e.g. ICES SCICOM/ACOM Steering Groups; survey and other data collection EGs; assessment EGs; ICES Data Centre) and with external bodies. Review and adapt the work programme for the next two years of PGDATA, and develop the ToRs for the 2016 meeting. Consider the need for specific workshops prior to the 2016 core-group meeting, or study proposals to address PGDATA goals.
--------	---

Year 2	Planning and workshop to develop MSE-type tools for evaluating contribution of data quality to variance of assessment estimates and quality of advice, and evaluating relative impacts of data improvements; guidelines to other SSGIEOM EGs on QAF implementation; Further development and testing of QAF procedures in benchmarks; consultations with end users; 2nd PG meeting
Year 3	Review of progress / results in implementing QAF; further implementation in benchmarks; Methodological Workshop – developing and testing criteria for evaluating data needs and requests; consultations with end users on data needs; 3rd PG meeting; evaluate future PGDATA workplans.

Supporting information

Priority	This PG has high priority for improving the effectiveness of the ICES benchmarking process and the quality of ICES advice, and for ensuring the best use of available resources for data collection. An objective of the PG is to help ICES to develop advice using the most appropriate assessments given the quality of the data, and to be able to explain uncertainties in the assessments due to aspects of data quality and how these are reflected in the advice. This objective addresses single species, mixed fishery and multi-species assessments carried out by ACOM and SCICOM EGs, with particular focus on regional benchmarking. A further goal is to develop objective procedures to identify where data quality improvements will have greatest impact on quality of advice, and to ensure that proposals to collect new data or amend existing data collection schemes can be made in an informed way taking account of factors such as feasibility, methods for collection and use of the data, impact on advice, costs of data collection relative to precision, implications for regional sampling schemes or surveys, and how the quality of the data can be evaluated.
Resource requirements	The national science programmes which provide the main input to this group are already underway, and will need to commit resources to support participation of staff in the PG. Due to relevance of the PG to fishery management under the CFP and to the DC-MAP, use of national EMFF funds to co-finance involvement in the PG should be agreed as eligible.
Participants	The core PG participation required to address annual work plans and plenary meetings will require experts in statistics, sampling design, surveys, modelling, stock assessment, management strategy evaluation methods and other modelling approaches needed, DC-MAP implementation; and RCGs, and efforts are needed to ensure participation of experts directly involved in specific work areas, such as regional benchmark processes, which are being addressed. Other experts, including external experts from USA and elsewhere will be invited when required. EC DG-MARE involvement will be beneficial. A broader pool of experts and other national scientists will be identified for participation in meetings and workshops and to facilitate two-way communication between PGDATA and national institutes.
Secretariat facilities	Support needed from Secretariat involved in setting up benchmarks meetings
Financial	No financial implications.
Linkages to ACOM and groups under ACOM	This is a joint ACOM-SCICOM Expert group. There will be strong and direct linkages with ACOM and with assessment EGs involved in regional benchmarks targeted for case studies.
Linkages to other committee or groups	There will be a very close working relationship with all the groups of SSGIEOM and with ACOM benchmarking groups.
Linkages to other organizations	There will be linkages with STECF, RCMs/RCGs; stakeholder Advisory Committees, European Commission and other RFMOs