

## Theme Session S

### Presenting scientific and advisory results: best practices

---

#### ICES CM 2009/S:01

---

**The ICES Report on Ocean Climate: presenting the very latest information of the status and trends of sea temperature and salinity in the ICES Area of the North Atlantic and Nordic Seas.**

Sarah L. Hughes and N. Penny Holliday

(i) What is the ICES Report on Ocean Climate? An overview of the report, describing its aims and evolution and the various formats of presentation (report, posters flyers). (ii) Highlights/key messages: How can we pull out the key messages from complex datasets using overviews/maps and text and tailor the level of results for different audiences? (iii) Anomalies and baselines: The problems faced when trying to present time-series of different lengths to a common standard. (iv) The trouble with circulation maps: Summary maps provide good background information, but providing simplified information can also misinform. (v) Feedback and development: How to decide what to include without being sure of the needs of the target audience.

Keywords: ICES Report on Ocean Climate.

Contact author: S. L. Hughes, Fisheries Research Services, Marine Scotland, Aberdeen, UK [tel: +44 1224 876544, e-mail: s.hughes@marlab.ac.uk].

---

#### ICES CM 2009/S:02

---

**Presenting stock assessment results to fishery management councils and the public in the northeastern United States**

James R. Weinberg

The main peer review process for assessments of federally managed fish and invertebrate stocks in the northeast United States is the SAW/SARC (Stock Assessment Workshop/Stock Assessment Review Committee). Following each scientific peer review meeting, the SAW chairman publicly presents a summary of the assessment's results and conclusions in the context of the fishery management process. These presentations are given at Fishery Management Council meetings, and the audience includes fishery managers, NOAA's Northeast Regional Administrator, fishers, non-governmental organizations, and the general public. It is important that the public presentation of best available assessment science is clear because regulatory and management decisions are made at these Council meetings. In the current paper, I present an overview of those presentation approaches that have proven to be effective and those which should be avoided. In general, it works best to: simplify and emphasize major points, speak in plain terms and avoid jargon and acronyms, provide a summary of the talk to the audience ahead of time, leave time for questions, and follow-up later with answers to questions that could not be answered at the time. Slide presentations should emphasize the assessment's results, and use a limited number of colours and designs. Avoid saying that something is "interesting"; fishers' livelihoods are affected by the assessment results, and they can get impatient with a speaker whose main emphasis is that the results are scientifically "interesting". Finally, avoid making personal remarks about others, and don't take remarks from the audience personally.

Keywords: stock assessment, presentation, fishery management, SAW, SARC.

Contact author: James R. Weinberg, NOAA Fisheries, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, 166 Water St. Woods Hole, MA 02543, USA [e-mail: james.weinberg@noaa.gov].

---

**ICES CM 2009/S:03**

---

**Lecture, sales pitch, or InfoVis? Communicating the elements of decisions under uncertainty to support stakeholder processes**

Gottfried Pestal and Tatiana Tunon

Presentations of scientific information can be grouped into three basic types, based on the role of the presenter, the main direction of information flow, and the desired outcomes: (i) Lecture: Experts on a subject matter convey a body of knowledge. The focus is on getting information across, presentations tend to be longer and uninterrupted, and there is an implied obligation on the audience to grasp the material (e.g. one-day seminar on restoration techniques for salmon habitat). (ii) Sales pitch: Here the presenter seeks to trigger a specific course of action from the audience, tailoring both content and format towards that goal based on anticipated audience reactions (e.g. 5-minute pitch to solicit funding for a salmon habitat restoration project). (iii) Information visualization: These presentations focus on illustrating the full complexity of available information and pointing participants to user-friendly sources of more detail. Presentations to established stakeholder processes typically fall in this category. Presenters take on a facilitator's role, coaching participants along a learning curve towards fluent use of decision support materials, without deliberately pushing the debate towards a particular outcome (e.g. short introduction to an interactive tool for prioritizing habitat restoration projects). Three examples of interactive information visualizations are used here to initiate debate about the role of scientific information and subject matter experts in multi-interest planning processes: (i) tree maps of population metrics and recent trends, (ii) risk profiles of status and information quality, and (iii) decision trees explained through a sequence moving from narrative through colour coding to probability distributions.

Keywords: stakeholder process, tree map, risk profile, information visualization

Contact author: Gottfried Pestal, SOLV Consulting Ltd. [e-mail: gpestal@solv.ca].

---

**ICES CM 2009/S:04**

---

**Communicating science advice to diverse clients: experiences in North America and Europe"**

Jake Rice

Over the past 15 years a substantial part of my work responsibility has been the communication of science advice to officials in governments at regional, national, and international levels; to industry and ENGOP stakeholders; and to media and the general public. I will share my perspectives on factors that affect the impact that such advice has on the various target audiences. Key messages include: the need for consistency in messages to all audiences; the costs of delays sharing science conclusions with all audiences; the types of contextual information that can be useful or unhelpful in reaching various audiences; and the types of messages that are particularly hard to communicate, and what can help in those cases.

Keywords: none.

Contact author: Jake Rice, Ecosystem Sciences, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Ottawa, Canada [e-mail: Jake.rice@dfo-mpo.gc.ca].

---

**ICES CM 2009/S:05      Poster**

---

**Making ICES advice easier to understand and to produce: a new concept for the presentation of single-stock information**

Christopher Zimmermann, Martin Pastoors, Neil Holdsworth, and the ACOM subformat group

ICES single-stock summary sheets are the prime source of information on the status and perspective of Northeast Atlantic commercially exploited stocks. However, these documents are at present highly technical and so difficult to digest that the advice is restricted to only a small group of customers. A subgroup of the ICES Advisory Committee has developed a proposal for a new

layout, which would make the essence of the summary sheets much easier to understand. At the same time, the way in which the report is produced could be fundamentally changed. We propose the use of an up-to-date web-based content management system for formatting and production of graphs and printable documents to relieve scientists currently spending much time on copy-editing. We would like to receive input from the Theme Session S audience on the proposed format and procedure.

Keywords: discards, fisher's responsibility, deregulation.

Contact author: Christopher Zimmermann, Johann Heinrich von Thünen-Institut, Institute of Baltic Sea Fisheries, Alter Hafen Süd 2, 18069 Rostock, Germany [e-mail: christopher.zimmermann@vti.bund.de].

---

**ICES CM 2009/S:06      Withdrawn**

---