Working Group on Cephalopod Biology and Life History (WGCEPH)

2016/MA2/SSGEPD05 The Working Group on Cephalopod Biology and Life History (WGCEPH), chaired by Graham Pierce, Spain, and Jean-Paul Robin, France, will work on ToRs and generate deliverables as listed in the Table below.

	MEETING DATES	Venue	REPORTING DETAILS	COMMENTS (CHANGE IN CHAIR, ETC.)
Year 2017	6–9 June	Madeira, Portugal	Interim report by 1 September to SSGEPD	
Year 2018	5–8 June	San Sebastian, Spain	Interim report by 1 August to SSGEPD	
Year 2019	4–7 June	Athens, Greece	Final report by 1 August to SCICOM	

ToR descriptors

ToR	DESCRIPTION	BACKGROUND	SCIENCE PLAN CODES	Duration	EXPECTED DELIVERABLES
A	Report on cephalopod stock status and trends: Update, quality check and analyse relevant data on European fishery statistics (landings, directed effort, discards and survey catches) across the ICES area.	This task is fundamental to support the assessment task and will involve a Data Call.	5.2	Years 1, 2 and 3	Annual report
В	Conduct preliminary assessments of the main cephalopod species in the ICES area by means of trends and_or analytical methods. Assess the relevance of including environmental predictors.		1.3; 5.1; 6.1	Years 1, 2 and 3	Peer-reviewed manuscript on assessment methodologies and results (year 3)
C	Update information on life history parameters including variability in these parameters. Define cephalopod habitat requirements.	There is a need to undesrtand variability in life history parameters in the wild and to provide knowledge to support captive rearing.	1.7; 5.2	Years 1 and 2	Publication on rearing conditions and habitat preferences (Year 2)
D	Evaluate the social and economic profile of the cephalopod fisheries, with emphasis on small scale fisheries and mechanisms that add value to cephalopod products (e.g. certification).	There is a need to better quantify the social and economic of cephalopod fisheries across Europe.	5.8; 7.2	Year 1, 2 and 3	Report on social and economic importance of cephalopod fisheries (Year 3)
Е	Recommend tools for identification cephalopod species and update best practices for data collection.	Currently cephalopods are not consistently identified to species in commercial and survey catches.	1.6; 3.2	Year 1, 2 and 3	Manual for cephalopod field identification and data collection (Year 3)

Summary of the Work Plan

Year 1 (2017)	Report on updated trends in Cepahlopod landings and abundance indices .(a)		
	Report on updated cephalopod stock assessments (b)		
	Report on scientific articles in relation to life-history and habitat requirements (c)		
	Report on social and economic profile of cephalopod fisheries (d)		
	Report on available information for species identification (e)		
Year 2 (2018)	Report on status and trends in cephalopod stocks (a and b))		
	First draft of paper in relation to population modeling and assesment tools (b)		
	Peer review paper on rearing conditions and/or habitat preferences (c)		
	Report on mechanisms that add value to cephalopod products (e.g. certifications) (d)		
	Draft of Manual for cephalopod field identification and data collection (e)		
Year 3 (2019)	Report on updated trends in Cephalopod landings and abundance indices .(a)		
	Peer-review paper on cephalopod population modeling and assesment tools (b)		
	Report on socio-economic issues related to cephalopod management options		
	Manual for cephalopod field identification and data collection guidelines (e)		

Supporting information

Priority	The current activities of this Group will inform ICES about the role of Cephalopods in the ecosystem and evaluate their importance as part of directed and indirected fisheries. Cephalopods are important components of marine ecosystems, as predators and as prey, more important than their biomass might suggest due to their high productivity and large year-to-year variation in abundance. Cephalopod catches are replacing depleted finfish catches in some fisheries and ecological replacement is also hypothesised. Thus, for promoting the sustainable use of the seas and conserving marine ecosystems, cephalopod biology and life history has to be understood. As an example, directed cephalopod fisheries, especially small-scale fisheries, are increasingly important and it is necessary to have in place a useful system of data collection and stock evaluation that would be adequate to support managementthese activities are considered. These activities are believed to have a very high priority.		
Resource requirements	As noted in several previous reports, participation in WGCEPH is limited by availability of funding, especially as many members and potential members are university staff with no access to "national funds" for attendance at ICES meetings. Although there are no specific resource requirements, funding to assist wider particupation would be beneficial.		
Participants	In recent years the group has fluctuated from around 15 attendees and as few as 6 to 8 regular members, with a strong bias towards participants from the Iberian peninsula. There is a need to broaden participation to ensure good attendance every year		
Secretariat facilities	None.		
Financial	No specific financial implications (but see resource requirements).		
Linkages to ACOM and groups under ACOM	The results of WGCEPH are potentially relevant for advice in the case that formal assessment and management are introduced for any of these species.		
Linkages to other committees or groups	Possible links with groups working on predators of cephalopod (e.g. WGBIE, WGCS, WGMME). WGCEPH would like to encourage improved data collection on cephalopods during trawl surveys. It will make available (e.g. to IBTSWG) detailed diagrams and protocols for identifying cephalopods and collecting biological parameters during the scientific surveys. WGCEPH will provide information to SCICOM and its satellite committees as required to respond to requests for advice/information from NEAFC and EC DG Fish.		

Linkages to other Cost Action (FA 1301) CephsinAction, Cephalopod International Advisory Council (CIAC). organizations