



SUMMARY REPORT

Annual Meeting between ICES and the Advisory Councils (MIACO)

Author: Alexandre Rodriguez

Date: 27 January 2017

DISCLAIMER NOTE: This is a personal summary of the meeting highlighting only those issues which are deemed to be relevant for the LDAC. Therefore, it is not intended to cover all topics that were dealt with at MIACO as this will be covered by the ICES ACOM report (e.g. determination of MSY ranges; use of multiannual management plans as a basis for advice and alignment of its objectives with ICES methodology and Precautionary Approach).

Main topics discussed and relevant actions agreed

1. Overview

The meeting was well attended by over 20 delegates from 5 Advisory Councils out of the existing 8 (all except the South Western Waters, the Mediterranean Sea and the Market ACs), as well as ICES scientists and representatives from third non EU countries (i.e. the Norwegian Fishermen's Association). Due to justified last minute absence of the Chair and the First and Second Vice Chairs, the LDAC was finally represented by its Executive Secretary, who provided an overview of the work between the LDAC and ICES in 2016 and identified some potential advisory needs from the LDAC for 2017.

The agenda for MIACO and the list of attendees is appended to this report.

2. General considerations and main issues for collaboration ICES - ACs

- The Advisory Councils agreed to take ownership together with ICES in organising a bilateral preparatory meeting prior to MIACO, together with setting the agenda and co-chairing this meeting. The Baltic Sea Advisory Council (Chair + Secretariat) was appointed as first coordinator dealing with ICES for next year.
- Enhanced cooperation is required in the process for making effective regional pre-meetings between ICES and AC stakeholders prior to AC Working Group meetings. It would be advisable also to channel input and participation of ACs at ICES meetings that are open to observers (e.g. Advisory Drafting Groups).
- Increased communication is demanded particularly on the scoping and the organisation of Benchmark Workshops (BW). The benchmark workshops are set to review and improve assessment data and methodology.

The benchmarking process is an important one as it might result in changes in the perception of the stocks and eventually shape ICES policy advice. The main output produced on the benchmarking process is the stock annex, in which the data and



methods are described, and these are peer reviewed. ICES and ACs exchanged views during MIACO on how to strike the right balance for scientists to remain independent while opening up for review a stock with participation of all stakeholders. This would also apply to the known as Inter Benchmark Workshops, which are “fast track” procedures dealt with by designated experts to address specific issues by correspondence.

- ICES will work with Secretariats and AC members on improving knowledge and training to access to ICES improved features of its web and SharePoint sites.
- ICES will proactively inform of their meetings calendar and plan and will provide ToR and any relevant background information for future BW meetings.
- Despite the fact that presentations of advice by ICES to the ACs are generally well structured and seem to respond the needs of the stakeholders, ICES staff was asked by the ACs to be available in critical dates after the release of advices (i.e. end of June for demersal mixed fisheries in EU waters and end of September for widely distributed and pelagic stocks). To this purpose, maximum utilization of the MoU to be signed between the European Commission and ICES allocates 15 days for ICES scientists to participate in all the existing ACs (8) for 2017.
- ACs improved communication with ICES and participated around the clock in several physical and web meetings in 2016. However, the level of ambitions also increases in terms of input, questions and level of involvement of stakeholders along the years. It was perceived that a more formalised relationship might be articulated for dealing with both specific questions on stocks assessments and other more general critical observations made by stakeholders resulting from the advice (e.g. quality control issues, uncertainty of data, etc.)
- It would be very valuable to find a forum besides MIACO to further strengthen dialogue between ICES and ACs in order to discuss the “meta level” issues, such as progress in methodology and work on data limited stocks, implementation of ecosystem approach to fisheries management, complexities of mixed fisheries, impact of LO on ICES advisory process and models used in the assessments, etc.
- The Pelagic AC asked that ICES gives due thought and consideration to the treatment made of stakeholders’ information (both editing and additions) and its inclusion into the scientific advice given their recent lack of reporting on changes made in 2016.
- Regarding VMEs, the representative of the Norwegian Fishermen’s Association asked if ICES could define objective indicators for different waters and sea beds. As an example, at the present time, habitats from the Barents Sea identified by ecosystem studies commissioned by Norway and Russia do not have good quality controls and are regarded as biased when they define “no go” fishing areas, providing uncertainty to fishermen on their fishing grounds. ICES noted that there is work already from UN guidelines which might be useful or not, about thresholds for vulnerable ecosystems.
- In terms of Communications with media, stakeholders and public in general, ICES has limited resources. In terms of what would be useful for the ACs to see in the advice?



There is still room for discussion on the way the MoU between the ICES and EU constraints and shape how the advice is presented. There was also a debate on how to read/interpret the advice sheets, maybe changes to the webpage might help and maybe a glossary of technical terms. Also, it was brought up that ICES PA and CFP PA are not identical, and this brings some consequences. All these are pertinent considerations for fisheries managers for making a better integration with the different policies under the CFP (MAMPs, TCMs, discards...).

- It would be interesting for the stakeholders' perspective that ICES might consider spending less resources on surveys and more on processing data and computing, thus increasing the quality of surveys with data we are feeding (e.g. blue whiting).
- It was noted that there is not an overall and/or permanent group to look at quality of surveys. ACs encouraged ICES to take this challenge. ICES acknowledged that a huge amount of the overall costs are invested in data collection and processing, while only about a 10% of the overall budget is allocated for work in ICES by EWG. Perhaps more weight should be given to the work of scientists at Working Groups.
- To optimise efforts while ensuring adequate coverage on key stocks, it was suggested by ICES revisit of the frequency of the assessments for certain candidate stocks. This is a process that has already at its final staged and being looked at within ICES this year. It is expected that the stakeholders will be consulted soon with the view of start implementing a first tranche on 2018, and start the changes in provision of advice effectively in 2019.

3. LDAC considerations (discussed with and supported by ICES ACOM)

- The LDAC representative reminded that ACs under article 44.2. (c) of CFP reform are required to "*contribute, in close cooperation with scientists, to the collection, supply and analysis of data necessary for the development of conservation measures*". Linked to this, the LDAC wishes to have specific information on data gaps and data need requirements in advance for any Benchmark Workshops so the Secretariat can appoint-collect the necessary data from their members and identify/designate the relevant participants.
- It is very important to make clear linkages and effects of the implementation of the ecosystem based approach to fisheries management (i.e. systems and pressures for water column and seabed and interactions between species and habitats) and the impact of economic human activities other than fisheries on the environment and the fishing activities (e.g. oil and gas extractions or seabed mining) outside EU waters. ICES replied that a document specifically on this topic will be published soon and submitted to the LDAC Secretariat for further deliberations. It is mainly an informative document but has the aspiration of serving as basis for providing future advice on this subject matter.

MIACO Doc 6A titled "ICES and Ecosystem-based Management" is annexed to this report. ICES welcomes comments and views from stakeholders of this document, particularly on the use and application of these ecosystem overviews on fishing



activities. This document is considered not as an advice on EBFM but a supporting document furnishing evidence to support to be updated every 4 years. ICES is working on this field in close collaboration with the European Environmental Agency (EEA) and HELCOM to avoid duplication of work.

- Regarding implementation of the LO outside EU waters, the LDAC announced that they will be working in improving knowledge on state of deep-water species (including deep-sea sharks) in NEAFC RA. The LDAC is currently waiting for the adoption of the EC Delegated Regulation setting *de minimis* rules for such species in NEAFC, given the inaction by MS and their lack of political will to date to set up a dedicated Regional MS Group to deal with implementation of LO outside EU waters.
- The LDAC will work on producing an advice and might submit a formal request for advice to ICES via the Commission to report on the existing scientific knowledge and review of stock assessments for this species as well as the availability and quality of the discard data.

The list of relevant deep-water species mentioned is annexed to this report.

- Work of the LDAC on management measures for Atlantic Tropical Tuna was also mentioned, highlighting the issue of improving knowledge and management of FADs. The Inter-RFMO meeting on FADs scheduled for April-May 2017 was flagged up as an opportunity to make progress on this topic. ICES Vice-Chair replied that ICES has not a specific mandate to deal with Atlantic Tropical Tuna although ICCAT scientists are or were in several occasions ICES scientists. However, they are not sure what ICES role would be here other than assessing implementation of LO for pelagic stocks. The ICES Working Group on survivability of species was mentioned. ICES is now advising on catches rather than landings and they include on the forecast as much information as possible.
- The LDAC announced that, in partnership with the Pelagic AC, they will be holding a Second International Conference on the North Atlantic Fisheries, with a panel dedicated to scientific issues including stock migrations and patterns due to climate change; and ecosystem considerations. This event is likely to be held in Norway in summer 2017 and an ICES representative will be invited as speaker or panelist under the LDAC funding. ICES delegates (Mark Tasker and Mark Dickey-Collas) thanked LDAC for this invitation and showed their interest in attending. It was also identified NAFO WG on Integrated Ecosystems as a reference together with work initiated in the Western Pacific.

4. ICES Summary on Fisheries overviews

This work started with the North Sea and is under phase of completion for all fisheries now: they hope to have five ecoregions completed by the end of May 2017 and the rest before the end of the year. ICES Fisheries overviews are reports giving summaries on who is fishing, landings by nation, graphs of catches by gear, stock status by group stock status for benthic fisheries, spatial distribution by gear (done on annual base).



ICES welcomes suggestions from policy makers, MS and stakeholders on management measures and regulations to be included here for getting a clearer picture of what is going on. The idea is to explore the trade-offs with different managements measures or policies, e.g. Cod as food for other species or for fisheries activities, predator-prey relations, etc.

The alternative would be to give only biological advice, but there is an economic dimension which is relevant, apart from biological indicators, and economic performance of fisheries is important here. For mixed fisheries, in MoU can be analysed how to optimize in the Baltic. EU system on ranges for F, how can you optimize the yield (as in tonnage does not reflect the economic yield...). However, some NGOs represented at the meeting did not support this idea as in their view is not for ICES to propose a MSE, as trade off analysis often influence policy.

The aim for ICES is that these fisheries overviews serve as backgrounds for developing regional MAMPs that are easily adaptable and contain clear references to data sources so it can be traced back and reviewed every 2-3 years.

-END-

ANNEX I. Catch limits for Deep-sea Stocks

International Waters, ICES VIb, XII, XIVb

Summary description:

- Most of the TACs for this species in EU waters were set on a biannual basis (2017-2018), as a result of the agreement reached by the Council in November 2016, and as such they have been accordingly reflected in the Council Regulation on TAC and Quota 2017.
- Annex IB NEAFC FO includes 49 species: 12 are subjected to TACs by the EU; 17 are deep-water sharks (coinciding with the EU Deep-sea Regulation); and the remaining 20 not subjected to catch limits (quotas).
- NEAFC Rec. 7/13 forbids direct fishery and retention on board of deep-water sharks.
- Unknown Stocks of wide distribution, without reference points.
- Limited data: only exploitation and stock trends (Increasing/Stable/ Decreasing)
- Recommendation made on catches, by-catches and discards.
- Little quota or quota zero in several cases ("Choke Species")
- Catch and discard data insufficient, although improving in the last years.

Table of deep-water species subject to catch limits in EU waters and NEAFC

* Regulation (CE) 2016/2285 of 12.12.2016

** EU Regulation 2017/127, published on 28.1.2017

			2017		2018		
Nombre especie /	Cod./	Areas CIEM	EU	ES	EU	ES	TAC

Species Name	Code	/ Cpaco		P		P	
Sable negro / Black Scabbardfish	BSF	I-IV y AAI	9	0	9	0	Cautelar
	BSF	V-VII and XII y AAI	2.9 54	16 8	2.6 00	14 8	Analítico
	BSF	VIII, IX y X y AAI	3.3 30		2.9 97	9	Analítico
	BSF	34.1.2 y AAI	2.4 88	0	2.1 89	0	Cautelar
Argentina / Greater Silver Smelt	ARU	I, II y AAI	90	0			
	ARU	III, IV y AAI	1.0 28	0			
	ARU	V-VII y AAI	3.8 84	0			
Alfonsino	ALF	III-X, XII, XIV y AAI	280	63	28 0	63	Analítico
Brosmio / Tusk	USK	I-II, XIV y AAI	21	0			Cautelar
	USK	V-VII y AAI	3.8 60	46			Cautelar
				2017	2018		
Nombre especie / Species Name	Cod./ Code	Areas CIEM / Cpaco	EU	ES P	EU	ES P	TAC
Grenadiers	RNG/RHG	I, II, IV y AAI	10	0	10	0	
	RNG/RHG	III y AAI	278	0	22 3	0	
	RNG/RHG	Vb - VII	3.0 52	49	3.1 20	50	
	RNG/RHG	VIII-X, XII, XIV y AAI	2.6 23	1.8 83	2.0 99	1.5 08	
Reloj Anaranjado / Orange Roughy	ORY	VII	0	0	0	0	
	ORY	I-V and VIII-XIV	0	0	0	0	
Maruca Azul / Blue Ling	BLI	Vb -VI - VII	11. 314	36 5			
	BLI	AAI XII	357	34 1			NDF Precautionary
Maruca / Ling	LIN	I,II y AAI	36	0			
	LIN	V y AAI	33	0			
	LIN	VI-XIV	13. 696	3.7 44			Cautelar
Besugo / Red Seabream	SBR	VI-VIII y AAI	144	11 6	13 0	10 4	
	SBR	IX, y AAI	174	13	16	13	

				7	5	0	
	SBR	X y AAI	517	5	51	7	5 Analítico
Brótola de fango / Greater Forkbeard	GFB	I-IV y AAI	243	70	24	70	Analítico
			4	6	34	6	
	GFB	V-VII, y AAI	243	70	24	70	Analítico
			4	6	34	6	
	GFB	VIII-IX y AAI	285	25	25	23	Analítico
			8	4	0		
	GFB	X-XII y AAI	58	0	52	0	Analítico
Tiburones profundas / Deepwater Sharks	15 Species	V-IX y AAI	10	--	10	--	Cautelar
		X y AAI	10	--	10	--	Cautelar
		34.1.1 aguas UE	10	--	10	--	Cautelar
Deanias (Bird Beak Dogfish)	2 Species						
		XII AAI	0	0	0	0	Cautelar