Planning Group on Data Needs for Assessments and Advice (PGDATA)

2017/2/EOSG11 A **Planning Group on Data Needs for Assessments and Advice** (PGDATA), chaired by Joël Vigneau, 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 2018	13-16 February	Ifremer Nantes, France	Interim report by 2 April 2018 to SCICOM, ACOM, EOSG	
Year 2019			Interim report by April to SCICOM, ACOM, EOSG	
Year 2020			Final report by April to SCICOM, ACOM, EOSG	Change in chair

ToR descriptors

ToR	DESCRIPTION	BACKGROUND	SCIENCE PLAN TOPICS ADDRESSED	DURATION	EXPECTED DELIVERABLES
a	Implement and maintain Quality Assurance Framework for assessment EGs to evaluate data quality and its impact on assessments	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	Proposal of a structured approach for agreement within ICES, including the development of the ICES/RDB for detailed fisheries Development of a 'best practice SISP' for data collection in support of stock assessment. Provision of a service to EOSG expert groups for statistical advice and guidance on sampling design to promote good practice and establish effective 2-way communication.
b	Review the outcomes on methodological procedures and quality estimates from past ICES technical workshops and working groups, and advise on ways forward.	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		Year 1-3	Organisation of a better accessibility to any recommendation or good practice provided by the variety of technical workshops, and including work

		ICES; establish workshops to develop and test methods. Consult with the intergrated assessment working groups. Many ICES groups have provided valid information on best practice and guidelines but it is very time consuming to locate the relevant information on how to improve the data quality for a specific domain. Therefore, PGDATA should locate and host a repository where the information on best practice and guidelines are available		done by other for a such as STECF and EU-MAP Identification of gaps and needs for statistical and/or tools developments Initiate workshops where needed
c	Propose ways to improve the communication and feedbacks on data issues		Year 1 – 3	Direct input in the same years data call in cooperation with ICES sec. Publication on findings (in the form of peer-reviewed publication (e.g. CRR) documenting the development of methodologies in the field of data collection)

Summary of the Work Plan

Year 1-3	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 benchmark5. Specific ToRs for the plenary meeting will be to:

a) Implement and maintain Quality Assurance Framework for assessment EGs to evaluate data quality and its impact on assessments;

  i) Propose a structured approach for agreement within ICES, including the development of the ICES/RDB for detailed fisheries data, and develop a "best practice SISP" for data collection in support of stock assessment;

  ii) Collaborate with EOSG expert groups to identify problems and prioritize actions to progress and improve quality data collection.

  iii) Provide a service to EOSG expert groups for statistical advice and guidance on sampling design to promote good practice seeking to establish effective two-way communication.

  iv) Cooperate with assessment expert groups to show and demonstrate the effects of data collection methodology on the advisory assessments to underline the relevance of good practice to the advisory process.

b) Review the outcomes on methodological procedures and quality estimates from past ICES technical workshops and working groups, and advise on ways forward.

  i) Maintain knowledge of the work done and organize accessibility to any recommendation or good practice provided by the variety of technical workshops and propose changes to SISP as necessary

  ii) Review the work done in other fora such as STECF and EU-MAP in order to integrate the initiatives and propose complementary work;

  iii) Identify gaps and needs for statistical and/or tools developments, and initiate workshops as needed;

c) Propose ways to improve the communication and feedbacks on data issues

  i) Review and comment on ICES data calls

  ii) Organize participation to end-user meetings to seek for mutually beneficial improvements

  iii) Promote publication on findings, likely in the form of peer-reviewed publication (e.g. CRR) that documents the development of methodologies in the field of data collection and the state of scientific knowledge on the topic at the end of the 3-year TOR period

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	The focus should be made on the development of the QAF for both fishery dependent and fishery independent data, and on creating links between the different expert groups. The statistical improvements and good practices should be put in context, promoted for implementation, and easily accessible to the public.
	
	   i) Design a Quality Assurance Framework to ensure that information on data quality is adequately documented and applied in assessments;
	
	   ii) Ensure consistency of approach for fishery dependent and fishery independent data quality framework, and complementarity with approaches developed in other fora such as STECF, EU-MAP, …;
	
	   iii) Identify improvements in data quality, or collections of new data, that have the greatest impacts on the quality of advice;
	
	   iv) Improve or create communication routes between data collectors, data managers and end-users, and advise on new approaches to ease the implementation of the QAF (through publication, RDB-development and, cooperation with other WG including shared workshops);.
	
	The terms of references should focus on methods and their evaluation rather than providing solutions to a specific data issue or recommending a single method to be used in all cases. The reason for this is that many assessments and data collections follow different methodologies ofr have different assumptions so that a universal answer is unlikely to be appropriate. The aim is to gather the existing information on data quality in a structured way, develop expertise and tools where gaps are identified, develop communication with end-users, and maintain knowledge of the work done.

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 committees or groups	There will be a very close working relationship with all the groups of EOSG 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