

ICES SCICOM REPORT, MARCH-APRIL 2014

ICES SCIENCE COMMITTEE

ICES CM 2014/SCICOM:01

REF. BUREAU, COUNCIL

Midterm report of the ICES Science Committee (SCICOM)

31 March-2 April 2014

ICES Headquarters, Copenhagen



ICES

International Council for
the Exploration of the Sea

CIEM

Conseil International pour
l'Exploration de la Mer

International Council for the Exploration of the Sea Conseil International pour l'Exploration de la Mer

H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46
DK-1553 Copenhagen V
Denmark
Telephone (+45) 33 38 67 00
Telefax (+45) 33 93 42 15
www.ices.dk
info@ices.dk

Recommended format for purposes of citation:

ICES. 2014. Midterm report of the ICES Science Committee (SCICOM), 31 March-2 April 2014. ICES CM 2014/SCICOM:01. 44 pp.

For permission to reproduce material from this publication, please apply to the General Secretary.

© 2014 International Council for the Exploration of the Sea

Contents

1	Opening.....	1
2	Adoption of agenda and timetable.....	1
3	Follow up on decisions taken at the SCICOM September 2013	1
4	Revised draft Science Plan (feedback and adoption).....	1
5	SCICOM Operational Groups	2
5.1	ICES Data and Information Management Group (DIG)	2
	Data storage	4
5.2	ICES Publications and Communications Group (PUBCOM)	5
5.3	ICES Training Group (ITG)	6
6	ICES Science Fund.....	7
7	Science Cooperation.....	8
7.1	GEF/LME (Large Marine Ecosystem initiative by the Global Environment Facility).....	8
7.2	Projects: COFASP, STAGES, incoming requests	9
	7.2.1 New procedure for project partners.....	9
	Project Decision Tree.....	10
7.3	The North Pacific Marine Science Organization (PICES) and SGSP	11
7.4	IPBES	11
7.5	UN Regular Process (Global Integrated Assessment)	12
7.6	Euroscience Open Forum (ESOF) 2014	12
	7.6.1 EUROCEANS/EUROMARINE	12
	7.6.2 JPI (Joint Programming Initiative – Healthy and Productive Seas and Oceans) (JPI-CSA).....	12
	7.6.3 EMBRC (European Marine Biological Research Centre).....	13
7.7	Symposia 2014–2015.....	13
7.8	Arctic cooperation	13
7.9	Aquaculture.....	14
7.10	Other	14
8	Science Implementation	14
8.1	Evaluation of EGs under multi-annual ToR	14
8.2	SSG roles and functions and Membership	15
	Making the SSGs functional.....	15
	The role/status of the SSG Chairs.....	15
	SSG reporting.....	16
8.3	Delivery of operational oceanographic products to IEA process (Dickey-Collas).....	16
8.4	Guidance for EGs regarding deliverables to MSFD.....	17

	IEA and monitoring groups.....	18
	External partners.....	18
	Indicators.....	18
9	SCICOM Steering Groups	18
9.1	SSGEPD (SSGEF)	18
9.2	SSGEPI (SSGSUE/SSGHIE).....	19
9.3	SSGIEA (SSGRSP).....	20
9.4	SSGIEOM (SSGESST)	20
9.5	Benchmark management and coordination.....	21
10	Draft resolutions for EG and SSGs	23
10.1	SSGEF Draft Resolutions	24
10.2	SSGRSP Draft Resolutions.....	24
10.3	SSGESST Draft Resolution.....	25
10.4	SSGHIE Draft Resolutions.....	26
10.5	SSGSUE Draft Resolutions	26
10.6	Category 3 Draft Resolutions	26
	6 th zooplankton production symposium.....	26
11	Cost of Science Programme	27
12	ASC 2014 – Conference programme	27
12.1	Update from Conference Coordinator.....	27
12.2	Appointment of ASC Award Selection Group.....	28
12.3	Appointment of ASC 2015 Theme Session Group	28
13	Format of ASC Business meetings	28
13.1	SCICOM and PUBCOM meetings.....	29
13.2	SCICOM Steering Group meetings.....	29
13.3	SCICOM Plenary Session.....	29
13.4	SCICOM Open Sessions.....	29
	Monday morning Open Sessions.....	29
	Wednesday afternoon Open Sessions	30
13.5	WGCHAIRS for Science.....	30
13.6	SCICOM/ACOM business meetings	31
14	Strategic Initiatives.....	31
14.1	SCICOM/ACOM Strategic Initiative on Biodiversity (SIBAS)	31
14.2	SCICOM Strategic Initiative on Climate Change (SSICCME)	32
14.3	SCICOM/ACOM Strategic Initiative on Stock Assessment Methods (SISAM).....	32
15	Awards Committee.....	33
16	Closure.....	33

Annex 1: List of participants.....	34
Annex 2: Actions and decisions	38

1 Opening

The SCICOM Chair welcomed participants to the 2014 SCICOM Spring meeting to Copenhagen and conducted a tour de table to introduce all members. A special welcome was extended to the new SCICOM participants, Antonina dos Santos (Portugal) and Mats Svensson (former Alternate, Sweden), and alternate Pekka Alenius (Finland). Steve Cadrin attended by WebEx for agenda items 5.3 and 14.3.

2 Adoption of agenda and timetable

The agenda was accepted without comments and no new items were brought up for inclusion.

The SCICOM Chair highlighted the main issue to be discussed at this meeting, i.e. the finalisation of the Science Plan. There will be updates of Operational Groups, SSGs and Strategic Initiatives as well.

3 Follow up on decisions taken at the SCICOM September 2013

All items identified as actions at the previous meeting of SCICOM (September 2013) had been followed up or would be dealt with under the SCICOM midterm meeting agenda.

There were no comments to the action list.

4 Revised draft Science Plan (feedback and adoption)

The SCICOM Chair presented the revised Science Plan. The proposal is for one associated plan, containing four chapters: Science, Advice, Data and the Secretariat. The main message from Bureau was that the Science Plan was too long (27 pages). The new version is 18 pages. The connection between the Strategic Plan and associated plans had to be strengthened. Regardless of the revisions, the objectives remain the same, but hopefully in a clearer format. The narrative text has been minimized and the concepts of Internalities, Externalities and Enabler have been removed. A new diagram showing how the groups connect to ACOM and SCICOM has been adopted from the Advice plan and will be the same in Advice and Science Plan.

The following comments were made:

- Overall, SCICOM members found that the condensed version of the Science Plan was good and even better without the internalities, externalities, etc.
- It was noted that PUBCOM was not included in the diagram and that this should be corrected. Also the monitoring programme (IEOM) should be better integrated in the diagram, perhaps using a different colour.
- The socio-economic dimension is not as strong as it is in the Advisory plan. The SCICOM Chair requested written suggestions from Jörn Schmidt to make the socio-economic side stronger.
- Looking at the Science sections there is a longer introduction for IEA than for the others. The length of the introductions should be similar.
- Under EPD and EPI the text refers to the two goals in Strategic Plan. We need to ensure that we are using the same wording as in the Strategic Plan.
- We have to be careful using words as sustainable and optimize.
- The word ecosystem service should be mentioned somewhere.

- The word conservation should be mentioned somewhere.

The SCICOM Chair thanked for the positive feedback.

Action: SCICOM members were requested to comment and provide feedback by 9 April (att. Vivian Piil, cc SCICOM Chair and HoS) for incorporation in the final version to be forwarded to Bureau and Council for adoption in June.

5 SCICOM Operational Groups

5.1 ICES Data and Information Management Group (DIG)

Ingeborg de Boois reported on the DIG and the work of the ICES Data Centre, supported by Doc 6.

ICES has been accredited with Associated Data Unit (ADU) status within the Inter-governmental Oceanographic Commissions (IOC) marine data programme, the International Oceanographic Data and Information Exchange (IODE). This means that the work of ICES will become more visible in the international setting, and it brings in a more global approach to the work on data exchange.

ICES Report on Ocean Climate 2012 (IROC). A digital version of the dataset and graphs is available in an interactive page <http://ocean.ices.dk/iroc/> which brings the pdf IROC 2012 to life. The DIG Chair congratulated the Data Centre and WGOH on the nice work!

Standard graphs have been launched on the ICES website and have been very well received by the ICES assessment groups. This was announced on the ICES News page.

Strategic activities related to ISP goal 4 (regional products)

A lot of effort has gone into clarifying issues around regional databases in connection with the strategic activities related to the ICES Strategic Plan, goal 4 (Regional products). For example the operationalization of the Eutrophication data to indicator flow is in the pipeline in a project with HELCOM (Eutro Oper).

Still under goal 4, a feasibility study "Scientific data storage and transmission under the DCF" has been carried out by contractors to the Commission, but the results are not available yet. This will be discussed by DIG 2014. ICES will also provide support and guidance to the Common Implementation Strategy in relation to the regional data management of data flows relevant to the MSFD.

Strategic activities related to ISP goal 5 (Interoperability reaching out for the wider ICES community, adding value reproducing data in systems elsewhere)

DIG and ICES Data centre are working on an online resource catalogue of products and services for ICES products. This will start by describing the ICES Data Centre services, i.e. specific output indices from the trawl survey. In the next stage we would hope to capture the working group products, in order to provide a comprehensive description of these ICES services for the marine community.

Work in progress:

A **Big Data Session** is being planned for the ASC 2014.

Data guidelines and manuals. DIG have been engaged in updating the inventory of the current data guidelines and manuals and is collaborating with IODE and PUBCOM to publish it in the best possible way over the next months.

Introduction to Digital Citation. This document was shared with SCICOM in the autumn and the DIG Chair invited comments and suggestions from SCICOM members to the document. This is an evolving topic and we are trying to find a way forward.

One action item from September is to have more ichthyoplankton data stored at ICES. WGACEGG has done some work on this, not completely clear how it will be incorporated in the ICES ichthyoplankton dataset. There is also a Baltic larvae survey being incorporated.

The Data Centre has received a formal request for acoustic data storage. DIG Chair encouraged members to fill in the formal request form if they have a wish for new products to be included in the workplan of the ICES Data Centre.

For this year's May meeting there will be no major strategic issues to be dealt with by DIG, which will leave more time for other issues. One of the main roles of DIG is to provide feedback to the ICES Data Centre workplan, products and activities. Also on the agenda are improvements for DATRAS, VMS products, and effects of findings of the feasibility study "Scientific data storage and transmission under the DCF".

The DIG Chair welcomed other suggestions for items to be dealt with by DIG at their forthcoming meeting.

Comments / questions:

The SCICOM Chair asked how DIG and the Data Centre connect the feasibility study and MSFD on a national level? These projects are heavily anchored on a national level. The Head of ICES Data and Information explained that it is not only about how they are organised nationally. With the new DCF framework it is all happening at the regional level. The feasibility study is looking at what is already in place at a regional level. There are different scenarios, but the choice of scenario is not known at this stage. So it is not just about the national angle, the regional aspect is the key part. How does ICES relate to the national level of data collection in connection with MSFD? The regional coordination was not very evident from the initial assessment reporting of the MSFD by the member countries. ICES has a Council Steering Group that looks after the interests of the member countries. ICES is working together with the EEA, RSC's, and the Commission towards the idea of one common set of reference dataset(s) per descriptor/region, and it is then possible to attach different indicators to these processes. Support and guidance from the Data Centre feeds into Commission WGs (WGDIKE) through papers and recommendations, and it is then up to the member countries to agree or not.

The work with our strategic partners (HELCOM, EEA (EIONET), and OSPAR) ensures that the data is only submitted once and we are making use of the ICES databases for more than one purpose.

The SCICOM Chair emphasized the importance for SCICOM members to bring home the message from ICES that the provision of support available in terms of data storage/transmission under DCF and also in relation to the common implementation strategy and data flows in MSFD.

More ichthyoplankton data stored in ICES, there are discussions on who is allowed to see the data, when and where. There are two Baltic datasets, which we are expecting to come online towards the end of the year/beginning of next year.

What kind of VMS products are important right now? The Data Centre would like to have input from the VMS Working Group (WGSFD) and would like them to raise the

main issues. VMS is a difficult topic, and we are well aware that it deserves some attention.

In relation to MSFD Descriptor 2, WGITMO suggested at its 2014 meeting to start using the 'Information system on aquatic non-indigenous and cryptogenic species', AquaNIS (<http://www.corpi.ku.lt/databases/index.php/aquanis>) as a reporting platform for non-indigenous species in the ICES (and also adjacent) area since 2015 onwards. This should replace the currently existing WGITMO data reporting Excel file format. AquaNIS was developed within the EU FP7 project VECTORS project and is fully operational. AquaNIS is currently hosted and managed by Klaipeda University (Lithuania).

Action: ICES Data Centre and Sergej Olenin (Klaipeda University, e-mail: sergej@corpi.ku.lt) to establish contacts and discuss/solve practicalities with a view to start using AquaNIS as an online reporting tool of non-indigenous species in ICES.

Data storage

Does ICES envisage being the long-term primary storage place for data for ICES members? A long-term commitment from ICES and willingness of national governments to provide their data needs to be clarified. A lot of data that is not stored.

To what extent does ICES store acoustic data? Would ICES be looking for additional data and what datasets do we have? Once the framework is there, you can start to put the data in as an ongoing process.

HoDC: On the commitment to the data, we are seen as a trusted repository, but it is not just about being a place to store data. The primary focus is on making data available. ICES has in recent years asked customers to fill out a formal request, to give background on the use of it, and all of this is considered so we can make a clear link to end users of data. We do look at all requests for housing more data. For the acoustics we will not look at the primary data. We would be overwhelmed and it would not be useful.

Specifically for Canada, we have just asked for oceanographic data, which needs to be processed. We don't have as much Canadian data as we should have.

Data storage and databases are an important issue. Integrating data into the business is key. So please bear in mind that it is not only a database; it is the whole process of converting the data from what you collect on the ship to the final data product that you give in the advice.

SICCME would like to look at climate change across the globe and how to compile the datasets in an integrated way. What is established already, could some bridges be built? How do we obtain consistent data for global analysis?

When you go from regional to international/global level it takes a lot of discussion. Ocean acidification is a global activity and SGOA is entering discussions, we don't want to replicate, we want to add value. We work with IODE, FAO, and others, but it takes time.

Action: DIG was asked to provide an update to SCICOM on the feasibility study "Scientific data storage and transmission under the DCF"

Action: DIG was asked to provide an update to SCICOM on DIG work towards the MSFD common implementation strategy and what you can operationalise from this work.

5.2 ICES Publications and Communications Group (PUBCOM)

Myron Peck gave an update from PUBCOM, supported by Doc 7 and 8.

Five key issues were outlined for discussion and comments:

PUBCOM Parent Committee / Membership

Bureau has tasked the Secretariat to develop a discussion document which will include input from the midterm SCICOM meeting on the role, future reporting and “parentage” of PUBCOM.

The question of communication between SCICOM and ACOM started the dialogue and steps should be taken to ensure that both SCICOM and ACOM have more active communication with PUBCOM on publication and communication activities. There is consensus in PUBCOM that SCICOM is the appropriate parent committee.

Decision: SCICOM revisited the question of “parentage” of PUBCOM and there was agreement in SCICOM that PUBCOM should report to SCICOM.

PUBCOM would like to attract 2-3 interested experts, either from academia (possibly someone from the Editorial Board), and/or from the Iberian area.

Action: SCICOM members were invited to nominate new members for PUBCOM.

Phasing out hardcopy printing

A decision has been made to phase-out hardcopy printing in 2015. Print and design costs amounted to roughly 75,000€ and although design costs can amount to 70% of total publication costs, ICES still stands to save considerable money by continuing to reduce its hardcopy printing. A road map is needed to accomplish this ICES goal and a variety of options exist beyond mere pdf. For example, ICES has a licence for 20 iPapers, which are excellent for ‘colourful’ material which can include interactive elements. After phasing in the reduction in hardcopy printing in 2015, an annual booklet summarizing ICES publications could be printed.

Action: PUBCOM and the Secretariat will develop a plan detailing which publications will be online only, how quickly this will take place, who will contact authors, and how online material will be referenced.

Increasing the size and price of the IJMS

SCICOM was informed about the proposal by Oxford University Press (OUP) to have a 19% increase the size of the IJMS (from 2070 pages to 2460 pages) in 2015. These additional pages would impose direct costs ~15450 €. Those costs would occur in parallel with a 4.5% increase in prices to cover suppliers, translating a need for a 10 to 12% increase in journal price to maintain revenues. IJMS is not that expensive compared to other journals. Extra pages would increase the annual printing from 9 to 10 volumes (of which 3 or 4 are normally special/symposium volumes).

Comments

There is no evidence that a symposia volume will increase our impact factor.

The journal quality should be the main issue for SCICOM. We should prioritise quality rather than potential increase in income.

Decision: SCICOM supported the proposal by OUP to have a 19% increase the size of the IJMS (from 2070 pages to 2460 pages) in 2015.

Social Media

PUBCOM would like to foster more use of social media such as TWITTER not only in relation to the Annual Science Conference but also, more generally, to communicate ICES science highlights and events. For example, PUBCOM supports the idea of having short TWEETable summaries produced by i) authors of extended abstracts accepted as talks and posters within ASC theme sessions, ii) authors of manuscripts accepted for publication within the ICES JMS, iii) coordinators of ICES-supported meetings, and iv) coordinators of ICES-sponsored symposia.

Comments were overall supportive.

Decision: SCICOM supported the idea of offering the possibility of having short TWEETable summaries of extended abstracts accepted from ASC theme sessions, from authors of manuscripts accepted for publication within the ICES JMS, coordinators of ICES-supported meetings, and coordinators of ICES-sponsored symposia.

Open Session on Big Data at ICES ASC

The open session is starting to be organized. The format would include keynote speakers within and outside ICES, a panel discussion as well as hands-on demonstrations. Coordinators of the session include Jens Rasmussen (DIG) and Barbara (Bee) Berx (WGOOFE). Feedback is welcomed / encouraged from SCICOM members on the content of this open session.

5.3 ICES Training Group (ITG)

Anna Davies on behalf of the Training Group, presented a status report with reference to Doc 9 on the SharePoint site.

Some courses were cancelled in 2013 due to practical issues.

The ten training courses offered for 2014 were presented. They are being advertised and are open for registration. The Training Group is trying to strike a balance between the "golden oldies" courses and the introduction of new courses (5, 7, and 8):

- 1) Introduction to Bayesian Inference in Fishery Science - 26-30 May, Helsinki, Finland
- 2) Communicating Science and Advice - 10-11 June, ICES, Copenhagen, Denmark
- 3) How to lead an effective technical meeting - 12-13 June, ICES, Copenhagen, Denmark
- 4) AD Model Builder and Stock Assessment - 16-20 June, ICES, Copenhagen, Denmark
- 5) Design and analysis of statistically sound catch sampling programmes - 23-27 June, ICES, Copenhagen, Denmark
- 6) Stock Assessment (Introduction) - 14-18 July, ICES, Copenhagen, Denmark
- 7) Social Science Methods for Natural Scientists - 13-16 October, ICES, Copenhagen, Denmark

- 8) Marine Spatial Planning: Processes and Tools - 27-31 October, ICES, Copenhagen, Denmark
- 9) Stock Assessment (Advanced) - 3-7 November, ICES, Copenhagen, Denmark
- 10) Application of Geostatistics to analyse spatially explicit Survey data in an Ecosystem Approach - 8-12 December, Fontainebleau, Centre de Geosciences Mines ParisTech

SCICOM discussed the possibility of introducing online courses in the course programme. The topic had been touched on at the SCICOM ASC meeting and the Training Group had followed up intersessionally. The training group is also exploring the possibility of providing trailers to bring more people in.

There are arguments for and against online courses, however at present it seems that ICES does not have the capacity to make online training worthwhile, as it would require a great deal of input from both instructors, and secretariat, as well as technical equipment and skills.

Some members felt that SCICOM underestimates the efforts that have to go into this. Trainers offering a course would need to allocate more time to make sure that all the relevant material is there and in a good shape. Furthermore, the intellectual property rights of the information is another issue.

The Head of Science Programme informed SCICOM that ICES is about to cooperate with Ocean Teacher, possibly at a low-cost risk, and in the context of cooperation with the LME/GEF funded project ICES may further explore developing online courses in partnership with Ocean Teacher.

Action: The September 2013 action item was reiterated by SCICOM.

SCICOM noted that there are advantages and also challenges associated with e-learning, but nevertheless the Training Group should continue to explore the opportunities of e-learning/e-training as a new format within the Training Programme.

Decision: Martin Pastoors, a member of the training course group has recently announced a shift of jobs in to industry, however there was unanimous agreement that it will be fine for him to continue his position in the Training Group, as well as instructor of the course on Communicating Science and Advice.

6 ICES Science Fund

The ICES Science fund received a total of 23 proposals. The proposals were presented at the SCICOM SharePoint site and ranked by SCICOM using a ranking tool, grading the proposal from high (5) to low (1). A total of 20 rankings were received.

A subgroup was formed consisting of Yvonne Walther (SCICOM Chair), Adi Kellerman (HoS), and SCICOM members; Peter Wright, Begoña Santos, Jan Jaap Poos, Thomas Noji and Mats Svensson (*unable to participate*).

The subgroup met via WebEx, and evaluated the proposals taking into consideration the ranking provided by SCICOM and made a preselected shortlist for presentation at SCICOM Midterm meeting. The list contains 8 proposals with 2 proposals as reserves.

There was agreement in SCICOM that since this was the first call, there are lessons learned and gaps to be filled in for a future call. The criteria would need to be revisited and the subgroup should take onboard feedback from all SCICOM members. If there

will be a second round, we have to be more clear as to the connection with the Science Plan and participation of academia. The application form needs to be very explicit in about the criteria.

Decision: SCICOM approved the shortlist with the exchange of one proposal with one of the reserves.

Action: The secretariat will, based on the work and comments of the subgroup and SCICOM members, get back to the successful and declined proposals with with a motivation to each of the proposers.

Action: SCICOM sees the Science Fund as a good opportunity for SCICOM to get involved with science community and to give opportunities to young scientists and thus SCICOM recommends continuation of the Science Fund.

Action: The ICES Science Fund subgroup was tasked to develop a new list of criteria (if and when we get funding for a second round of funding) to be presented at SCICOM September for feedback.

7 Science Cooperation

Wojciech Wawrzynski, ICES Projects Coordinator, presented a status report on science cooperation with reference to Doc 12 on the SharePoint site.

7.1 GEF/LME (Large Marine Ecosystem initiative by the Global Environment Facility)

Since the LME idea was born many years ago in NOAA, the GEF has funded 18 regional projects. ICES has been involved in developing the 'Strengthening global governance of Large Marine Ecosystems and their coasts through enhanced sharing and application of LME/ICM/MPA knowledge and information tools' application for the past 5 years. This is not a regional but a cross-cutting project, which is still under development with UNDP, IOC and NOAA. ICES is envisaged to take the role of training coordinator. The project's main focus is capture of best practises in ocean management, including environmental and fisheries aspects, twinning and training (including e-learning). 'Ocean Teacher' – a Flemish government funded e-learning organization is a new partner in the consortium, their involvement may be beneficial for the ICES Training Programme (see 5.3). The total ICES budget to be funded by the global environment facility is ca. 400.000 USD. The project kicks of in September. ICES WGLMEBP will meet in July together with the LME consultative committee. ICES will be represented by SCICOM Chair Yvonne Walther and Wojciech Wawrzynski and the ICES DC.

The Ocean Teacher training programme offers the use of their e-learning facilities, in return for the ICES expertise which is offered to the pool. License agreements and intellectual rights remain to be defined. Implementation of this project will be a tremendous outreach for the Training Programme.

HoS also informed SCICOM that the new ToRs for the Working Group on Large Marine Ecosystem Program Best Practices (WGLMEBP) will be focusing on IEAs and there is also a lesson to be learned for ICES on their best practises which can be applied to our work in the North Atlantic. The HoS encouraged SCICOM members to sign up for the meeting, which will be embedded in the LME week in Pars, 7–11 July.

7.2 Projects: COFASP, STAGES, incoming requests

COFASP (Cooperation in Fisheries, Aquaculture and Seafood Processing – FP7 ERA NET)

The funding mechanism for COFASP is an ERANET similar to the ICES science fund. The call was opened on 1 February and it closes in April, and consists of four topics:

- Topic 1: The ecosystem approach to fisheries management,
- Topic 2: Spatial planning in fisheries and aquaculture,
- Topic 3: Improved aquaculture,
- Topic 4: Production chain.

Training needs is expected to be an important part of future calls.

COFASP intends to launch 3 calls during its runtime. The next task for ICES is to identify training needs so that this element is included in next calls.

There are seven countries funding this call (Germany, Denmark, Rumania, France, Iceland, Norway, and Turkey) and only proposals from these countries are eligible for funding.

One supporting activity will be a case study of the European Maritime Fisheries fund (EMFF). This proposal is likely to go through and ICES will be involved.

STAGES

In an effort to improve the current scientific understanding for assessing Good Environmental Status, the STAGES project organised the three following workshops to highlight where specific knowledge gaps occur for the five Thematic Groups - Biodiversity, Contaminants & Nutrients, Disturbances, Commercially Exploited Fish and Hydrographical Conditions:

- The identification of research needs with regard to the implementation of Monitoring programmes,
- Research needs with regard to the Pressures and their Impact on Marine Ecosystems,
- Research needs with regard to the socio-economic analysis under the MSFD.

Results of the workshops are available at: <http://www.stagesproject.eu/stages-project/stages-overview/stages-news/882-stages-future-research-needs-workshop-reports>

Still pending are the last deliverables:

- To work out recommendations for a MSFD science-policy interface. Establishing a science-policy mechanism will be the task of the EC's MSFD Project Coordination Group,
- An analysis 'assessing trade-offs for programmes of measures' – lead by ICES.

The STAGES project finishes in July 2014.

7.2.1 New procedure for project partners

This item is an outcome from the February Bureau meeting. ICES has been invited to more than expected competitive consortia and this turned out to be a challenge. The Bureau decided to take steps and as a result Letters of Intent have been sent to the coordinators of 8 applications to the following call topics:

- BG5-2014 Preparing for the future innovative offshore economy,

- BG8-2014 Developing in situ Atlantic ocean observations for a better management and sustainable exploitation of marine resources,
- BG9-2014 Acoustic and imaging technologies
- BG11-2014 Monitoring, dissemination and uptake of marine and maritime research,
- BG13-2014 Ocean literacy – engaging with society,
- SC5-6-2014 Biodiversity and ecosystem services: drivers of change and casualties.

HoS explained that ICES is very popular as a potential partner of consortia. When competing consortia asked us for support, some went as far as asking us to turn down the competing consortium while others invited ICES but didn't specify a budget or detailed the tasks. Others announced certain roles for ICES, however during the further process allocated that role to other partners while ICES was left with minor tasks. The way out of that dilemma suggested by Bureau was to say yes to all parties requesting ICES support, and to re-evaluate ICES participation after the first round of review for the successful ones

Some quality assessment could be needed because some of the proposals supposed to have ICES support are poor. In addition, a purely passive role for a big marine science organization is disappointing and not adequate to our reputation in the North Atlantic science community. SCICOM was asked to come with suggestions for how to improve the process of project involvement in general.

SCICOM pointed to the fact that surprisingly ICES has not been invited to some of the consortia responding to crucial calls related to the new EU landing and reporting obligations for instance. Therefore ICES should reconsider a more proactive approach instead of restricting to a passive mode only.

On the other hand there are consortia asking for a passive participation of ICES (as a supporting/endorsing organization, without a partner role). HoS suggested that the Secretariat could be given the mandate to evaluate proposals and propose the ones for supporting. SCICOM concluded that the evaluation process can be cumbersome and should be left to the donor and thus the Secretariat should issue a support letter to all requests received from ICES member states.

SCICOM was reminded of the decision tree and the Bureau's responsibility to select proposals for ICES to join.

Decision: The evaluation process is cumbersome and would make an elitistic choice between consortia. SCICOM supports the generic process and supports leaving the evaluation process to the funding agency.

Project Decision Tree

SCICOM revisited and discussed the '[Project Decision Tree](#)' which was adopted by Council in 2011 and its consequences for the current situation debated earlier (see 7.2.1). It outlines how the ICES Secretariat engages with project proposals where the organisation is asked to be an active partner, i.e. whether ICES should have an active or passive participation/role. Given the new practice of sending Letters of Intent, part of the decision tree has become redundant. However, what role can be foreseen for SCICOM given it is ICES representation of science?

If ICES is approached by consortia, there is full confidentiality involved, with a template to be filled in with information that goes to the Bureau. If SCICOM is involved in the first filtering exercise currently done in the Secretariat, competing consortia might

learn from each other derived from the information that comes along with the invitation. But still, given its leadership in science SCICOM felt it would benefit from increased, proactive involvement in consortia and in initiating those. Thus, it should be SCICOM looking into future Horizon 2020 calls and select those that are relevant for the organization with a view on bringing institutes together. This would be a good and new approach and might ensure that those funding research are aware of the transatlantic role of ICES.

SCICOM will have to establish a group and look into Horizon 2020 programmes and calls, otherwise the train has left the station. There are 16 calls that relate to our work and they all have deadlines in June. It was agreed to forget about this year. For next year SCICOM should establish a process.

Action: A subgroup was tasked to start a process on how to be proactive towards upcoming calls, such as Horizon 2020. The subgroup consists of SG Chairs, Tom Noji and Wojciech Wawrzynski.

7.3 The North Pacific Marine Science Organization (PICES) and SGSP

HoS reported on Study Group on Strategic Planning (SGSP). The scientific cooperation between PICES and ICES was given direction by the "Report of the P/ICES Study Group on Strategic Planning: Developing a Framework for Scientific Cooperation in Northern Hemisphere Marine Science". The document was agreed by the PICES Science Board and ICES Science Committee in 2011. The document suggested that a review of the agreed priorities and a wider strategic analysis be conducted every 3–5 years. Given that in PICES, the FUTURE programme (equivalent to a strategic research agenda) is under review in April 2014, and that the new ICES Science Plan is released in June 2014, there will be a solid background for a review and strategic discussion of research priorities and areas of common interest between the two organizations. The long-term, joint research priority areas agreed in 2011 were: Climate Change, Ecosystem Assessment, Ocean acidification, Hypoxia/anoxia, Marine Spatial Planning, Training, Knowledge Exchange/ Communication. Notably, while the joint research activities on climate change were very successful, hypoxia/anoxia as well as ocean acidification for instance were neglected. Strategic cooperation of two regional marine science organizations in a global science world is crucial for the success of both.

SCICOM is to establish a subgroup which will form the refreshed Study Group on Strategic Planning with complimentary membership to come from the PICES Science Board.

Decision/Action: Daniel Duplisea, Tom Noji, Mats Svensson, Henn Ojaveer, volunteered to join the Study Group on Strategic Planning – and the Russian SCICOM member should be invited to join the group as well.

7.4 IPBES

The IPBES progress is described in Doc 32. There have been two actions since the last report – attendance of the second stakeholder conference and nomination of experts.

Visibility of marine issues is still a problem because marine issues are generally only vaguely incorporated into the current (2014–2018) workplan. However, this can potentially change from 2019 onwards.

ICES has offered hosting a meeting and nominated experts on two areas. The process was led by the SIBAS co-Chair. ICES has extended a wish to IPBES to become a formal observer and the process is ongoing.

SCICOM Chair thanked Henn Ojaveer for the good work. SCICOM recommended continuing the dialogue with IPBES.

7.5 UN Regular Process (Global Integrated Assessment)

Jörn Schmidt gave an update from the UN regular process. The process formerly referred to as “Regular Process for Global Reporting and Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment, including Socio-economic Aspects” has been renamed and is now called “United Nations World Ocean Assessment”, and it is a global endeavour to produce the scientific basis for the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, following on the Assessment of Assessments which ended in 2009.

Jörn Schmidt outlined the contents of the report. The Group of Experts will be assisted by a Pool of Experts (without limit of numbers) nominated by States, through the regional groups of the UN General Assembly. The Pool of Experts will provide expertise in the wide range of areas and subjects needed for the World Ocean Assessment. Currently there are 517 experts

Writing teams have been formed and ICES Scientists are represented. The 2014 meeting is taking place in parallel with the SCICOM meeting.

The first World Ocean Assessment is expected to be completed by the end of 2014.

7.6 Euroscience Open Forum (ESOF) 2014

HoS reported on the European Open Science Forum which is organised bi-annually – the last event was held in Dublin, Ireland and this time the meeting will be held in Copenhagen. ICES has been invited to contribute with proposals for topical sessions and to take part in the public outreach programme - Science in the City Festival – that takes place alongside the conference from the 21–26 June 2014.

ICES submitted a proposal for a topical session on food security, which was not approved. The second activity with ICES involvement was a proposal to bring in ICES research vessels on Langelinie and there will be a vessel from Sweden, two from Denmark, one from Germany and one from the Netherlands.

7.6.1 EUROCEANS/EUROMARINE

The ICES HoS is on the Advisory Board. The most recent meeting was the EUROCEANS Hot Topics Conference “A Changing Ocean” in November 2013 (http://www.eur-oceans.eu/hot_topics_conf). The EUROCEANS consortium decided to accept an offer (out of three in total) of the French CNRS to host the secretariat, however, it has not been officially announced yet. The EUROMARINE CSA consortium prepares for the launch of EUROMARINE+, the merger of the three NoEs Marbef, EUROCEANS and MarineGenomics(+) in early 2014. More details here <http://www.eur-oceans.eu/?q=node/33363>. There is a contractual agreement, but all have made provisions to safe-guard their continued existence.

7.6.2 JPI (Joint Programming Initiative – Healthy and Productive Seas and Oceans) (JPI-CSA)

HoS gave an update on ICES cooperation with JPI. JPI has conducted an analysis of major marine science networks in Europe and ICES was identified as a particularly good example of a science-supporting-policy organisation. JPI is interested in using ICES as a case study in one of their Coordinating Support Actions (CSA) deliverables. The question how JPI Oceans can benefit ICES and other science-policy organisations

is considered essential for this case study as well as for the proposed Strategic Research Agenda for the JPI. There is a continuing dialogue between ICES and JPI.

7.6.3 EMBRC (European Marine Biological Research Centre)

EMBRC has successfully reached the end of the (project) preparatory phase and is now moving towards the implementation phase. Implementation will build on documents and knowledge produced in the last three years of preparation. The implementation phase will see the establishment of a new governance structure and infrastructure construction funded by ESRFI. The countries that have signed the Memorandum of Understanding are committed to lead EMBRC into operation.

7.7 Symposia 2014–2015

The HoS updated SCICOM on the 2014-2015 symposia.

The Second Symposium on Fishery-Dependent Information was held in Rome from 3–6 March 2014. Ingeborg de Boois reported from the symposium. The keynotes were excellent and there were fishermen in the audience, and they were involved and felt they were taken seriously.

The fliers are now available for the Oceans Past symposium to be held during 18-20 May 2015 in Tallinn, Estonia.

The new proposals for symposia to be held in 2016 were briefly presented and were dealt with in more detail under item 10.6:

- Understanding marine socio-ecological systems: including the human dimension in Integrated Ecosystem Assessments
- Drivers of dynamics of small pelagic neritic fish resources
- 6th Zooplankton Production Symposium, at an early planning stage.

It was clarified that due to the high number of symposia having asked for the IJMS as outlet in 2016, the Eel symposium [2013/3/SSGEF01] will not be published until 2017 in the ICES Journal of Marine Science. The revolving list will be updated accordingly.

7.8 Arctic cooperation

HoS gave a short state-of-the-art update on Arctic cooperation.

ICES has established good work relationships with the following working groups of the Arctic Council:

Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP). There are regular meetings between the secretariats. Amongst other topics, it was agreed to reinvigorate the role of the ICES Data Centre as AMAP data repository. ICES has co-sponsored the science symposium on Arctic Ocean Acidification, held in Bergen, Norway, May 2013, and hosted meetings of AMAP groups (for instance, APECS Board meeting) at ICES HQ. ICES was invited to nominate experts to the upcoming Arctic Ocean Acidification Assessment.

Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF) (<http://www.caff.is>): The Secretariat participated in the Circumpolar Biological Monitoring Programme CBMP marine, Steering Group meeting, held in Akureyri, Iceland, October 2013. CBMP marine expressed an interest in using the fish data kept in the ICES data centre. However, in order to be meaningful the fish data need to include the Icelandic and Barents Sea data.

Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME) (<http://www.pame.is>). The secretariat participated in the PAME Working Group meeting (PAME I-2014), held at Alyeska AK (USA) and presented ICES portfolio of marine research and networks.

The Secretariat attends the meetings of the International Arctic Science Council (IASC) in the context of the Arctic Science Summit Week since 2010. ICES was also invited to join the ICARP III process (International Conference in Arctic Research Priorities, under the joint umbrella of AC and IASC) which will culminate in the actual conference in 2015. ICARP III is an interactive process considering the interests of all involved players (<http://icarp.arcticportal.org/>).

The Secretariat participated in the 2nd Meeting of Scientific Experts on Fish Stocks in the Arctic Ocean (<http://icarp.arcticportal.org/>) held in Tromsø, Norway, 27–31 October 2013. The meeting discussed fish stock and fisheries issues and reported to the governments of Canada, Greenland, Norway Russia and the USA (see Annex 3: Report of meeting).

7.9 Aquaculture

HoS updated SCICOM on the most recent activities on aquaculture.

ICES is cooperating with the 7th RFP ERA-net project COFASP, standing for Cooperation in Fisheries, Aquaculture and Sea Food Processing. The project focuses on capture fisheries, aquaculture and seafood processing including distribution to consumers. But it will also enter into the area of blue biotechnology in terms of integrated production technology and utilization of limited marine living resources and maritime space. One of the processes in COFASP leads towards a SRA i.a. for aquaculture.

The next step will be to initiate an exchange of views and to identify areas of common research interests with the EU and NA aquaculture industry representatives (such as FEAP, EATIP, EAS, CIMTAN). There is a consultation process with WGAQUA.

In 2013 the IMR provided a secondment (Ole Torrissen) to work in the Secretariat for one year and to develop some guidance on developing aquaculture science and advice to member countries. The first product is a strategic paper on the topic (see Annex 2: Strategic paper. The Secretariat (HoS, Ole) participated in and presented ICES to the 2014 International Conference of the World Aquaculture Society held in Seattle WA (US) from 9–12 February. The ICES Bureau has requested SCICOM to review the document and the document is also discussed outside ICES – Ole Torrissen is trying to invigorate the aquaculture constituencies that used to be linked with ICES.

Action: SCICOM members were requested to send their comments on the strategic paper "ICES Advice on Aquaculture " to the HoS programme.

7.10 Other

No other issues were brought up.

8 Science Implementation

8.1 Evaluation of EGs under multi-annual ToR

The transition to multi-annual ToRs was introduced as a staggered process starting in 2012 and the remaining groups will present MA draft resolutions this year for their 2015-2017 meetings. Science Expert Groups are not automatically renewed and this year two groups will end their three-year terms (WGHIST and WGOOFE), and they

will be asked to complete an online self-evaluation in the autumn. SCICOM members were referred to Doc 18 providing an overview of all Science EGs, their meeting dates, Chairs, Support Secretaries, and the multi-annual start-year.

8.2 SSG roles and functions and Membership

SCICOM Chair, Yvonne Walther, presented Doc 19 on Steering Group Role and function in the context of the new set of SSGs reflecting the new Science Plan. The SCICOM Chair asked for comments and input on the structure and the roles of the SSGs.

SSG Draft Resolutions

The draft resolutions for the SSGs have been developed via Webex meetings in cooperation with all SSG Chairs and are available on the SCICOM Sharepoint site for feedback. The aim is for SCICOM to approve the SSG resolutions by end-May.

SSG parentage

Three SSGs (SSGEPD, SSGEPI, SSGIEA) refer to SCICOM and two SSGs (SSGIEOM and BSG) have shared parentage between ACOM and SCICOM.

Action/Decision: It was agreed that in addition to SSGIEOM and BSG, SSGIEA should be under joint parentage by ACOM and SCICOM and in order to formalise this an ACOM Co-Chair should be nominated.

SSG Membership and Chairmanship

Finding new Chairs for SSGs must be an active process as it will be difficult to foster new Chairs without new resources. The possibility of having co-chairs that could be eligible for the future chairmanship is a possibility to explore. Co-chairs can for example be picked from interested experts at the EG level. This process will open up the SSGs as a possibility to advance within ICES and get more responsibility.

Members of the SSGs are Chairs of the constituent EGs when applicable, appointed SCICOM and ACOM members. The SSG chairs are allowed to appoint additional members based on the need for expertise in the group.

Action: The Benchmark SG does not have any EGs, so it will have to create its own core membership. to be appointed by SG benchmark Chairs.

Making the SSGs functional

The SCICOM Chair highlighted the need to establish a structure to improve the SSG communication process. This could be done via regular (minimum two per year) WebEx meetings - one before the midterm meeting, and one before ASC. The SCICOM Chair would be happy to join the first round of SSG WebEx's.

The role/status of the SSG Chairs

This issue had been brought up intersessionally. The SSG Chairs, representing either ACOM or SCICOM, are responsible for the information process between their parent Committee and the Steering Group. The SSG Chairs are welcome to participate in SCICOM and ACOM meetings but are not members or eligible for any additional travel funding.

The SCICOM Chair highlighted the need to strengthen the profile of the SSG Chairs.

Action: ICES Secretariat, ACOM and SCICOM should engage in promoting the importance of the SSG Chairs and their key position in implementing the Science Plan and associated advice.

The possibility of having cross-cutting meetings on EG level should be explored. Other for cross-cutting actions are the SCICOM Business group WebEx'es and the ACOM leadership/SCICOM Business Group. The ACOM/SCICOM joint meetings is an important source of information flow between the SSGs and ACOM/SCICOM.

SSG reporting

SCICOM discussed the reporting format for SSGs for the SCICOM Midterm and September meetings, and for the annual progress report.

It was agreed that the reporting would be made a lot easier with a template and the following items were brought up:

- EG performance/MA ToR Progress
- Science highlights
- Structural diagrams of the consistent EGs
- EG participation – perhaps SCICOM interaction will be needed to assist at solving the problems.
- Interaction between ACOM and SCICOM,
- Perceived needs and gaps

The ACOM Chair stressed that since three of the SSG reports will also be fed to ACOM, they should deal with strategic issues of mutual interest, and issues of relevance to Bureau and Council should be given priority. Coordination between SCICOM and ACOM is needed to minimize the reporting as much as possible.

The reports should focus on how well we are fulfilling the strategy; if we are not moving with the IEAs there is not much point in all of this. Are we progressing towards what we hoped they would be?

There should be a linkage between the SSG report given at the spring and September meetings in order to create continuation which be time-saving for the SSG Chairs.

Perhaps a special template needs to be developed for the joint SSGs.

SCICOM has already developed a template for the annual Progress report, asking for SSG to report on vision, roadmap, recommendations and aspirations.

Action: SSG Chairs will meet by WebEx intersessionally to develop a template for SSG reporting, building on the current template for the annual progress report with vision, highlights and aspirations of the Chair. Strategic issues and performance measurements and highlights from EGs should be included. Dual reporting for ACOM and SCICOM needs to be established. The SSG template(s) should be tabled at the joint ACOM/SCICOM leadership meeting for approval.

8.3 Delivery of operational oceanographic products to IEA process (Dickey-Collas)

Mark Dickey-Collas gave an update of progress on preparations for the call for operational oceanographic products and services. Since September 2013, a larger group (including the chairs of WGOOFE, WGOH, WGIPEM, SSGESST, SSGRSP and ICES data centre and scientists from the MyOceans community and from North America) have contributed to the development of the call. The proposed call text was presented to SCICOM. The Chair thanked the group for their work and acknowledged that the group had addressed the concerns raised at the last SCICOM meeting in Iceland.

A discussion by SCICOM lead to the following issues:

- The call must be widely publicised to ensure an equitable approach and that the most appropriate producers have an opportunity to respond.
- When different producers provide competing products, the evaluation group must choose one product, based on the evaluation criteria. The committee must be independent of those offering products.
- The initial process should be viewed as the start of an iterative approach. There are likely to be mistakes in the approach, but we hope to learn by our mistakes. Likewise the list of variables for which we need products should be considered an initial list.
- The process is a SCICOM process. The Secretariat is enabling the process, not making the decisions. All assessments and decisions made by the evaluation group will be recorded and provided with full transparency and openness to scrutiny.

Decision: SCICOM agrees to launch the call. Mark Dickey-Collas confirmed that addition text will be added to address the issues surrounding transparency of the selection process and equitability across the community.

8.4 Guidance for EGs regarding deliverables to MSFD

Pierre Petitgas presented Doc 21 on MSFD work and procedures within ICES. Pierre is member of the Council Steering Group on MSFD (CSG-MSFD) and acts as a link to SCICOM.

MSFD is a legal framework that obliges the EU countries to monitor and assess the state of their ecosystems and take measures to ensure good health of their ecosystems. Each member state is responsible for Good Environmental Status in their national waters. CSG-MSFD has worked to make ICES visible in the international context. ICES has to streamline the delivery of MSFD products across relevant groups.

Several groups of SCICOM can contribute to this process but there are no ToRs or coordination and the EGs address the MSFD issues as they think best. There have been some specific activities requested through ACOM like indicators of food-webs indicators, etc.

The work will be channelled through the regular ICES process. The joint ACOM/SCICOM steering groups (SSGIEA on regional seas, BSG (benchmark) and SSGIEOM (surveys)) together with the CSG-MSFD should develop new ToR for the expert groups to channel short case studies.

SCICOM and CSG-MSFD are invited to jointly develop a strategy. The challenge is to balance the academic work and the MSFD developmental needs.

The SCICOM Chair requested feedback from SCICOM for CSG-MSFD. A better information flow between SCICOM and CSG-MSFD will be needed in the future. CSG MSFD wil meet in May.

Comments/discussion

ICES is learning how to streamline our products, and how to use our knowledge in relation to the MSFD. There is lots of knowledge in IEA groups that can be used for the MSFD, but the operational delivery lines need to be facilitated. We can use ToRs for EGs to direct work, but we should not increase the workload of EGs. The aim is to use the work already done.

SSGIEA EGs should be asked how they can deliver to the MSFD process but with a gentle hand. This is an area where ACOM and SCICOM should work more closely and offer a space for them to volunteer into.

Action: As a first step Pierre Petitgas, acting as CSG-MSFD representative, and the SCICOM Chair will be invited to attend the next SSGIEA WebEx meeting.

IEA and monitoring groups

There is a missing link between the IEA and the monitoring groups and clear communication lines need to be established. **Action:** The Chairs of SSGIEA and SSGIEOM should establish cross cutting communication between the groups.

External partners

ICES has explained to external partners what ICES can contribute and now has to look inwards and find out how we will do this in practise. Guidance should be given to EGs on how to provide knowledge to MSFD processes. ICES has a good dialogue with the Regional Seas Commission (RSC), the Black Sea and the Mediterranean commissions. As a result there is a WG dealing with foodwebs. We have increased our cooperation with DG-ENV and DG-MARE. We are building cooperation with HELCOM and OSPAR, both with requests but also to have joint WGs. HELCOM will revise their HO-LAS process and would like ICES to contribute. Experts in HELCOM and ICES working in parallel processes will start to work jointly on this.

Indicators

Indicators are developed through requests and through the *pro bono* science. Suggestions for indicators from EGs could also come into the integrated assessments and the MSFD framework. However, since the EGs do not get to see the bigger picture of how their work fits with other EG MSFD-developed products, more coordination at high level would be helpful, trying to make better use of the science products developed. For instance, the survey groups could provide their own product feeding into IEA.

The General Secretary pointed out that ICES is already participating in the process and that ICES cooperates with JRC on developing the implementation process. In addition ICES was requested to look at biodiversity indicators and MSFD descriptors D3, D4, D6 and D11.

The SCICOM Chair thanked the SCICOM members for the discussion. SCICOM is becoming more active in relation to MSFD and the information flow has to be improved between the groups.

9 SCICOM Steering Groups

9.1 SSGEPD (SSGEF)

Graham Pierce reported from Steering Group on Ecosystem Processes and Dynamics (SSGEPD)/SCICOM Steering Group on Ecosystems Functions (SSGEF).

The ASC September discussions focused on the Science Plan and there was also some discussion of how to ensure communication and coordination across EGs, much of which came down to acknowledgement of the value of talking to people rather than attempting to communicate through recommendations.

Suggestions included more WKCHAIRS-type events and creation of a good practice guide for report writing, and giving all EGs a ToR that specifically asks them to (a)

examine how they can best help to implement the Science Plan and (b) optimise communications with other groups and committees.

The SSGEPD ToRs were presented in draft form. All SSG ToRs will be streamlined via SSG Chair WebEx and SCICOM will be asked for approval by correspondence in late May.

SSGEPD recommends forming a core group of chairs. In addition to undertaking general monitoring and reviewing tasks, this group would work with all associated EG chairs and members to best achieve the implementation of the Science Plan and optimize communication, possibly writing a position paper on this.

A discussion on SSG core groups followed and there was overall agreement that SCICOM should not create more levels within the SSGs, but as an informal mechanism core groups could be a good way for SSGs to organise their work.

All EG Chairs should be invited to join the core group, but clearly participation in SSG core groups should be on a voluntary basis.

SCICOM was informed that Graham Pierce will complete his three-year term by the end of this year (2014), with the possibility of a one-year extension. **Decision:** Graham agreed to stay on as SSGEPD Chair. SCICOM applauded his decision and thanked him.

The question of how to foster new SSG Chairs was raised. If they cannot be found within SCICOM, they should be found among the EG Chairs.

9.2 SSGEPI (SSGSUE/SSGHIE)

Daniel Duplisea reported from Steering Group on Ecosystem Pressures and Impacts (SSGEPI),

At the ASC September 2013 meeting SSGSUE and SSGHIE met jointly. The meeting aimed at introducing the Science Plan to expert groups and good and useful feedback was received. The following challenges were brought up at the ASC meeting for the attention of SCICOM:

- We need to work hard to integrate groups doing work such as Marine Chemistry into the grand vision of IEA.
- EPI has groups doing aquaculture, fisheries assessment methods and marine chemistry and is quite disparate and we need to be aware of that
- ICES is volunteer science organisation and we need to do the work to keep people coming in the face of competition for people's time and money from organisations like OSPAR.
- The decline of middle management in ICES has the potential to leave some groups adrift. EPI contains many more expert groups than either SUE or HIE and they have a wider subject area yet there is about the same level of care for it as for SUE or HIE alone. We are going to need all of SCICOM to come into the steering groups in a more active way and need points of contact for expert groups.
- We need to transfer knowledge towards the benchmarking process.

SCICOM was reminded that Daniel Duplisea will complete his term (three years plus one) by the end of this year (2014). SCICOM discussed the possibility of introducing a

co-Chair, but it was not possible to recruit a co-Chair in SCICOM and Daniel is now seeking potential candidates within the SSG membership.

Action: SCICOM members were encouraged to suggest good candidates for chair to SSGEPI and SCICOM

Action: SSGEPI Chair will contact potential candidates from within the SSG. If none are interested an official call will be sent out.

9.3 SSGIEA (SSGRSP)

Dave Reid reported from Steering Group on Integrated Ecosystem Assessments (SSGIEA)/Steering Group on Regional Sea Programmes (SSGRSP). There are two new groups devoted to ecosystem assessments and comparisons. WGIBAR is the new ecosystem assessment group for the Barents Sea and by its geographic nature is mainly a Norwegian/Russian group. While WGECOMEDA deals with comparing IEA processes between Mediterranean European and Atlantic ocean regions, SGSPATIAL is a Baltic SG looking at spatial changes, changes in predator-prey overlap, changes in spatial connectivity, and at indicators for spatial distribution.

WGEAWESS met last year and worked on ecosystem descriptions proposed by WKECOVER, and is moving towards ODEMM type of analysis.

WGNARS presented worked examples of linked IEA components, advice on the process for operational IEAs and IEA management objectives.

WKRISCO is a new workshop proposed to SCICOM as a successor to WKBEMIA which was considered a good scoping exercise and spawned good basis for developing in WKRISCO. It will provide a forward looking system analysis across the ICES ecoregions of the governance and legal context that impact on IEAs. It will also explore with HELCOM and OSPAR their science needs.

WKLINCON, linking contaminants into IEA: it proved difficult to identify new Chairs, so it was felt that we had reached the point where we recommend closing it down until there is more momentum on the topic in the future.

In general there is a participation problem in the IEA groups. There is still a critical mass, however, the issue will need attention of delegates at some point. WGIAB will need to develop stronger relationships with HELCOM. Steps have been taken but it needs continuous attention.

9.4 SSGIEOM (SSGESST)

Nils-Olav Handegard presented an update from Steering Group on Integrated Ecosystem Observation and Monitoring (SSGIEOM)/Steering Group on Ecosystem Surveys, Science and Technology (SSGESST).

The structure of the SSG will be the same as previous, although not fully updated to reflect the new group membership. From the meeting last year it created some sub-groups, and ACOM groups were added which are mainly concerned with catch statistics, which will be fitted into the map.

WGISUR and WGISDAA provide info on how to further develop SSGIEOM services. Methods development is important according to thesecond objective in the SP (4.2) andtwo groups are tasked to do this one WGFASST and WGFSTB (with SGCAL).

Other main objectives are the monitoring programme, the quality and delivery of data products and guidelines/standards. The survey planning and operations groups are linked to these objectives.

Two ToRs were proposed in cooperation with the ACOM co-Chair):

ToR m) guidelines for good practice – what kind of info do you need to have in place in order to have a survey protocol. This also needs to decide how to document time-series changes in sampling and processing methods, personnel etc..

ToR h) How can the survey groups know what guideline to use? An overview of all surveys is needed, a list of ACOM data products received from the secretariat, which is then followed by an ICES position paper on Integrated Surveys, followed by data requirements for the IEAs, then all of this info will be collated in one place. The overview will be essential for successful surveys, data and IEA production. During the process communication with the Regional Conventions is needed to tune survey requirements with their monitoring needs, as well as consultation with the DCF needs via the regional coordination groups. Ideally this info should be easily available on the ICES Website. Communication with the other SSGs will be needed. One of the main problems to be addressed is that surveys were designed for a targeted and thus restricted purpose but then frequently are used massively for different observation requirements, but for which they were never designed. The problem then is how to deal with the data. As an example, just because there may be more herring the catches, it does not really mean that there are 10 times more herring in the sea. Also, somewhere along the road, it could be nice to take the survey protocols and check if they are being followed.

In terms of flexibility of surveys and suitability for integrated surveys requirements how can they be made more appropriate to collect data for the ecosystem assessments?

9.5 Benchmark management and coordination

Jörn Schmidt gave an introduction to the new Benchmark Steering Group. It was clarified that the correct acronym for the Benchmark Steering Group is BSG and this has to be streamlined across documents.

BSG does not yet have specific groups under its umbrella.

Benchmarking/Operationalization is a very central component of the new Strategic Plan. To aim is to ensure the effective transfer and application of innovative and relevant science into sound, credible and responsive advice. The overarching objectives were outlined:

From Science Plan:

- Establish a multiple tier process for benchmarks of ecosystems and ecosystem sub-components assessments in ICES regional seas.
- Define a clear step-by-step approach with an achievable timetable to manage the benchmarking process
- Develop performance criteria and standards to evaluate the process.

From Advice Plan:

- Improve incorporation of process understanding to the advice

BSG will be building on the existing benchmark process looking at other environmental and ecosystem aspects, e.g. seabirds, marine mammals, contaminants, and furthermore to expand to the IEA (including social and economic aspects).

One of the objectives of BSG is to form an umbrella for the entire benchmark process within ICES to explore and lead the transition from single stock benchmarks to regionally based benchmarks that identify the ecosystem process and integrated ecosystem process, potentially interacting with the stock assessments.

Jörn Schmidt emphasized that good communication will be key – both within ICES (Stock Assessment, IEA, Survey and methodological EGs and current benchmarks) and outside ICES (with academics and other scientists, managers, stakeholders).

The next steps will be to organise membership, to better understand the existing process (and how to build on it), identify recurrent advice, and develop a process for regional IEAs and in the longer run regional advice.

The Advice Plan outlines specific actions for BSG which will ensure the transition from single stock to regional benchmarks.

Comments:

Benchmarking – data and surveys

The DIG Chair asked if the benchmark process will involve the people who collect the data? In reply Jörn Schmidt and Carmen Fernández confirmed that there is a recognised need to look at the quality of the data and this is already the case in the current benchmark process. When doing a benchmark for a specific stock, you have a data compilation workshop. It will be important to look at the data issues, including common features and problems connected to the data that one might encounter in a given region and to have data compilation workshops proceeding the IEA workshops on benchmarks.

Quality control of the surveys should also be included in the benchmark process. What has been missing is evaluation of the survey itself. Up to now there has mostly been focus on whether the data fits with the assessments. **SCICOM and ACOM need to consider whether this should be done within SSGIEOM, or under BSG.**

Benchmarks in the wider ecosystem context need input from ecosystem experts and demonstration examples need to be seen by the EG.

This is collected in September which would make it possible to contact the relevant EGs.

There are complex models developed to address the processes in the ecosystem that are not used in the advisory process at the moment and this should be a priority for this group. Perhaps the modelling WG could belong to BSG?

Having the modelling groups under BSG umbrella makes sense and WGISDAA would be an obvious candidate to be involved in servicing the benchmark process. The benchmarking process should pick up on which groups to be contacted for each of the benchmarks.

Remit/scope

Defining the scope and the remit of the benchmark process could be a challenge. Potentially all ICES science could be benchmarked. There is a wish to build on the current benchmark process and to improve it with ecosystem elements. We want to transfer

science into advice and the mechanism to do this is called benchmarks! Not all advice needs to be benchmarked.

Membership

The Chairs will approach relevant experts with interest on the benchmarking process to populate BSG. All SSG Chairs should be ex officio members of BSG. Pierre Petitgas volunteered to become a member of the group.

Action: The SCICOM Chair requested that the final draft of the BSG resolution should aim toward better harmonization between the Science Plan and the ToRs. Furthermore the resolution should include a membership list and a multi-year roadmap. All SSG Chairs should be ex officio members of BSG.

The SCICOM Chair praised the Co-Chairs for an excellent job at developing the new SSG and draft resolutions.

10 Draft resolutions for EG and SSGs

Updated Category 3 resolution

ICES will alter resolution 2011/3/SSGSUE05 for World Conference on Stock assessment Methods to provide a symposium volume of the ICES Journal of Marine Science in support of the conference proceedings.

Decision: The updated Category 3 resolution was approved by SCICOM and PUB-COM supported the proposal unanimously.

Category 2 Resolutions

Terms of Reference for WGNEPS, WGCRAb and WGSCALLOP (ACOM)

The proposal to give the shellfish expert groups (WGNEPS, WGCRAb and WGSCALLOP and maybe more) a push in direction of the MSFD and D3 via a term of Reference:

“The group is requested to consider development of methods to assess MSFD Descriptor 3 as regards criteria 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 and possible other future contributions.”

was supported by SCICOM

Action: SCICOM recommended that as a first step the suggested approach should be communicated to the relevant groups by the Secretariat, with a request to provide feedback to SCICOM.

Parentage of WGITMO and WGBOSV

Henn Ojaveer explained to background for the proposal to change the parentage of [Working Group on Introduction and Transfers of Marine Organisms \(WGITMO\)](#) and [Working Group on Ballast and Other Ship Vectors \(WGBOSV\)](#). These groups are largely doing science and the groups unanimously decided at their last meeting that they would like to report to SCICOM instead of ACOM.

ACOM Chair supported the proposal, but brought up the need for a clear mechanism for adding specific advisory requests to multi-annual Science expert groups. The groups discussed this and both groups are flexible and willing to take on the advisory requests on an annual basis.

Decision: SCICOM supports the wish of the groups to change parentage to SCICOM starting in 2015. It was agreed to add a ToR to the multi-annual ToRs of these groups to deal with advisory requests an annual basis.

10.1 SSGEF Draft Resolutions

Workshop on Lampreys and Shads (WKLS).

Decision/Action: The workshop will report to WGRECORDS and to SSGEF (to be added to the resolution). A reference should be added to WGBYC, otherwise approved!

Workshop of a Planning Group on the Monitoring of Eel Quality under the subject “Development of standardized and harmonized protocols for the estimation of eel quality” (WKPGMEQ) as proposed by WGEEL. SCICOM was informed that WGEEL expects to submit a draft resolutions for a workshop on contaminants for SCICOM approval in September

Decision: SCICOM noted that the topic of this workshop is very important and approved the resolution.

Workshop on Growth-increment Chronologies in Marine Fish: climate-ecosystem interactions in the North Atlantic (WKGIC).

Decision: SCICOM approved the resolution with a note that PGCCDBS should engage in this group as well.

Working Group on Cephalopod Biology and Life History (WGCEPH)

Decision: SCICOM supported the resolution and noted that the group is ambitious. WGCEPH will meet the first year in Lisbon, Portugal, to get good attendance of cephalopod scientists.

Working Group on Seabird Ecology (WGSE). SCICOM noted the plans to establish a joint working group with the regional conventions. A new resolution will be brought forward for SCICOM approval in September 2014.

SCICOM noted that the **Working Group on the Science Requirements to Support Conservation, Restoration and Management of Diadromous Species (WGRECORDS)** will continue under the same format as under the old Science Plan. The group spawns EGs and theme sessions, and thus the Secretariat was asked to ensure that the relevant groups (under WGRECORDS) have been moved to SSGEPD as well. This group will present new MA tors and new chairs.

Working Group on the Biology and Life History of Crabs (WGCRAB). WGCRAB were approached during the SCICOM meeting to clarify whether ToR c) “to produce assessment and advice of the main crab and lobster species in the ICES area in future” was a request from ACOM, or from the group itself. It was clarified that this task is their own initiative.

Decision: With this clarification the resolution was approved.

10.2 SSGRSP Draft Resolutions

Working Group on Integrating Ecological and Economic Models (WGIMM).

Decision: SCICOM approved the resolution and noted that the meeting date for the first meeting of WGIMM under multi-annual ToRs will be late in the year and the report date will be updated to December 31.

Working Group on Large Marine Ecosystem Program Best Practices (WGLMEBP).

SSGRSP/SSGIEA Chair found that some of the ToRs were repetitive, and it was agreed that he should get back the Chairs to ask for clarification with regard to ToR G, **and to consolidate e), f) and g) into a single ToR linking to the GEF initiative.**

Decision/Action: The resolution was approved, pending the update of ToRs e, f and g.

Study Group on Spatial Analyses for the Baltic Sea (SGSPATIAL)

Decision: SCICOM approved the resolution with no comments.

Workshop on Regional Seas Commissions and Integrated Ecosystem Assessment Scoping (WKRISCO)

SCICOM was informed that this workshop (joint owned by ACOM and SCICOM) is a sequel to WKBEMIA. The meeting and reporting date will be added to the resolution as soon as the attendance has been assured.

Decision: The coding should be updated to reflect that this is a workshop jointly owned by SCICOM and ACOM. This group should be under the parentage of the Benchmark Steering Group (BSG) and should report to SSGIEA. The resolution was approved by SCICOM, pending decision by ACOM.

10.3 SSGESST Draft Resolution

Working Group on International Deep Pelagic Ecosystem Surveys (WGIDEEPS). SCICOM noted that this group was the former **Working Group on Redfish Surveys (WGRS)**. The Secretariat informed SCICOM that this group normally meets three times a year; this year they only met once, and they did not have enough attendance to decide on an extra chair.

Decision: SCICOM approved the resolution.

Working Group on Electrical Trawling (WGELECTRA)

Decision/Action: SCICOM approval was postponed. The SSGESST Chair was asked to get back to the chairs and ask for a new resolution to be submitted with new ToRs c) and d) and it should be clarified if this is in response to an advisory request.

Working Group on Acoustic and Egg Surveys for Sardine and Anchovy in ICES Areas VII, VIII and IX (WGACEGG).

SCICOM noted that WGACEGG had been renamed to cover a larger area.

SSGESST Chair was asked to get back to the Chairs asking for a ToR to be added on data storage. If they are positive to this request, the ToRs will be added. If the group is not in agreement, SCICOM will need to revisit the issue in September. The incoming Chair should be asked to contact WGISDAA.

Decision/Action: SCICOM approved the resolution pending this issue of data storage and renaming of workshops (to be held within the meeting) to subgroups/sessions.

10.4 SSGHIE Draft Resolutions

ICES-CIESM workshop on 'Latest advances regarding the ecology and impact of *Mnemiopsis leidyi*', including its associated alien predatory ctenophore *Beroe* spp. and economic aspects'

Decision: SCICOM noted that this is a very ambitious topic and approved the resolution, pending a workshop acronym.

10.5 SSGSUE Draft Resolutions

Working Group on Methods of Fish Stock Assessment (WGMG)

Decision: SCICOM approved the resolution, and requested that the extra set of ToRs be removed to comply with the template for multi-annual ToRs.

Updated MA ToRs for Working Group on Multispecies Assessment Methods (WGSAM)

Decision: SCICOM approved the resolution with a revision of ToR h) which should be rephrased to say "working towards the basis of".

Working Group on the History of Fish and Fisheries (WGHIST).

WGHIST has suggested a new ToR d), Support historical ecological baseline development in the context of the MSFD including indicators of Good Environmental Status (GES) and aim at primary publications resulting from such analyses. SCICOM asked for clarification of this new ToR and whether the group is now intending to develop new indicators, and whether this TORs is linked with Descriptor 1?

Decision/Action: SCICOM approved the resolution pending clarification and more specific information on ToR d). SSGSUE/SSGEPI Chair, Daniel Duplisea, will contact the WGHIST Chairs.

10.6 Category 3 Draft Resolutions

Two new symposia resolutions were brought to SCICOM requesting approval:

Symposium on "Understanding marine socio-ecological systems: including the human dimension in Integrated Ecosystem Assessments"

This symposium may become a joint PICES effort. SPICES is involved. ICES is represented on the Steering Committee.

Decision: SCICOM supports the Symposium on "Understanding marine socio-ecological systems, including 10,000 Euro funding.

Symposium on "Drivers of dynamics of small pelagic neritic fish resources"

A possible venue in Spain. This is a joint planning activity with PICES.

It was clarified that Jürgen Alheit is willing to act as a convener.

Decision: SCICOM supports the Symposium on "Drivers of dynamics of small pelagic neritic fish resources", including 10,000 Euro funding.

6th zooplankton production symposium

The third symposium that was brought to the attention of SCICOM, **6th Zooplankton Production Symposium**, is still in an early planning stage. SCICOM will soon be asked for members of the Steering Committee.

11 Cost of Science Programme

Poul Degnbol presented the Doc 28 “Total Costs of ICES Advice”. The starting point for the exercise of estimating the real costs was that the figures used by the EU Commission were thought to underestimate the real effort. The Secretariat made a survey asking institutes about their costs (resources used and funding in support) and responses were very revealing – they painted a very different picture. The preparations for SA groups represents a large part of the costs and much more than show from the back-of-the-envelope estimate. By far the largest cost is to collect the data (surveys and data processing and evaluation). The congruent pattern in all the tables in the document is that we are underestimating the hidden costs in the research institutes. The resources used for the delivery of the advice is limited so it is also here important that we have the real figures at hand.

The issue is presented here because there is an additional cost component in the science programme underpinning the production of advice. Bureau has tasked SCICOM to review the procedure used in the advisory programme and suggest a way to include the costs of the science (i.e. the indirect costs of the advice) in the total figures.

One way could be to produce a questionnaire to be sent to the research directors of all institutes involved. Such an exercise is also good and useful to demonstrate the added value of having the science programme in support of the advice, given the increasing demand on resources in the member institutes. No science, no sustained advice, no advice needs to need for good science. Developing a questionnaire is a tricky business. Therefore one way forward is to review the one used for advice and adapt it to the science survey needs. The review should be done in a SCICOM subgroup. We are looking at the additional costs to get a full picture not covered by the advice exercise..Marine chemistry samples have not been included, and there is potential for defining synergies for integration of surveys. The instructions for research institutes have to be very clear to avoid duplication and misunderstanding.

Action: The Secretariat will prepare a first draft questionnaire to obtain a representative sample of the total costs related to the advisory process.

Action: A subgroup consisting of Niall O’Maoleidigh, Olafur Astthorsson, Dave Reid, Ingeborg de Boois, Dariusz Fey and HoS were tasked to review the questionnaire before it is sent out.

12 ASC 2014 – Conference programme

12.1 Update from Conference Coordinator

The Meeting and Conference Coordinator, Anna Davies, presented Doc 29 and 30, and gave an outline of the programme and the logistics for the 2014 Annual Science Conference to be held in A Coruna, Galicia, Spain, from Monday 15 September to Friday 19 September. The venue will be the Palexco Congress and Exhibition Centre, located by the harbour.

The Opening and Plenary lectures were presented:

- Dr Luis Valdés, Head Ocean Sciences, IOC-UNESCO will give the Open Lecture on “Prospects and opportunities in a changing marine science and policy landscape”

- Dr Phillip Levin from the Northwest Fisheries Science Center, USA will give a Plenary Lecture entitled: “Integrated science for integrated management: fairytale or finally here?”
- Dr Ana Parma, Centro Nacional Patagónico, Argentina will give a Plenary Lecture on the “Challenges and achievements in rebuilding fisheries: uncertainty, prescriptions and scientific advice”

SCICOM was informed that the printed material will be minimised this year compared to previous years. The conference handbook will be available online as i-paper and there will be a hard copy version of the conference programme as a small tri-folder. The conference application for smartphones will be available for downloading during the summer.

For the ASC 2015, ICES has not received any invitations from member countries to host the conference, and the Secretariat has thus started looking into conference facilities in Copenhagen as a back-up plan.

12.2 Appointment of ASC Award Selection Group

The ASC Award Selection Group is responsible for identifying in consultation with the theme session conveners the best poster and best oral presentations and the early career scientist awards.

Since SCICOM people are very busy during the ASC, it was suggested to request assistance from some of the older emeritus people (SPICES) to join in the award selection group. There are four parallel sessions, and ideally there should be two people in each session.

Action: Nils Olaf Handegard (Norway) Chair; Myron Peck (Germany); Antonina dos Santos (Portugal); Antanas Kontautas (Lithuania); Pekka Alenius (or Atso) (Finland); Dariusz Fey (Poland); NN (ACOM member to be announced), and an emeritus/SPICES member (to be announced) were appointed for the 2014 ASC Award Selection Group.

12.3 Appointment of ASC 2015 Theme Session Group

The call for Theme Session proposals for the ASC 2015 will open in April and proposals will be accepted until 1 September. In line with previous years an online rating tool will be set up to assist SCICOM in preselecting their favourite theme sessions. Based on the ranking of theme sessions, the subgroup will make a pre-selection.

The Chair is always the SCICOM member of the host country and since Denmark is expected to be the host in 2015, Brian MacKenzie was asked to chair the group. Should a country step up the SCICOM member of that country will become the Chair.

The SCICOM Chair is ex officio member of the group.

Action: Brian Makenzie (Chair), Olafur Astthorsson, Peter Wright, Henn Ojaveer, Tom Noji, Matts Svensson, and Begoña Santos were appointed to the pre-selection group for the 2015 theme sessions at the ASC 2014 for final decision by SCICOM.

13 Format of ASC Business meetings

SCICOM Chair presented the draft calendar of the ASC week.

13.1 SCICOM and PUBCOM meetings

No changes or requests for different timing was brought up.

Saturday 13 September	09:00–18:00	Publication/Communication Group
Sunday 14 September	09:00–18:00	Science Committee (SCICOM)
Saturday 20 September	09:00–18:00	

13.2 SCICOM Steering Group meetings

SCICOM discussed the necessity for a physical meeting between EG Chairs and SSG chairs. This has been a reoccurring topic over a long period, and to date a viable solution has not been found. There is no extra timeslot available for a meeting with only the EG Chairs, and therefore SSG Chairs need to plan for better interaction with SSG Chairs via WebEx meetings.

It was suggested to set up a multi-annual plan for SSG meetings, i.e. for some years to focus on SSG open session and some years to focus on cross-cutting issues.

13.3 SCICOM Plenary Session

The SCICOM Chair informed the meeting that (in line with previous years) a Monday morning plenary is planned with main focus on science highlights and the Science Plan. The plenary will be chaired by the SCICOM Chair, and the SSG Chairs will give an introduction to the new Science Plan and to the new SSGs and Science highlights. The Strategic Initiatives and the Operational Groups should also be mentioned.

The five SSGs will be allocated approx. five minutes each for their presentations and the contents of the talks need to be structured well. At the end of the plenary people should be encouraged to attend the open session of the SSG they are involved with, and others can chose as they wish..

The contents of the open plenary and open sessions should be clear, either in the printed programme (trifolder) the app, or on the website.

It was suggested to make the open sessions more inclusive, by calling them ICES Science Open Sessions, thus removing the implication of being invited to an exclusive committee meeting. However it is important to keep the profile of SCICOM and separate the open sessions from the theme sessions. Other possibilities will be explored to make the open sessions more attractive and inclusive.

13.4 SCICOM Open Sessions

Monday moning Open Sessions

The Open Plenary on Monday morning will be followed by:

SSGIEA/SSGIEOM joint session – invite strategic partners (Arctic Council, EMAP)?

SSGEPD/SIBAS joint session

SSGEPI

The Benchmark Steering Group (BSG) will be a ‘travelling gypsy’ attending all the parallel sessions.

Wednesday afternoon Open Sessions

On Wednesday afternoon four Open Sessions are planned for the afternoon with two parallel sessions before the coffee break and two sessions after the coffee break. The final programme for this time slot has not yet been decided.

SISAM (Strategic Initiative for Stock Assessment Methods)

SISAM leadership proposes an open session with an agenda that is intended to inform the audience on progress and plans and encourage discussion to develop the scope and vision of the initiative.

Proposed Agenda

10:30-10:45 Strategic Initiative on Stock Assessment Methods - 2010-2013 progress
- Steve Cadrin, SISAM co-chair

10:45-11:00 ICES Methods Working Group progress and future directions - José De Oliveira and David Miller, WGMG chair (if David is willing and will be at the ASC)

11:00-11:15 Development of Good Practices Guidance - Rick Methot, SISAM Steering Committee

11:15-11:30 The Next Stage of the Strategic Initiative on Stock Assessment Methods
- Ciaran Kelly, SISAM co-chair

11:30-12:00 open discussion moderated by Steve Cadrin

Presentations, discussions and conclusions will be reported to the ICES Science and Advisory Committees.

Strategic Initiative on Climate Change Impacts on Marine Ecosystems

This session will inform the audience on progress and plans and will present key findings of IPCC AR5 by chapter authors (2 talks to be invited on physical and biological results). There will also be a presentation by HoS on ICES activities and role in the Arctic.

Big (Ocean) Data Journey' session (90 minutes)

Final description to be submitted

Open Session on Benchmarking process

BSG will invite external speakers and show some concrete examples of benchmarks. The exact format to be decided.

Action: The SCICOM Chair will finalise the planning of the open sessions with SSG and SI chairs by 12 June.

13.5 WGCHAIRS for Science

As a follow up from the SCICOM September meeting, SCICOM discussed the possibilities of setting up a WGCHAIRS meeting, similar to ACOM. The SCICOM Chair invited comments from the members on whether they felt it would be relevant to plan such an activity. The following comments were made:

- WGCHAIRS would not be needed on an annual basis; every third year would be a reasonable interval. SCICOM would need to carry the message forward to delegates, if this is something that has high priority.

- The financial constraints are too big. The reporting at the ASC was changed because there was not enough attendance by EG Chairs. We should have a financing mechanism for this, otherwise a WGCHAIRS meeting is not feasible.
- Funding for a WGCHAIRS meeting should be part of the package when appointed to be an EG Chair. The guidelines for EG Chairs could state that attendance at ASC is required.
- Would a WGCHAIRS physical meeting be an extension to ASC? ASC would be the right venue for such a meeting, EG Chairs should be required to attend for the massaging of their ToRs and for building bridges.
- Although the ACOM WGCHAIRS meeting is considered to be very useful, ACOM has also experienced problems with attendance, travel costs and interest.
- Before planning the meeting there should be a vision for the meeting with contributions from EG Chairs. It could be a manuscript that really outlines the structure, the goals and gaps.
- Having an interactive event was suggested, but it would take significant investments in technology.
- There are logistical problems with the staggered MA ToRs.

Action: Based on the comments made by SCICOM members the SCICOM Chair, in cooperation with SSG Chairs, will draft a proposal for SCICOM September 2014.

13.6 SCICOM/ACOM business meetings

14 Strategic Initiatives

14.1 SCICOM/ACOM Strategic Initiative on Biodiversity (SIBAS)

Henn Ojaveer gave an update on SIBAS activities.

SIBAS related ToRs. ToRs have been designed for EGs relevant to SIBAS (WGBIODIV, BEWG, and WGZE) and there are several outward directed initiatives.

Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). ICES has informally been approved as an observer and thus has been invited to propose experts. ICES has proposed three experts, but IPBES has not communicated any the decision yet.

Third World Conference on Marine Biodiversity. ICES has proposed a theme session for the Third World Conference on Marine Biodiversity to be held in China in October 2014. The proposal was accepted, and Henn Ojaveer, Paul Snelgrove and Tasman Crowe will convene the session.

Cooperation with CIESM and PICES on bioinvasions include ASC 2014 theme session on 'The increasing importance of biofouling for marine invasions: an ecosystem altering mechanism' (with PICES), a joint workshop on *Mnemiopsis leidyi* (with CIESM).

Cooperation with PICES. More substantial cooperation with PICES could have two components: data exchange and joint sessions at International Marine Bioinvasions Conference series (the next will be in Sydney, Australia in 2015). Dialogue to be continued intersessionally and at the ICES ASC 2014 with Tom Therriault, Chair of the PICES Science Board

The SCICOM Chair thanked for the update and noted that SIBAS has done a good job in putting biodiversity back on the agenda with good visibility outside ICES.

Chairmanship. SCICOM was informed that Mark Tasker has been appointed SIBAS Co-Chair and that Henn Ojaveer's three-year term is ending this year (with the possibility of a one-year extension).

Continuation of SIBAS. There was agreement in SCICOM that there would be scientific merit to continue SIBAS, but funding would have to be sought for all strategic initiatives.

Action: The SCICOM Chair in cooperation with the Head of Science Programme, will explore the funding possibilities and submit a request (including budget, estimates and documentation) for additional funding for SIBAS for a 4-year period.

14.2 SCICOM Strategic Initiative on Climate Change (SICCME)

Brian MacKenzie gave an update on recent and upcoming SICCME activities:

The 2nd Scientific Meeting on Arctic Fish Stocks was held in Tromsø, Norway, 28-31 October 2013. Adi Kellermann, Head of Science Programme, gave a presentation on the potential roles and contributions of ICES to Arctic marine science.

Forthcoming activities include:

- Ecosystem Studies of Sub-Arctic Seas (ESSAS) Conference, April 7-9, 2014, Copenhagen
- PICES FUTURE 2014 Conference, April 15-18, 2014, Hawaii (5 topic sessions and 3 workshops organized by SICCME)
- Theme sessions and workshops at 2014 ICES (1) and PICES Annual Science conferences (6)
- 3rd Intl. Symposium on Effects of Climate Change on the World's Oceans, Santos, Brazil, March 23-27, 2015.

The SICCME open session at the 2014 ASC will include overview of activities and planning of new activities. There will be presentations on the IPCC AR5 key findings and possibly a presentation on the potential role and contributions of ICES to Arctic marine science.

Chairmanship and continuation of SICCME. The three-year term for the SICCME ICES co-Chairs (Manuel Barange and Brian MacKenzie) will be ending this year, but with the possibility of a one-year extension. It was agreed that it would be useful to postpone a change in leadership until after the 2015 Brazil symposium.

In line with SIBAS and SISAM funding should be sought for the continuation of the strategic initiative and PICES should be consulted asked for their view on the time horizon for this joint strategic initiative.

Action: The SCICOM Chair in cooperation with the Head of Science Programme, will explore the funding possibilities and submit a request (including budget, estimates and documentation) for additional funding for SICCME for a 4-year period.

14.3 SCICOM/ACOM Strategic Initiative on Stock Assessment Methods (SISAM)

Steve Cadrin (via WebEx) gave a progress report from SISAM, including the special volume of IJMS, simulation based evaluations, global coordination, and best practises guidelines.

The ICES SISAM was developed to advance the SA methods. The primary aspects of the first stage was to catalogue different models used around the world and evaluate

their usefulness. A simulation-based workshop was held in advance of the SISAM conference. That was the end of the first three-year cycle. SISAM is now initiating the second phase. Ciaran Kelly will join the leadership group as a co-Chair. He will replace Mark Dickey-Collas, who is stepping down.

The World Conference on Stock Assessment Methods (WCSAM) made the following recommendation: "A multi-organizational Global Assessment Methods Working Group for Sustainable Fisheries (GAME) should be formed. This will provide a forum to bring regions together to compare developing methods and test new ideas. It will also be able to lobby for investment in research into stock assessment methods. Advances by modelling experts should be effectively communicated to practitioners through training programmes."

The Regional Fishery Management Organizations who contributed to SISAM and WCSAM appreciate the leadership of ICES and hope that ICES can maintain such a role in GAME. Therefore the 2nd stage of SISAM should involve the goal of forming GAME and transitioning from SISAM to GAME.

The transition to GAME means that ICES would maintain a leadership role after SISAM (but on a global level).

SCICOM supported the transition process from SISAM to GAME.

Action: The SCICOM Chair in cooperation with the Head of Science Programme, will explore the funding possibilities and submit a request (including budget, estimates and documentation) for additional funding for SISAM for a 4-year period.

SISAM leadership proposes an open session at the ASC 2014 with an agenda that is intended to inform the audience on progress and plans and encourage discussion to develop the scope and vision of the initiative.

15 Awards Committee

The Chair of the ICES Awards Committee, Pierre Petitgas, informed SCICOM that both of the prestigious awards will be conferred at this year's Annual Science Conference: the Prix d'Excellence Award (given every three years) and the Outstanding Achievement Award (given every year).

SCICOM was encouraged to participate actively in soliciting candidates for these two prestigious awards and nominations should not be restricted by age or gender.

16 Closure

The SCICOM Chair thanked SCICOM members for their fruitful constructive discussions. The SCICOM Chair also thanked the SSG Chairs for their dedication and hard work and directed a special thanks to the ACOM Chair who has been very supportive, and our new structure under the Strategic Plan will ensure close links between SCICOM and ACOM.

Annex 1: List of participants

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX/EMAIL
Chair:		
Yvonne Walther	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences Institute of Marine Research Utövågen 5 37137 Karlskrona Sweden	Phone +46 10 478 40 50 Fax Cell: + 46 709 35 92 82/+46 76 126 80 41 Email yvonne.walther@ices.dk
SCICOM Steering Group Chairs :		
Daniel Duplisea, SSGEPI Chair (and national member Canada)	Fisheries and Oceans Canada Institut Maurice- Lamontagne, Mont-Joli, QC, Canada G5H 3Z4	tel: (418) 775 0881 fax: (418) 775 0740 daniel.duplisea@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Nils Olav Handegard, SSGIEOM Chair (and national member, Norway)	Institute of Marine Research P.O. Box 1870 Nordnes 5817 Bergen Norway	Phone +47 55238500 Email nils.olav.handegard@imr.no
Graham Pierce, SSGEPD Chair	University of Aberdeen Oceanlab Main Street AB41 6FL Newburgh, Ellon, Aberdeenshire Scotland United Kingdom	Phone +44 1224 272459 Email g.j.pierce@abdn.ac.uk
Dave Reid, SSGIEA Chair	Marine Institute Rinville Oranmore Co. Galway Ireland	Phone +353 91 387431 Fax +353 91 387201 Email david.reid@marine.ie
Jörn Schmidt (Germany), BSG Co-Chair	Christian-Albrechts- University of Kiel Department of Economics Wilhelm-Seelig-Platz 1 24118 Kiel Germany	Email jschmidt@economics.uni- kiel.de
PUBCOM:		
Myron Peck, PUBCOM Chair	University of Hamburg Institute of Hydrobiology and Fishery Science Olbersweg 24 D-22767 Hamburg Germany	Phone +49(0)40 - 4 28 38 6602 Fax +49(0)40 - 4 28 38 6618 Email myron.peck@uni- hamburg.de
DIG:		
Ingeborg de Boois, DIG Chair (Sunday, 22 September only)	Wageningen IMARES P.O. Box 68 1970 AB IJmuiden Netherlands	Email ingeborg.deboois@wur.nl

SISAM and Training

Apologies received from Steven Cadrin, USA, will report from Training and SISAM via WebEx.

Ex officio:

Anne Christine Brusendorff, ICES General Secretary	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	Phone 33386701 Email anne.christine@ices.dk
Eskild Kirkegaard, ACOM Chair	Eskild Kirkegaard DTU Aqua - National Institute of Aquatic Resources Jægersborg Allé 1 2920 Charlottenlund Denmark	Phone +45 35 88 30 10 Fax +45 Email eskild.kirkegaard@ices.dk
Carmen Fernandez (ACOM Vice-Chair and BSG Co-Chair)	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	Phone +34 (620) 588 360 Email Carmen.Fernandez@ices.dk

National members and alternates:

Daniel Duplisea (Canada and SSG Chair)	Fisheries and Oceans Canada Institut Maurice- Lamontagne, Mont-Joli, QC, Canada G5H 3Z4	Phone: (418) 775 0881 daniel.duplisea@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Brian R. MacKenzie (Denmark)	Brian R. MacKenzie DTU Aqua - National Institute of Aquatic Resources Section for Ocean Ecology and Climate Charlottenlund Slot Jægersborg Alle 1 DK-2920 Charlottenlund Denmark	Phone +45 35883445 Fax +45 3588-3333 brm@aqua.dtu.dk
Henn Ojaveer (Estonia)	Estonian Marine Institute University of Tartu 2a Lootsi EE-80012 Parnu Estonia	Phone +372 443 4456 mobile: +372 5158328 Fax +372 6718 900 Email henn.ojaveer@ut.ee
Pekka Alenius (Finland, Alternate)	Finnish Meteorological Institute P.O. Box 503 00101 Helsinki Finland	Phone +358 50 4392887 Email pekka.alenius@fmi.fi

Pierre Petitgas (France and Chair of Awards Committee)	IFREMER Nantes Centre P.O. Box 21105 44311 Nantes Cédex 03 France	Phone +33 240 37 40 00 Fax +33 240 37 40 75 Email pierre.petitgas@ifremer.fr
Jörn Schmidt (Germany and BSG Chair)	Christian-Albrechts- University of Kiel Department of Economics Wilhelm-Seelig-Platz 1 24118 Kiel Germany	Email jschmidt@economics.uni-kiel.de
Ólafur S. Astthórsson (Iceland)	Marine Research Institute Skúlagata 4 IS-121 Reykjavík Iceland	Phone +354 5520240 Fax 3545623790 osa@hafro.is
Niall Ó Maoiléidigh (Ireland)	Marine Institute Fisheries Ecosystem Advisory Services Farran Laboratory Furnace Newport Co. Mayo Ireland	Phone +353 9842300 Fax +353 9842340 Email niall.omaoleidigh@marine.ie
Georgs Kornilovs (Latvia)	Institute for Food Safety, Animal Health and Environment (BIOR) 8 Daugavgrivas Str. Fish Resources Research Department 1048 Riga Latvia	Phone +371 76 76 027 Fax +371 762 6946 Email georgs.kornilovs@bior.gov.lv
Antanas Kontautas (Lithuania)	Klaipeda University Coastal Research and Planning Institute Herkaus Manto str. 84 92294 Klaipeda Lithuania	Email antanas.kontautas@ku.lt
Jan Jaap Poos (the Netherlands) ONLY Monday, 31 March	Wageningen IMARES P.O. Box 68 1970 AB IJmuiden Netherlands	Phone +31 317 487 189 Fax +31 317 480 900 Email Janjaap.Poos@wur.nl
Nils Olav Handegard (Norway and SSGIEOM Chair)	Institute of Marine Research P.O. Box 1870 Nordnes 5817 Bergen Norway	Phone +47 55238500 Email nils.olav.handegard@imr.no
Dariusz Fey (Poland)	National Marine Fisheries Research Institute ul. Kollataja 1 81-332 Gdynia Poland	Phone +48 58 735 61 30 Email dfey@mir.gdynia.pl

Antonina Santos (Portugal, member)	Portuguese Institute for the Sea and the Atmosphere (IPMA) Avenida de Brasilia 1449-006 Lisbon Portugal	Phone +351 21302 7000 Email antonina@ipma.pt
Yuri A. Kovalev	Knipovich Polar Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography (PINRO) 6 Knipovitch Street 183038 Murmansk Russian Federation	Phone +7 8152 472 469 Fax +7 8152 473 331 Email kovalev@pinro.ru
Maria Begoña Santos (Spain, Member)	Instituto Español de Oceanografía Centro Oceanográfico de Vigo P.O. Box 1552 36200 Vigo (Pontevedra) Spain	Phone +34 986492111 Email m.b.santos@vi.ieo.es
Mats Svensson (Sweden)	Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management PO Box 11930 40439 Göteborg Sweden	Email mats.svensson@havochvatten.se
Peter Wright (UK)	Marine Scotland Science Marine Laboratory 375 Victoria Road AB11 9DB Aberdeen United Kingdom	Phone +44 1224 295436 Fax +44 1224 295511 Email P.J.Wright@marlab.ac.uk
Thomas Noji (USA)	National Marine Fisheries Services Sandy Hook Laboratory 74 Magruder Road Sandy Hook Highlands NJ 07732 United States	Phone 1 732 872 3025 / 24 Fax 1 732 872 3068 Email thomas.noji@noaa.gov

ICES Staff:

Poul Degnbol, Head of Advisory Programme	poul.degnbol@ices.dk
Adi Kellermann, Head of Science Programme	adi@ices.dk
Inigo Martinez, Professional Officer Advice	inigo@ices.dk
Wojciech Wawrzynski, Professional Secretary for Scientific Cooperation	wojciech@ices.dk
Mark Dickey-Collas, Ecosystem Professional Officer	mark.dickey-collas@ices.dk
Claire Welling, Science Programme Assisting Secretary	claire.welling@ices.dk
Anna Davies, Meeting & Conference Coordinator, Training	anna.davies@ices.dk
Vivian Piil, Departmental Secretary, Science Programme	vivian@ices.dk

Annex 2: Actions and decisions

ITEM NO.	AGENDA ITEM	ACTIONS AND DECISIONS	RESPON-SIBLE	DEADLINE
4	Revised Draft Science Plan	Action: SCICOM members were requested to comment and provide feedback by 9 April (att. Vivian Piil, cc SCICOM Chair and HoS) for incorporation in the final version to be forwarded to Bureau and Council for adoption in June.	SCICOM Chair	9 April
5.1	DIG	Action: ICES Data Centre and Sergej Olenin (Klaipeda University) to establish contacts and discuss/solve practicalities with a view to start using AquaNIS as an online reporting tool of non-indigenous species in ICES.	Data Centre	–
5.1	DIG	Action: DIG was asked to provide an update to SCICOM on the feasibility study “Scientific data storage and transmission under the DCF”	DIG	SCICOM September 2014
5.2	PUBCOM	<i>Decision: SCICOM revisited the question of “parentage” of PUBCOM and there was agreement in SCICOM that PUBCOM should report to SCICOM.</i>		
5.2	PUBCOM	Action: SCICOM members were invited to nominate new members for PUBCOM.	SCICOM members	
5.2	PUBCOM	Action: PUBCOM and the Secretariat will develop a plan detailing which publications will be online only, how quickly this will take place, who will contact authors, and how online material will be referenced.	Secretariat, PUBCOM Chair	
5.2	PUBCOM	<i>Decision: SCICOM supported the proposal by OUP to have a 19% increase the size of the IJMS (from 2070 pages to 2460 pages) in 2015.</i>		

5.2	PUBCOM	<i>Decision: SCICOM supported the idea of offering the possibility of having short TWEEtable summaries of extended abstracts accepted from ASC theme sessions, from authors of manuscripts accepted for publication within the ICES JMS, coordinators of ICES-supported meetings, and coordinators of ICES-sponsored symposia.</i>		
5.3	TRAINING	Action: The September 2013 action item was reiterated by SCICOM. SCICOM noted that there are advantages and also challenges associated with e-learning, but nevertheless the Training Group should continue to explore the opportunities of e-learning/e-training as a new format within the Training Programme.	TRAINING	SCICOM September 2014
5.3	TRAINING	<i>Decision: Martin Pastoors, a member of the training course group has recently announced a shift of jobs in to industry, however there was unanimous agreement that it will be fine for him to continue his position in the Training Group, as well as instructor of the course on Communicating Science and Advice.</i>		
6	ICES Science Fund	<i>Decision: SCICOM approved the shortlist with the exchange of one proposal with one of the reserves.</i>		
6	ICES Science Fund	Action: The secretariat will, based on the work and comments of the subgroup and SCICOM members, get back to the successful and declined proposals with with a motivation to each of the proposers.	Secretariat	Done
6	ICES Science Fund	Action: SCICOM sees the Science Fund as a good opportunity for SCICOM to get involved with science community and to give opportunities to young scientists and thus SCICOM recommends continuation of the Science Fund.	SCICOM Chair	June

6	ICES Science Fund	Action: The ICES Science Fund subgroup was tasked to develop a new list of criteria (if and when we get funding for a second round of funding) to be presented at SCICOM September for feedback.	SCICOM Chair and subgroup	pending
7.2.1	<i>New procedure for project partners</i>	<i>Decision: The evaluation process is cumbersome and would make an elitistic choice between consortia. SCICOM is pro the generic process and supports leaving the evaluation process to the funding agency.</i>		
7.2.1	<i>New procedure for project partners</i> <i>Projection decision tree</i>	Action: A subgroup was tasked to start a process on how to be proactive towards upcoming calls, such as Horizon 2020 The Sub-Group consists of SSG Chairs, Tom Noji and Wojciech Wawrzynski.	HoS, Wojciech Wawrzynski	
7.3	PICES/SGSP	Decision/Action: Daniel Duplisea, Tom Noji, Mats Svensson, Henn Ojaveer, volunteered to join the Study Group on Strategic Planning – and the Russian SCICOM member should be invited to join the group as well.	HoS	
7.9	Aquaculture	Action: SCICOM members were requested to send their comments on the strategic paper "ICES Advice on Aquaculture " to the HoS programme.	SCICOM members	
8.2	SSG roles and functions and Membership	Action/Decision: It was agreed that in addition to SSGIEOM and BSG, SSGIEA should be under joint parentage by ACOM and SCICOM and in order to formalise this an ACOM Co-Chair should be nominated.	Secretariat	
8.2	SSG roles and functions and Membership	Action: The Benchmark SG does not have any EGs, so it will have to create its own core membership. to be appointed by SG benchmark Chairs.	BSG Chairs	

8.2	SSG roles and functions and Membership	Action: ICES Secretariat, ACOM and SCICOM should engage in promoting the importance of the SSG Chairs and their key position in implementing the Science Plan and associated advice.	Secretariat, ACOM and SCICOM Chairs	
8.2	SSG roles and functions and Membership	Action: SSG Chairs will meet by WebEx intersessionally to develop a template for SSG reporting, building on the current template for the annual progress report with vision, highlights and aspirations of the Chair. Strategic issues and performance measurements and highlights from EGs should be included. Dual reporting for ACOM and SCICOM needs to be established. The SSG template(s) should be tabled at the joint ACOM/SCICOM leadership meeting for approval.	SCICOM Chair	Joint ACOM/SCICOM meeting ASC
8.4	Guidance for EGs regarding deliverables to MSFD	Action: As a first step Pierre Petitgas, acting as CSG-MSFD representative, and the SCICOM Chair will be invited to attend the next SSGIEA WebEx meeting.	SSGIEA Chair	
8.4	Guidance for EGs regarding deliverables to MSFD	There is a missing link between the IEA and the monitoring groups and clear communication lines need to be established. Action: The Chairs of SSGIEA and SSGIEOM should establish cross cutting communication between the groups.	SSGIEA and SSGIEOM Chairs	
9.1	SSGEPD	SCICOM was informed that Graham Pierce will complete his three-year term by the end of this year (2014), with the possibility of a one-year extension. Decision: Graham agreed to stay on as SSGEPD Chair. SCICOM applauded his decision and thanked him.		
9.2	SSGEPI	Action: SCICOM members were encouraged to suggest good candidates for chair to SSGEPI and SCICOM		

9.2	SSGEPI	Action: SSGEPI Chair will contact potential candidates from within the SSG. If none are interested an official call will be sent out.	SSGEPI and SCICOM Chairs	June 2014
9.5	BSG	Action: The SCICOM Chair requested that the final draft of the BSG resolution should aim toward better harmonization between the Science Plan and the ToRs. Furthermore the resolution should include a membership list and a multi-year roadmap. All SSG Chairs should be ex officio members of BSG.	BSG Chairs	
10	Draft resolutions for EG and SSGs			
10	WCSAM	<i>Decision: The updated Category 3 resolution was approved by SCICOM and PUBCOM supported the proposal unanimously.</i>		
10	<i>Terms of Reference for WGNEPS, WGCRAAB and WGSCALLOP (ACOM)</i>	<i>Action: SCICOM recommended that as a first step the suggested approach should be communicated to the relevant groups by the Secretariat, with a request to provide feedback to SCICOM.</i>	Secretariat	
10	<i>Parentage of WGITMO and WGBOSV</i>	<i>Decision: SCICOM supports the wish of the groups to change parentage to SCICOM starting in 2015. It was agreed to add a ToR to the multi-annual ToRs of these groups to deal with advisory requests an annual basis.</i>		
10.6	<i>Symposium on "Understanding marine socio-ecological systems: including the human dimension in Integrated Ecosystem Assessments"</i>	<i>Decision: SCICOM supports the Symposium on "Understanding marine socio-ecological systems, including 10,000 Euro funding.</i>		
10.6	<i>Symposium on "Drivers of dynamics of small pelagic neritic fish resources"</i>	<i>Decision: SCICOM supports the Symposium on "Drivers of dynamics of small pelagic neritic fish resources", including 10,000 Euro funding.</i>		

11	Cost of Science Programme	Action: The Secretariat will prepare a first draft questionnaire to obtain a representative sample of the total costs related to the advisory process.		
11	Cost of Science Programme	Action: A subgroup consisting of Niall O'Maoleidigh, Olafur Astthorsson, Dave Reid, Ingeborg de Boois, Dariusz Fey and HoS were tasked to review the questionnaire before it is sent out.		
12.2	Appointment of ASC Award Selection Group	Action: Nils Olaf Handegard (Norway) Chair; Myron Peck (Germany); Antonina dos Santos (Portugal); Antanas Kontautas (Lithuania); Pekka Alenius (or Atso) (Finland); Dariusz Fey (Poland); NN (ACOM member to be announced), and an emeritus/SPICES member (to be announced) were appointed for the 2014 ASC Award Selection Group.		
12.3	Appointment of ASC 2015 Theme Session Group	Action: Brian Makenzie (Chair), Olafur Astthorsson, Peter Wright, Henn Ojaveer, Tom Noji, Matts Svensson, and Begoña Santos were appointed to the pre-selection group for the 2015 theme sessions at the ASC 2014 for final decision by SCICOM.		
13.5	WGCHAIRS	Action: Based on the comments made by SCICOM members the SCICOM Chair, in cooperation with SSG Chairs, will draft a proposal for SCICOM September 2014.	SCICOM Chair, SSG Chairs	September 2014
14.1	SIBAS	Action: The SCICOM Chair in cooperation with the Head of Science Programme, will explore the funding possibilities and submit a request (including budget, estimates and documentation) for additional funding for SIBAS for a 4-year period.	SCICOM Chair, HoS	June

14.2	SICCME	Action: The SCICOM Chair in cooperation with the Head of Science Programme, will explore the funding possibilities and submit a request (including budget, estimates and documentation) for additional funding for SICCME for a 4-year period.	SCICOM Chair, HoS	June
14.3	SISAM	Action: The SCICOM Chair in cooperation with the Head of Science Programme, will explore the funding possibilities and submit a request (including budget, estimates and documentation) for additional funding for SISAM for a 4-year period.	SCICOM Chair, HoS	June
