

ACOM Chair – Annual Progress Report

1 Overview of advice provided in 2014

1.1 Recurring fisheries advice

ICES will in 2014 provide advice on fishing possibilities for approximately 252 stocks. All recurring fisheries advice has been provided by mid-October with the exception of the advice for Celtic Sea Nephrops stocks, anglerfish in IV+VI, Rockall megrim, eel and possible update of advice based on results from research vessels surveys conducted in third quarter.

Area	Number of stocks for which advice has been or will be provided in 2014
Iceland and East Greenland	13
Barents Sea	9
Faroe Plateau	4
Celtic Sea and West of Scotland	65
North Sea, Eastern Channel, Skagerrak and Kattegat	51
Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian Waters	40
Baltic Sea	19
Widely distributed and migratory stocks	50

Table. Number of recurring fisheries advice in 2014

Approximately one third of the stocks are category 1 and 2 stocks (stocks for which the advice is based on analytical assessments). For the remaining two thirds the advice has been based on the category 3 to 6 approach (DLS approach).

1.2 Environmental and ecosystem advice

ICES has in 2014 provided environmental and ecosystem advice to OSPAR on:

- Review and update of the Technical Annexes to JAMP Guidelines for Monitoring of Contaminants in Biota and in Sediments;

- Interaction on wild and captive fish stocks;
- Bottom fishing intensity;
- Implementation of MSFD for marine mammals

To the EU Commission on:

- Assessment of MSFD Descriptor 3;
- New information regarding the impact of fisheries on other components of the ecosystem;
- Bycatch of small cetaceans and other marine animals – Review of national reports under Council Regulation (EC) No. 812/2004 and other published documents;
- Indicators for MSFD Descriptor 4 (foodwebs)

To NEAFC on:

- Vulnerable deep-water habitats in the NEAFC Regulatory Area

1.3 Special requests

Recipient	Topic	Date received	ICES response
DG MARE	Bay of Biscay anchovy TAC	September 2014	December 2014
	Harvest control rule for sole in the Bay of Biscay - clarification	February 2014	March 2014
	Criteria and conditions for a Non-Detriment Finding regarding European eel	October 2014	
	Pelagic Stock annual quota flexibility	September 2014	September 2014
	Red seabream in Subarea IX clarification	June 2014	September 2014
	FMSY ranges for Baltic cod, herring and sprat stocks	August 2014	September 2014
	Catch levels of Grenadier species	September 2014	November 2014
EU-Norway	Evaluate the long-term MP for haddock in the North Sea	Sept 2014	November 2014
	Herring in IIIa management strategy	September 2014	February 2015
	Herring in the North Sea proposed MP evaluation	September 2014	February 2015
	North Sea cod TAC (2 requests)	February 2014	March 2014
EU-Coastal states	Mackerel longterm Management plan	September 2014	February 2015
NEAFC	Explore possible long-term management plan options for redfish in ICES Sub-areas I and II	November 2012	February 2014
	Redfish - clarification of TAC level	September 2014	October 2014
	Grenadier	September 2014	November 2014
	Blue whiting forecast model	May 2014	September 2014
NASCO	Advice for 2015	June 2013	May 2014
NAFO	North Atlantic harp seal population harvest strategies	April 2014	<i>Being discussed</i>
Faroese, Greenland, Iceland	Evaluation of a proposed HCR for deep pelagic redfish in Irminger Sea and adjacent waters	January 2013	March 2014
Iceland, Faroese, Greenland	Evaluation of a proposed HCR for golden redfish (<i>Sebastes norvegicus</i>) in Subareas V, VI, XII and XIV	February 2013	February 2014
Iceland	Request for annual advice on ling, blue ling, tusk and greater silver smelt in Va	November 2013	June 2014
Netherlands	North Sea horse mackerel proposed MP evaluation	March 2014	July 2014
Netherlands and Germany	Crangon in the North Sea management	April 2014	October 2014
Russia	White Sea/Barents Sea harp seal current status and catch potential	August 2014	<i>Being discussed</i>
OSPAR	Continuation of SGOA	June 2013	

	Spatial representation of existing CEMP sediment monitoring stations	June 2013	May 2014
	Tech. Annexes for JAMP monitoring in biota and sediments	June 2013	May 2014
	Interactions between wild and captured fish stocks	June 2013	July 2014
	Spatial and temporal description and analysis of bottom fishing intensity	June 2013	August 2014
	Placeholder - biodiversity	June 2013	<i>Not decided?</i>
	Submission mechanism for CEMP data	June 2013	September-2014
	Assess availability of biological effect data	June 2013	Done
	Assess availability of eutrophication data	June 2013	Done
DG ENV	Draft recommendations for D3	April 2014	September 2014
	Participate to DG GES	End 2013	September 2014
	Development of Black Sea components (capacity building)	June 2014	September 2014
	Indicators for D4	June 2014	September 2014
	Review of Decision 2019/477/EC	May 2014	May 2014

Table. Special advice addressed in 2014

The number of new special requests was relative low in the first half of 2014. This was mainly due to the delayed adoption of the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) which blocked for new requests for advice for the EU. After the adoption of the EMFF ICES has received a number of special requests. An overview of special requests received in 2014 is given in the table above.

The delayed reception of the special requests from the EU Commission has been a challenge for the Secretariat in terms of planning. Planned meetings had to be postponed and although the experts needed to address the requests have been very flexible it has been very difficult to find new meeting dates.

1.4 Advisory services

ICES has in 2014 until mid-October provided the following advisory services to the European Commission:

- Review of MSFD Descriptors 3, 4, 6 and 11.
- Clarification regarding ICES advice in 2014 for red (= blackspot) seabream (*Pagellus bogaraveo*) in Subarea IX.
- Preliminary FMSY ranges for Baltic cod, herring and sprat stocks. This service has been followed up by a special request and final advice will be delivered in March 2015.
- Evaluation of effect of increased quota flexibility for 2014 –2015 on pelagic stocks and Baltic salmon.

Advisory service has been provided to NEAFC on clarification of the TAC level and the basis of the advice for Beaked redfish (*Sebastes mentella*) in Subareas V, XII, and XIV and NAFO Subareas 1+2 (Deep pelagic stock > 500 m).

2 Review of advisory process in 2014

2.1 Basis for the review

In October 2007 the Council established ACOM and implemented an advisory structure that employs:

- Benchmark and Data Compilation Workshops to assemble data and lay down a reviewed or new assessment methodology,
- Expert Groups(EGs)
- Review Groups(RGs) to provide an independent review of the technical text, and
- Advice Drafting Groups (ADGs) to draft the advice for consideration by the ACOM and communication to the client.

ACOM will at its 2014 December meeting review the advisory process in 2014. However, a preliminary review of the work carried out so far in 2014 was discussed at the ACOM Consultations at the ASC. The following is based on the discussions at the ACOM Consultations.

2.2 Fisheries Advisory Expert Groups

The attendance of fisheries advisory expert groups seems in general to have been satisfactory and the groups have been able to address most of the ToRs.

A couple of stock advices were delayed a few days because the assessments had to be redone due to late data submission/revision. A number of WG chairs have requested guidelines for dealing with late data submission and for when it is necessary to redo assessments and redo the advice drafts when errors are found late into the process (e.g. during an EG meeting, or even during the ADG meeting). This was discussed at the ACOM Consultations and it was agreed that the ACOM Leadership shall develop draft guidelines for discussion at the December 2014 ACOM meeting.

Some of the stock assessment expert groups seem not to have operated optimally, having limited time available for quality assurance and discussions on future developments.

The current process for providing recurrent fisheries advice is based on the assessments, forming the basis for the advice, are ready before the expert group meetings. This is not the case for a large number of assessments and experts are often using a substantial part of the expert group meetings finalising the assessments.

This seems to be a combination of the workload put on the expert groups in terms of number of stocks to be addressed by the group and the experts not being able to prepare the assessments in advance of the meeting.

ACOM is addressing the workload issue at expert group level by a number of initiatives:

- Data calls. ICES started to launch official calls for data in 2012 to support the single stock and mixed-fisheries advice of demersal stocks in the North Sea ecoregion. Since then, data calls have been an integrated element in the process.

The main objectives of the data calls are to: i) improve awareness of all data needed; ii) obtain data in a standard format; iii) ensure data is available in a timely manner; iv) enhance accountability and transparency and v) facilitate data delivery by standardising the process.

- Database. Further development, in cooperation with the ICES Data Centre, of regional databases as well to support data collection, quality assurance and preparation of data for use in assessments.
- Advice format. The format of the recurrent fisheries advice is complicated and Expert Groups and Advice Drafting Groups use (waste) substantial time in understanding and filling in the advice templates. ACOM is working on a revision of the format to among others simplify the format. See also section 4 Format of Advice.
- Secretariat support. In cooperation with the Advisory Programme ACOM is exploring how to better draw on the expertise in the Secretariat in assessing the stocks and drafting the advice.
- Frequency of assessment. For most of the stocks ICES is requested to provide annual advice. This does not necessarily mean that the assessments forming the basis for the advice has to be redone on an annual basis. Especially for category 3 to 6 stocks ACOM is exploring the possibilities of reducing the frequency of performing the assessment used as basis for providing advice.

These initiatives are expected to contribute to reduce the workload for the fisheries expert groups but will not be sufficient to ensure a balance between the advisory tasks and the expert resources available. This will require that ICES Member Countries give higher priority to ICES advisory work and make the expert resources required to conduct the assessment work available.

2.3 Environmental and Ecosystem Advisory Expert Groups

A number of ACOM expert groups and workshops are set up to support the advisory work on ecosystem and environmental request. In general these expert groups have been able to provide the basis for the advice. However, while the basis for most of the fisheries advice is prepared by the assessment expert groups set up to address the requests for fisheries advice, the development of environmental and ecosystem advice is to a larger extent dependent on contributions from expert groups not having the support of the advisory process as their main task.

It is, therefore, important that ACOM has the possibility to add advisory related ToR to expert groups currently not identified as advisory groups (see section 2.4 Joint ACOM/SCICOM Expert Groups).

For the first time this year, ICES issued data calls for VMS and logbook data to help OSPAR and HELCOM meet their obligations under MSFD. The majority of EU Member States and Norway responded in full with data as requested, but data was either missing or only partial from a number of countries.

2.4 Joint ACOM/SCICOM Expert Groups

The establishment of the joint ACOM – SCICOM Steering Groups means that many of these expert groups are now referring both to ACOM and SCICOM. This represents a positive development and makes it easier for ACOM to draw on the expertise required to address the advisory requests. However, it has also created uncertainty on the rules of membership of the expert groups. Science expert groups are open to observers which is not the case for advice expert groups. The rules for

how chairs can appoint members also differ between SCICOM and ACOM expert groups. Guidelines on which rules apply to the joint expert groups are required.

2.5 Benchmarking workshops

Six stock assessment benchmark workshops and two inter-benchmark protocols have taken place in 2014. In addition, a scoping workshop on integrated Baltic cod assessment was held in October.

Benchmark workshops were implemented in 2008 as part of the implementation of the new advisory structure to review and improve the assessment methodology and integration with environmental issues, under supervision of external peer reviewers.

The system of benchmark workshops has contributed to the development and quality assurance of the classic stock assessments but has not been efficient in facilitating the incorporation of process understanding to the advice. It was therefore in 2013 decided to establish the joint ACOM/SCICOM Benchmark Steering Group (BSG) to support the further development of the benchmarking concept and practice, to tackle broader questions such as the development of integrated advice, examining shifts in productivity of marine system, or the possible ramifications of climate change. The BSG was implemented in 2014 and the first activity coordinated by the group was the scoping workshop on Baltic cod (see section 5).

2.6 Advice drafting groups.




Figure. The participation in advice drafting groups held in 2014 until mid-October. Nominated participants mean participants nominated by ACOM members.

The quality of the draft advice produced by the ADGs seems to be satisfactory. None of the recurrent fisheries advice (catch advice) was changed during the

WebEx. Substantial changes were made to one of the environmental advice drafts at the WebEx, where the use of biomass reference points was not consistent with ICES approach as described in the introduction to the advice.

The number of participants in the ADGs varies from 2 in ADGCAP to 22 in ADGBS. Attendance by ACOM national members (excluding ACOM chair and vice-chairs) varied from 0 to 8. The attendance by ACOM national members was less than 5 in 21 of the 26 ADGs. In 8 ADGs no participants were nominated by ACOM members.

The fisheries Advice Drafting Groups dealing with a larger number of stocks have generally been well attended, while it has been more difficult to ensure satisfactory participation in Advice Drafting Groups dealing with a low number of stocks or with environmental and ecosystem requests.

The work of several ADGs has been almost entirely dependent on contributions from the chairs of the relevant expert groups and the ACOM Vice-chairs with the support from the ICES Secretariat.

Most of ICES member countries have nominated ACOM alternates with environmental expertise. However, few of these alternates have contributed actively to the advisory process.

The low involvement of ACOM members/alternates in many of the ADGs including those dealing with environmental advice gives rise to concern. When implementing the current advisory structure the ADGs were given a central role in the advisory process, being responsible for drafting the advice for the consideration of ACOM. It was foreseen that the members of the ADGs would be nominated by the national ACOM members with no more than one nominee per member country. The groups should include members with insight in the technical basis for the advice as well as members with regional knowledge and knowledge on the context in which the advice is to be used. A criterion was also to avoid direct connections with the relevant Expert Group.

The issue of low ACOM involvement in the ADGs will be on the agenda for the ACOM December meeting. The ACOM Leadership will table a proposal for a system which identifies by ADG a minimum number of ACOM National members responsible for nominating members to the ADG. All ICES Member Countries will of course have the right to nominate a member but to ensure a minimum participation the ACOM members listed are expected to nominate a member for the ADG concerned.

This proposal may, if adopted by ACOM, ensure a minimum participation in the ADGs. However, it is important that ACOM takes its responsibility seriously as the committee that overlooks the advisory process and ensures that the advice delivered is in accordance with the criteria (evidence-based, relevant, responsive, sound, reliable, and credible). This implies that the national ACOM members coordinate the national contribution to the advisory process and ensure the appropriate involvement of expertise including expertise required to address the request for environmental advice.

2.7 ACOM Advice WebEx Meetings.

The final approval of the advice by ACOM is done at WebEx meetings. The draft advice is made available on the ACOM Forum and ACOM members are invited to provide comments in advance of the WebEx.

The participation in advice WebEx's planned for 2014 until mid-October is shown in Figure below. A total of 30 WebEx's were planned. Eight of them were canceled because no substantial comments on the draft advice were received and the advices were adopted without a WebEx being held.

On average 50% of ICES Member Countries were represented at the WebExs, 31% did not attend but approved the advice beforehand and a little less than 20% did not respond to the WebEx invitation.

The number of ACOM members/alternates commenting on the draft advice on the ACOM Forum varied between zero and seven with an average of little more than three.

The comments and discussions of advice on ACOM Forum and at the WebExs have mainly addressed editorial issues or suggestions for including new text/statements in the advice sheets. (In some cases text agreed to previous year was raised only in the WebEx). In only one case (advice on MSFD Descriptor 3) were substantial changes to the advice agreed at the WebEx. This ADG had low ACOM participation.




Figure. Number of ACOM members participating in advice WebEx’s or approved the advice before the WebEx. In cases where no participation is reported the WebEx was canceled because no substantial comments to the advice were received.

The time and resources used in processing these editorial comments seems not to reflect the resulting changes and value added to the advice. As part of the process of reducing workload and enhance the efficiency of the advisory process the ACOM leadership plan to table the role and modus operandi of ACOM Forum and the WebEx’s for discussion at the December ACOM meeting.

3 Workplan 2015

The workplan for 2015 is well underway. The recommendations from expert groups have been reviewed and draft resolutions for ACOM and joint ACOM/SCICOM expert groups and workshops were discussed with ACOM and expert group chairs at the ACOM Consultations at the ASC. A WebEx to approve the workplan for 2015 including resolutions was held on 8 October.

The workplan is a “living plan” as changes and updates will occur throughout the year resulting from new or changed requests or need for new activities to support the advisory process. The workplan as adopted by ACOM on the 8 October contains, however, most of the meetings required in support of the advisory process.

4 Format of advice

While the MoU’s with the EU Commission and NEAFC requests recurring advice on three levels, ecosystem, fisheries and stock, the advice is in most cases delivered

to the recipients in the form of single stock advice sheets. The present template for recurring fisheries advice is designed to address the requests for advice on fishing possibilities by stock. This means that fisheries and ecosystem issues affecting more than one stock are difficult to handle without having to repeat the relevant advice sections in the advice sheets for all the stocks concerned or to issue a separate advice (North Sea mixed fisheries advice).

In addition to not being designed to address all the requested recurring advisory deliverables the advice templates are very complicated to apply and to read. Expert and Advice Drafting Groups use substantial time on understanding and filling in the current advice sheets and the recipients of the advice have difficulties in reading and understanding all the elements of the advice.

The ACOM leadership has therefore developed a draft proposal for a new format for recurrent fisheries advice that is designed to address all the requested recurring advice deliverables; easier to read; concise and containing all information requested and required to understand the advice.

The proposal was discussed at the ACOM Consultations at the ASC. ACOM expressed its support to the proposal and a sub-group was established to further develop the proposal with the aim of having a new format adopted at the December ACOM meeting for implementation in 2015.

Members of ACOM were encouraged to discuss the proposal with relevant national authorities and report back to the sub-group.

The proposal was presented to the DG MARE at an informal meeting on 26 September. DG MARE's initial reaction was very positive. They will solicit feedback from relevant staff in DG MARE.

The revision of the format will be discussed with NEAFC representatives at a meeting scheduled for 20 October.

5 Introduction to Advice

The introduction to advice (General context of ICES advice, [Intro 2014](#)) gives a very detailed presentation of the basis for ICES advice, the criteria and approaches applied in developing the advice and the process to provide the advice. The document has expanded over the years to accomplish new developments and changes and fills in its present version 20 pages.

The content of the document is a mixture of introduction to the ICES advice, explaining the basis or principles for the advice and the process, and technical guidelines on the approaches applied in developing the advice. The technical nature of the document makes it difficult to read for non-experts.

ICES is, as part of the MoUs with the EU Commission and NEAFC, requested to deliver a full methodological description of the assessments and advisory procedures applied. The introduction serves together with the expert group reports explains the basis and principles behind the advice.

The introduction to the advice was discussed at the ACOM Consultations at the ASC and it was agreed that the ACOM Leadership should revise the document, splitting it into a relative short introduction to the advice and a document containing technical guidelines outlining the approaches to be applied in

developing the advice. This document should be an expansion of the current DLS document and expanded to include the category 1 methods and the basis for advice.

It was furthermore agreed not to use the term “Data-limited stocks” for stocks in categories 3 – 6. Many of the stocks concerned are not really data-limited and labelling them data-limited gives a wrong impression on the reasons for ICES being unable to conduct an analytical assessment.

6 Baltic cod

It has not been possible to conduct an analytical assessment of the Eastern Baltic cod stock and the advice for 2015 is based on ICES approach for category 3 stocks. A benchmarking process has been initiated involving the Workshop on Scoping for Integrated Baltic Cod Assessment (WKSIBCA) that took place in Gdynia, Poland, 1–3 October 2014.

The workshop was very successful with more than 40 participants. The workshop focused on four issues: 1) age and stock ID 2) Mortality and growth 3) recruitment and 4) Process of integrated assessment. For each issue the workshop identified the main challenges, made suggestions on how to solve the challenges, identified who is going to do the work and developed a timeline for the process.

Based on the workshop a plan will be developed for the work that can realistically be done before the benchmark workshop scheduled for March 2015.

7 Persistent errors in advice

It seems that the catch forecasts for several stocks are subject to repeated bias. This may be due to repeated retrospective error in the assessments or the forecasts or biased assumptions in the forecasts. It was discussed shortly at the ACOM Consultations and it was agreed to return to it at the ACOM December meeting with the aim of agreeing on a process to address the issue.

8 Discard data

Triggered by EU's implementation of the landing obligation, ICES advice on fishing possibilities changed over the last two years from advice on landings to advice on catches. As a consequence of this shift Expert and Advice Drafting Groups have paid extra attention to the quality of catch and landings data and in a number of cases expert groups have questioned whether the available data were sufficient to justify previous year's statement that discards were considered negligible. During the North Sea herring advice discussion this year, it was suggested that discarding at <4% could be described as 'considered negligible', and discarding >5% could be treated as non-negligible and dealt with according to the quality of information. However, no specific guideline has been issued in this respect this year and ACOM will at its December meeting develop guidelines for this.

9 Advice on by-catch species

ACOM has taken initiatives to develop risk-based methods for biodiversity and ecosystem approach to be used as basis for advice on by-catch species. The idea is to move towards a risk-based advice for by-catch stocks which are not considered economically important but should be considered from an ecosystem perspective (biodiversity, foodwebs, and habitats). The advisory process for these stocks could be first to conduct a risk assessment and for stocks considered to be at risk, advice regarding potential mitigation measures should be developed. ACOM are considering developing such advice as 'demonstration advice' which could be used as basis for discussions with advice recipients and observers.

The ToRs to support this work have not been included in the resolutions. ACOM will await the outcome of the WGMIXFISH meeting 20 – 24 October before deciding on how to move forward.

10 MSY approach

WKMSYREF2 which met in January 2014 developed guidelines for estimation of MSY reference points to be used in the ICES MSY approach to ensure that this is compatible with the ICES precautionary approach. It has subsequently proved important that ICES can show a well-founded basis for its MSY advice, particularly for credibility with NGOs who, with reference to criteria used in USA or Australia, have expressed doubts about ICES approach with respect to biomass targets.

The workshop WMLIFE IV will continue the work on developing quantitative assessment methodologies for category 3 to 6 stocks. This includes work on how to develop MSY-based exploitation proxies for category 3 stocks.

For the core stocks in fisheries management plans DG MARE needs to state intervals for F which are in agreement with F_{MSY} and have formally requested advice on ranges for Baltic Sea and North Sea stocks. In absence of policy guidelines for defining F_{MSY} ranges ICES advice is expected to be based on the 'pretty good yield' concept, which result in no less than 95% of the estimated maximum sustainable yield and which is consistent with the precautionary approach. A workshop WKMSYREF3 will be held in November 2014 to identify appropriate methods and criteria to determine the ranges.

11 MoUs with advice recipients

The MoU with the EU Commission is renewed annually and is normally signed in January. The MoU is, from 2014, financed under the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF). Due to the delayed adoption of the EMFF the EU Commission did not sign the 2014 MoU until late August. This has created problems in relation to addressing special requests from the EU Commission (see section 1.3).

The 2015 MoU between ICES and the EU Commission was discussed at a meeting with DG MARE on 26 September 2014. The MoU as it stands (text and budget) is seen by DG MARE and ICES as having developed into something which is difficult to understand and therefore difficult to manage properly for those involved. Both sides would therefore like to see a thorough revision of both the text and the

budget to simplify, make it more understandable, and remove duplication. This is not doable for the 2015 MoU due to the delay in 2014, but it is a shared intention to start early in 2015 to revise this for the 2016 MoU.

12 Advice Plan

The activities described in this report are in support of the advice plan which forms part of the implementation of the ICES Strategic Plan. As indicated in the report on 1st year progress on the implementation of the Strategic Plan (See attached Annex 1) progress is made on most actions listed in the advice plan. For a few actions (advice on spatial planning, dialogue meeting on social and economic analysis, development of advisory capacity for the Arctic) progress has been very limited.

13 Joint ACOM – SCICOM activities

The joint ACOM/SCICOM activities include the Steering group on Integrated Ecosystem Assessments (SGIEA), the Steering Group on Integrated Ecosystem Observation and Monitoring (SGIEOM), the Benchmark Steering Group (BSG), The Strategic Initiative on Biodiversity Science and Advice (SIBAS) and Strategic Initiative for Stock Assessment Methods (SISAM). The reports of these joint activities are provided in the SCICOM Progress Report (CM 2014 Del 7.1).

14 ACOM Leadership

The number of ACOM Vice-Chairs was reduced from 4 to 3 by 1 January 2014 and the payment to each of the Vice-Chairs was increased from 0.25 to 0.33 person-year. There is, however, still a substantial mismatch between the workload for the Vice-chairs and their work tasks.

The three year term for Vice-Chair Carmen Fernandez expires by the end of the year. An election was held at the ASC and ACOM unanimously agreed to nominate (for adoption by Council) a one-year prolongation of the contract of ACOM Vice-Chair, Carmen Fernandez.

Annex . The ICES Strategic Plan (2014 2018) - Implementation - Linking Science, Advice, Data and Information and Secretariat

The Advisory Picture after 9 months - A first look at Performance - A Qualitative Approach

OVERVIEW - % of Actions in each Score Category

SCORE	<i>Deliver relevant timely and credible advice</i> SA 1 and 2	<i>Foster efficient use of resources and quality assurance</i> SA 1, 2, 3 ,4	<i>Improve data collection and use</i> SA 1, 2, 3, 4	<i>Develop Scope of Advice</i> Sa 1, 2, 3, 4	<i>Develop process and Communications</i> SA 4
1				3	
2		2	1	2	
3		1	1	7	2
4	1	2	2	2	2
5					
	N = 1 Action	N = 5 Actions	N = 4 Actions	N = 14 Actions	N = 4 Actions

SCORE

1	Not Started
2	Just Started
3	Some Progress
4	Good Progress
5	Doing Well

Supporting Activities (SA) of ACOM to achieve Goal 3

1. Provide recurrent advice on fisheries and environmental issues in the North Atlantic and adjacent seas, such as the provision of advice on multiannual fisheries management plans, spatial management needs, and on possible consequences (biological, physical, social and economic consequences of alternative management scenarios as will be presented).
2. Responding to the evolving policy context and to non-recurring special requests on fisheries, aquaculture and environmental issues
3. Promoting their use and delivery of integrated advice in an ecosystem based approach to fisheries and environmental management such as integrated ecosystem assessments providing guidance on how to improve good environmental status and advice on ecosystem health and productivity that considers drivers such as climate change and various maritime activities.
4. Ensuring quality assurance, transparency, and political neutrality so that users and stakeholders have confidence in the advice. This will involve dialogue and collaborations with managers and stakeholders on both regional and international levels.

The ICES Strategic Plan (2014 2018) - Implementation - Linking Science, Advice, Data and Information and Secretariat

The ACOM Picture after 9 months - A first look at Performance - A Qualitative Approach

(Version 1 @ 29/09/14)

ACOM	ACOM Category	ACOM - Action	Supporting Activity	Gut Feeling	PI
Evaluater and advise for the sustainable use and protection of marine ecosystems (Goal 3)	1. Deliver relevant, timely and credible advice	Implement MOU's with advice recipient	1, 2	4	

SCORE

1	Not Started
2	Just Started
3	Some Progress
4	Good Progress
5	Doing Well

%

1	
2	
3	
4	100
5	

N = 1 Action

Supporting Activities (SA)_ for ACOM to achieve Goal 3

1. Provide recurrent advice on fisheries and environmental issues in the North Atlantic and adjacent seas, such as the provision of advice on multiannual fisheries management plans, apatial managemernt needs, and on possible consequences (biological, physical, social and economic consequences of alternative management scenarios as will be presented).
2. Responding to the evolving policy context and to non-recurring special reqwuests on fisheries, aquaculture and environmental issues
3. Promoting ther use and delivery of integrated advice in an ecosystem based approach to fisheries and environmental management such as integrated ecosystem assessments providing guidance on how to improve good environmental status and advice on ecosystem health and productivity that considers drivers such as climate change and various maritime activities.
4. Ensuring quality assurance, transparency, and political neutrality so that users and stakeholders have confidence in the advice. Thjis will involve dialogue and collaborations with managers and stakeholders on both regional ad international levels.

The ICES Strategic Plan (2014 2018) - Implementation - Linking Science, Advice, Data and Information and Secretariat

The ACOM Picture after 9 months - A first look at Performance - A Qualitative Approach

(Version 1 @ 29/09/14)

ACOM	ACOM Category	ACOM - Actions	Supporting Activity	Gut Feeling	PI
Evaluater and advise for the sustainable use and protection of marine ecosystems (Goal 3)	2. Foster efficient use of resources and quality assurance	Implement RCT and priotitiuse resource use	1	4	
		Further exlore and implement, where appropriate multiannual evaluations of management measures (the state of the stock) for the provision of annual advice	1	2	
		Enhance substantive support by ICES Scretariat to the advisory process	1, 2, 3, 4	4	
		Implement the CARA system ; Automate the process of transferring assessment results from the assessment software to the advisory sheets, including standard graphs	1, 4	2	
		Conduct internal audits of data. Input and assessment results for all advice providing expert groups	4	3	

SCORE

1	Not Started
2	Just Started
3	Some Progress
4	Good Progress
5	Doing Well

	%
1	0
2	40
3	20
4	40
5	0

N = 5 Actions

Supporting Activities (SA) for ACOM to achieve Goal 3

1. Provide recurrent advice on fisheries and environmental issues in the North Atlantic and adjacent seas, such as the provision of advice on multiannual fisheries management plans, spatial management needs, and on possible consequences (biological, physical, social and economic consequences of alternative management scenarios as will be presented).
2. Responding to the evolving policy context and to non-recurring special requests on fisheries, aquaculture and environmental issues
3. Promoting ther use and delivery of integrated advice in an ecosystem based approach to fisheries and environmental management such as integrated ecosystem assessments providing guidance on how to improve good environmental status and advice on ecosystem health and productivity that considers drivers such as climate change and various maritime activities.
4. Ensuring quality assurance, transparency, and political neutrality so that users and stakeholders have confidence in the advice. This will involve dialogue and collaborations with managers and stakeholders on both regional ad international levels.

The ICES Strategic Plan (2014 2018) - Implementation - Linking Science, Advice, Data and Information and Secretariat

The ACOM Picture after 9 months - A first look at Performance - A Qualitative Approach

(Version 1 @ 29/09/14)

ACOM	ACOM Category	ACOM - Actions	Supporting Activity	Gut Feeling	PI
Evaluater and advise for the sustainable use and protection of marine ecosystems (Goal 3)	3. Improve data collection and use	Coordinate and integrate surveys	1,2	2	
		Develop guidelines for best practice in design and implementation of statistically sound catch sampling schemes	1, 2	4	
		Identify the data required to provide advice on fisheries and environmental issues and communicate the requirements to those responsible for the collection of data	1, 2, 3, 4	4	
		Promote efficient and effective data storage through integration of data in regional databases, including making data available for experts through intercath	1, 2, 3, 4	3	

SCORE

1	Not Started
2	Just Started
3	Some Progress
4	Good Progress
5	Doing Well

%

1	0
2	25
3	25
4	50
5	0

N = 4 Actions

Supporting Activities (SA) for ACOM to achieve Goal 3

1. Provide recurrent advice on fisheries and environmental issues in the North Atlantic and adjacent seas, such as the provision of advice on multiannual fisheries management plans, spatial management needs, and on possible consequences (biological, physical, social and economic consequences of alternative management scenarios as will be presented).
2. Responding to the evolving policy context and to non-recurring special requests on fisheries, aquaculture and environmental issues
3. Promoting the use and delivery of integrated advice in an ecosystem based approach to fisheries and environmental management such as integrated ecosystem assessments providing guidance on how to improve good environmental status and advice on ecosystem health and productivity that considers drivers such as climate change and various maritime activities.
4. Ensuring quality assurance, transparency, and political neutrality so that users and stakeholders have confidence in the advice. This will involve dialogue and collaborations with managers and stakeholders on both regional and international levels.

The ICES Strategic Plan (2014 2018) - Implementation - Linking Science, Advice, Data and Information and Secretariat

The ACOM Picture after 9 months - A first look at Performance - A Qualitative Approach

(Version 1 @ 29/09/14)

ACOM	ACOM Category	ACOM - Actions	Supporting Activity	Gut Feeling	PI
Evaluater and advise for the sustainable use and protection of marine ecosystems (Goal 3)	4. Develop scope of advice	Provide advice in relation to the changing policy environment . Facilitate transition of a new regime, new data, ecosystem impacts and fisheries opportunities.	1,2	3	
		Further develop/implement methodologies, which entails establishment of indicators and targets for all stocks, including data limited stocks (DLS)	1,2	4	
		Provide advice taking into account technical interactions in each mixed fishery, as well as biological interactions between stocks, such as predation and competition in each ecoregion, per an established schedule, including a link with social and economic aspects when possible.	1,2	3	
		Further develop capacity for provision of advice for emerging human activities in the Arctic - taking into account ecosystem considerations; monitor stock distributions into the Arctic region; data requirements and monitoring needs in the Arctic	2	1	
		Advisory needs for aquaculture and its environmental aspects	2	3	
		Integrate considerations fo by catch in the advice for fisheries (including elasmobranchs, mammals and seabirds)	2, 3	3	
		Integrate considerations of impacts of sensitive habitats in the advice fort fisheries	2, 3	3	
		Prepare methodologies and examples of impact assessments of management measures that account for environmental variability and social and economic trade offs	2, 3	2	
		Include discussion on social and economic analysis needs of users of advice in an ICES Dialogue meeting	2, 4	1	
		Facilitate transition from single stock benchmarks to regional benchmarks	3	2	
		Further develop ecosystem overviews on a regional scale	3	4	
		Provide advice on Marine Spatial Planning	3	1	
		Develop mechanisms for promoting IEU as a basis for ICES advice	3, 4	3	
		In cooperation with Member Countries and regional seas organisations, develop IEA for the Baltic, North Sea and Barent Sea for use in advice provide exampoles of how IEA can be used in advice	3, 4	3	

SCORE

1	Not Started
2	Just Started
3	Some Progress
4	Good Progress
5	Doing Well

%	
1	22
2	14
3	50
4	14
5	

N = 14 Actions

2
14
0.142857

Supporting Activities (SA) for ACOM to achieve Goal 3

1. Provide recurrent advice on fisheries and environmental issues in the North Atlantic and adjacent seas, such as the provision of advice on multiannual fisheries management plans, spatial management needs, and on possible consequences (biological, physical, social and economic consequences of alternative management scenarios as will be presented).
2. Responding to the evolving policy context and to non-recurring special requests on fisheries, aquaculture and environmental issues
3. Promoting ther use and delivery of integrated advice in an ecosystem based approach to fisheries and environmental management such as integrated ecosystem assessments providing guidance on how to improve good environmental status and advice on ecosystem health and productivity that considers drivers such as climate change and various maritime activities.
4. Ensuring quality assurance, transparency, and political neutrality so that users and stakeholders have confidence in the advice. This will involve dialogue and collaborations with managers and stakeholders on both regional and international levels.

The ICES Strategic Plan (2014 2018) - Implementation - Linking Science, Advice, Data and Information and Secretariat

The ACOM Picture after 9 months - A first look at Performance - A Qualitative Approach

(Version 1 @ 29/09/14)

ACOM	ACOM Category	ACOM - Actions	Supporting Activity	Gut Feeling	PI
Evaluator and advise for the sustainable use and protection of marine ecosystems (Goal 3)	5. Develop process and communication	Further develop the capacity of the ICES community and the stakeholders/policy developers to facilitate their interaction and dialogue as well as involvement in the advisory process	4	3	
		Communicate advisory products to the public	4	4	
		Communicate the advice through meetings with competent authorities and stakeholders	4	4	
		Support existing expert Groups chairs and potential future chairs to ensure they have the necessary skills (e.g. Training etc.)	4	3	

SCORE

1	Not Started
2	Just Started
3	Some Progress
4	Good Progress
5	Doing Well

%	
1	
2	
3	50
4	50
5	

N = 4 Actions

Supporting Activities (SA) for ACOM to achieve Goal 3

1. Provide recurrent advice on fisheries and environmental issues in the North Atlantic and adjacent seas, such as the provision of advice on multiannual fisheries management plans, spatial management needs, and on possible consequences (biological, physical, social and economic consequences of alternative management scenarios as will be presented).
2. Responding to the evolving policy context and to non-recurring special requests on fisheries, aquaculture and environmental issues
3. Promoting the use and delivery of integrated advice in an ecosystem based approach to fisheries and environmental management such as integrated ecosystem assessments providing guidance on how to improve good environmental status and advice on ecosystem health and productivity that considers drivers such as climate change and various maritime activities.
4. Ensuring quality assurance, transparency, and political neutrality so that users and stakeholders have confidence in the advice. This will involve dialogue and collaborations with managers and stakeholders on both regional and international levels.