



MIAC 2022 FINAL REPORT

Meeting: **MIAC – Annual Coordination Meeting ICES-ACs**

Parties: **BSAC, CC RUP, LDAC, MAC, NSAC, NWWAC, PelAC and SWWAC members and ICES**

Date: **22 June 2022**

Location: **ICES Headquarters in Copenhagen & Zoom**

Chair: **Emiel Brouckaert**

1. Welcome and introduction

The Chair, Emiel Brouckaert – Chair of the North Western Waters Advisory Council (NWWAC) – welcomed everyone to the meeting. He thanked ICES for facilitating the MIAC meetings in their offices and for their availability to discuss specific topics of interest to the advisory bodies of the ICES contractual partner, DG MARE. He also thanked the NSAC for chairing one and a half year ago and all the Advisory Councils representatives for their attendance.

Apologies were received from Mo Mathies (NWWAC Secretariat) and Kenn Skau Fischer (NSAC Executive Committee Chair) in advance of the meeting.

The agenda was adopted as drafted.

2. Action Points from the previous meeting

Action Points numbering refers to the item on the MIAC 2021 agenda to which an Action Point is relevant.

3.1 – Updates on the activities of the ICES Working Group on Offshore Wind Development and Fisheries (WGOWDF): A new WG, formed on the subject in 2020, has ToRs covering a three-year period and will prepare a report after three years. Chairs of the WG will be made aware of the AC interest and the observer forum will be used to inform of any workshops developed on the subject. ACs are encouraged to attend.

Presentation on the work of WGOWDF at NWWAC/PelAC workshop on seismic and offshore wind energy developments on fisheries on 10 May 2022.

3.2 – Research developments on the interactions between fisheries and underwater noise & seismic activities, related to agenda item: ICES is part of the European process centered around the Marine Strategy Framework Directive and OSPAR and HELCOM efforts, collating data on continuous and impulsive noise, and exploring impacts and mitigation measures. A number of A number of WGs and deliverables are due to report in 2021 on this, including the setting of thresholds for both impulsive and continuous noise in Spring 2021. NSAC to circulate the link to this work, provided by ICES, to all MIAC attendees.

Discussed at NWWAC/PelAC workshop on seismic and offshore wind energy developments on fisheries on 10 May 2022.

3.3 – Update on the activities of the ICES Working Group on Bycatch of Protected Species (WGBYC): All work in this area to be carried out under the framework of the ICES Roadmap for bycatch advice on protected, endangered and threatened species (PETS). The biggest issues in this area are PETS monitoring data, fishing effort data, and abundance data of PETS. ACs could contribute on these main aspects by addressing this with national authorities and the Commission. ACs to consider actions to support quantitative data improvement and communication to relevant authorities on the subject of PETS bycatch – including making it clear to national authorities that ‘more research and more experts in this area are needed’ to improve the evidence base.

Discussion planned at MIACO under agenda item 9.

3.4 – Report from BSAC meeting on Stickleback: There is a proposal to hold a Workshop to explore the ecological consequences and commercial opportunities offered by the increased abundance of stickleback. This may take place in 2022 and will be open to AC participants. It will focus on the synthesis of available science. BSAC will follow progress in this regard and contribute as much as possible.

3.5 – Western Baltic Spring Spawning Herring: Based on 2020 advice, WBSSH not expected to rebuild above B_{lim} before 2023. Following a successful WKREBUILD workshop in 2020, ICES is developing ToRs for WKREBUILD2, which still requires approval. This meeting may take place in Autumn 2021. This work inter-links into a number of initiatives looking at reference points and productivity issues. A workshop on reference points is provisionally planned for 2022. BSAC to monitor developments in this regard and contribute as / when possible.

Update under item 3.4 of the MIAC agenda.

3.6 – Update on NAFO/ICES joint Pandalus WG: scientific advice on 3M Shrimp for 2021 and management implications for NAFO RA: ICES to continue to ensure timing of meetings and assessments fits into needs of both ICES and NAFO. ICES noted a strong progress on ecosystem modelling for the Flemish Cap and the relationships between redfish, cod and shrimp, including on multi-species MSE. It was noted that a ‘number of pandalus benchmarks’ may take place in 2022. LDAC noted this and LDAC members would be interested in supplying data into the model(s) being developed.

Update under item 3.1 of the MIAC agenda.

4.1 – Ecosystem considerations: ICES doesn’t have sufficient data flow, so BSAC should liaise with HELCOM on ecosystem considerations on coastal fisheries data. BSAC to consider the research shared by ICES within the meeting (<https://academic.oup.com/icesjms/article/74/6/1708/2629217?login=true>) as ‘food for thought’ for additional consideration of the issue in future MIAC discussions.

Discussion planned at MIACO under agenda item 4 on how ICES provides information for ecosystem-based management and ecosystem-based fisheries management

5 – Communication

Mark Dickey-Collas highlighted a request from the ICES communications team for quotes from various members of MIAC and MIACO, noting that they would appreciate prompt replies. Those contacted by ICES communication team with requests for quotes to reply as soon as possible, if they are comfortable sharing a comment for public use.

3. AC-specific issues

3.1 LDAC: Joint ICES-NAFO Pandalus Working Group and Ecosystem-multispecies approach for NAFO Flemish Cap (3M) cod, redfish and shrimp fisheries

Alexandre Rodriguez asked for updates on the work of the joint ICES-NAFO Pandalus Working Group, mentioning that the fishery had been closed again by decision at the last NAFO annual meeting in September 2021, causing a serious economic impact in certain EU fleets which are members of the LDAC. He argued that there are still uncertainties around the state of this stock and that a more solid scientific basis is needed to better discuss quota allocation and the development of a management regime. Rodriguez also added that frontloading the advice for this stock from November to September could be beneficial to discussions. He felt that work is being impacted by the Ukraine crisis, with Russia being one of the main players in the management of the stock. Rodriguez concluded by asking ICES for updates on the approach to address advice for this species.

Mark Dickey-Collas explained that *Pandalus* advice is planned for September and that NAFO establishes the deadlines. He then referred to the benchmark carried in 2021, explaining that it could not be concluded for the stock in Division 3m. There was a preparatory meeting in October aiming at compiling data, but resources were lacking and it was not possible to put forward an assessment. However, Dickey-Collas explained it was a good exercise that will contribute to the future assessment of the stock. Referring to the other two *Pandalus* stocks in the Skagerrak and Norwegian Deep, he explained that a lot of work was done looking at ecosystem drivers (9 species of fish in different combinations). Ultimately, no links were found between predation indicators, temperature and *Pandalus* abundance. He pointed out that it does not mean that these links do not exist, but that the available data cannot support this at the moment. Future work will have to focus on more detailed data and other ecosystem drivers to support this model. He also mentioned a novel, encouraging approach for the Skagerrak stock, with three models with different mortality.

Rodriguez thanked for the explanation and mentioned that the LDAC is planning to attend the upcoming NAFO meetings in August in Halifax focusing on developing an ecosystem approach framework to fisheries management, including a workshop to draft ecosystem objectives for NAFO. He concluded by confirming the LDAC willingness to provide stakeholder input and continue collaboration with ICES on the topic.

3.2 PELAC: Background to decision and communication to stakeholders of the change of the F_{msy} reference point for Southern horse mackerel

Sean O'Donoghue explained that, during the July 2021 meeting, ICES had informed the Pelagic AC of its decision to change the F_{msy} reference point for the Southern horse mackerel stock (horse mackerel in area 9) from 0.11 to 0.15. This decision came with unfortunate timing, since the PelAC had been working with the SWWAC for over a year on amending the long-term management strategy in place for this stock, trying to bring it in closer alignment with the ICES MSY advice. This work was finalized a month before the change in MSY reference point became apparent, thereby having a significant impact, as it brought the plan out of alignment with the MSY approach once more. He felt it was important to highlight the serious management issue caused by this lack of transparency and recommended that in future ICES communicates such changes externally to advice recipients and stakeholders in an earlier stage. O'Donoghue then asked for confirmation of an inter-benchmark happening in 2022 for this stock and whether this issue would be included in the planned discussions.

He then mentioned a separate issue related to the 2021 ICES advice on Southern horse mackerel, since the headline states: "*Management of southern horse mackerel, blue jack mackerel, and Mediterranean horse mackerel under a combined TAC prevents effective control of the single-species exploitation rates and could lead to overexploitation of any of these species.*" O'Donoghue explained that the PelAC would appreciate

suggestions from ICES on what could be done by managers/stakeholders to address this issue.

Dorleta Garcia expressed ICES apologies for the problems caused by the change of the F_{msy} reference point. She explained that the F_{pa} approach was changed last year by ICES, as a more solid scientific basis is now available for this reference point. In principle this is independent from F_{msy} , but in case of horse mackerel F_{msy} corresponds to F_{pa} and this is why the advice was impacted. She agreed that the issue was caused by lack of communication and confirmed ICES willingness to improve this, to avoid similar problems in the future. Regarding the uncertainty due to the survey and recruitment, Garcia explained that this is already taken into account in the advice, with recruitment being replaced by biometric need. Referring to the contribution of other species to the TAC, she explained that this varies year to year and advised that the best management solution would be to have separate TACs (for *Trachurus trachurus* especially).

O'Donoghue specified that the new F_{msy} brought significant difference in the 2022 catch advice and the management strategy developed by the PelAC was no longer fit. He stressed the need to have an inter-benchmark or a benchmark on Southern horse mackerel. "*How can we move forward and rectify the situation? Do we have enough data for the distinct species?*", he asked.

Dickey-Collas explained that the issue is between the need to provide MSY and how ICES evaluates the management plan (only on basis of precautionary approach). He added that a benchmark is planned in 2023 and that no sampling work is planned at the moment.

ACTION POINT: Reference points are agreed by ACOM as the advice is published. This is when ICES will notify of changes to reference points.

3.3 CCRUP: Quota of *Beryx* sp. in area X – Azores

Daniela Costa explained that the *Beryx* sp. (*Beryx decadactylus* and *Beryx splendens*) are one of the most important species for the Azorean fishers, representing about 71% of the total landings of demersal and deep-sea species. Fishing for the *Beryx* is traditionally carried out by an artisanal fleet and management measures were introduced, such as a maximum catch limits per vessel and an increase in the minimum landing size, to ensure a careful management of the fishing effort and the sustainability of the resource. She added that reports from fishermen indicates a substantial increase in the abundance of these species and data from the monitoring campaign carried out annually by the Department of Oceanography and Fisheries (University of the Azores) indicates a trend towards the stability in the resource. However, ICES advice continues to follow the precautionary approach and the *Beryx* quota decreases every year.

Rui Catarino replied that the reduction in this year advice follows the ICES frameworks. This is a category 5 stock - *Stocks for which either only data on landings or a short time-series of catch are available* - thus the advice follows a precautionary approach with 20% reduction every three years. He explained that there is one survey which experts consider not to be representative of the total population. Moreover, the species is highly mobile and the model does not catch enough individuals. With current framework, survey design and sampling need to be increased in order to move to category 3.

3.4 BSAC: Western Baltic herring

Jarek Zieliński asked whether ICES progressed on the recommendations on the Western Baltic herring management measures. The stock is in a critical state and a rebuilding plan needs to be implemented, covering Norway and the UK as well, as the western spring spawning herring migrates through Division 3A to the North Sea. In its Work Programme for 2022-2023 the BSAC states that it will investigate further work on management of the western Baltic spring spawning herring with a view to developing a re-building strategy for this stock. Any support from ICES on this subject would be much appreciated.

Lotte Worsøe Clausen explained that in order to work on a rebuilding plan, ICES needs to receive a request from ICES advice requesters (Commission and Member States). She stated that Germany had tried to formulate a request on productivity changes in 2019, but no final request was put forward. Then, ICES received a request on unavoidable bycatch in 2020, but it was rejected by ACOM because there was no suitable data and expertise was lacking. She added that work is ongoing on the subject in ICES Baltic Fisheries Assessment Working Group, which is focusing on the science needed.

ACTION POINT: BSAC to advise DG MARE for a request to ICES on developing a rebuilding plan for Western Baltic herring.

3.5 BSAC: The issue of seals, parasite infections and the assessment of Eastern Baltic cod

Zieliński asked clarification whether the impact of parasites from seals has been factored in the assessment of eastern Baltic cod. He referred to the information included in the ICES 2021 advice sheet on Eastern Baltic cod. The parasite infestations coincide with an increased abundance of grey seals. It is unknown whether the parasite infection is the cause or an effect of the poor condition of cod. These drivers are interrelated, and their cumulative effect on the cod stock is unclear. Zieliński pointed at the urgent need to find out all the effects that have an impact on the cod stock in the Baltic Sea. He also put forward a request for an investigation into these connections as soon as possible.

Ojaveer explained that, in terms of science and evidence, ICES encourages its scientists to address topics that are relevant to managements. There are experts working on this topic, but it is not an easy task to identify links with the parasite and there are no results available to the audience yet. Research is progressing, with experiments on growth performance of cod and some new data and approaches by DTU Aqua using liver category methods. Further parameters are being measured to establish cause-effect relations. On the contrary, quite many papers have been published on both the oxygen and the prey-species influence on cod.

Nils Høglund mentioned the sprat predation on cod eggs and asked if this had been considered as a driver for depressing cod stock in the Baltic. Ojaveer replied that this is indeed a very important ecological interaction which is likely considered. He will get back to BSAC with more information.

When Zieliński asked whether there were any discussions on adding seals in the assessment work on Eastern Baltic cod, Dickey-Collas replied that he would revert to the BSAC with confirmation.

ACTION POINT: BSAC to liaise with ICES regarding Eastern Baltic cod assessment.

3.6 NWWAC: Presentation of ICES advice on undulate ray

Matilde Vallerani explained that on 17 December 2020, following a meeting of the joint NWWAC/NSAC Focus Group Skates and Rays, NWWAC and NSAC presented a request to DG MARE to change the presentation of the ICES advice on undulate ray. The two ACs proposed to follow the same approach used for *Nephrops* to improve communication and understanding of the undulate ray advice, especially in regard to survivability of this species. The NWWAC would be grateful if ICES could clarify if this request has been considered yet and whether ICES can take this into account.

Dickey-Collas replied that ICES appreciates the importance of survivability and how it can be communicated. Unfortunately, this issue is waiting for EU-UK negotiations in the Specialised Committee on Fisheries to formulate its request to ICES. Survivability is an issue for both parties and they are looking

at streamlining survivability information across all stocks.

ACTION POINT: NWWAC to follow discussions in SCF regarding survivability of undulate ray.

4. General Items

4.1 NWWAC: List of special requests received by ICES from DG MARE

Emiel Brouckaert stated that the NWWAC would appreciate if ICES could provide an overview of the special requests received by the European Commission that will be addressed in the coming year, including opportunities for the ACs to provide their contribution.

Worsøe Clausen replied that ICES can make that available for those requests being approved by ACOM. The list of special requests could be made available on the online observer forum, then ACs could contact her, who would put the ACs in touch with the relevant experts team.

ACTION POINT: ICES to make list of approved requests available on their website for ACs consultation via the advice forum.

4.2 PELAC: Clarification procedure for using agreed management plan in top-line advice

O'Donoghue asked for an update from ICES regarding the procedure for adopting an agreed management/rebuilding plan as the headline advice for ICES advice sheets (rather than including this advice in the catch options table). During the PelAC July meetings in 2021, a discussion was held suggesting that there was a difference in opinion between ICES and the EU Commission on this procedure, and that this issue was still under bilateral discussion. For sake of clarity, the PelAC would appreciate an update on the latest status of this discussion and if possible, what the exact procedure is as followed by ICES.

Dickey-Collas replied that ICES is sticking to the guidelines developed through joint decision by MIRIA in 2010. The rule is to consider management plans if they are being evaluated, otherwise the MSY approach is used. A slight disagreement occurred within DG MARE on a number of management plans on the identification of the responsible fishing authorities. There has also been a misunderstanding for some DG MARE operators in relation to what the relationship between MSY and management plans is. ICES is in the process of clarifying this, however discussions with the Commission had to be postponed due to the Ukraine crisis

Worsøe Clausen added details on how ICES decides what to include in the headline advice. She explained that generally ICES sends the table of management plans to all relevant management bodies. Plans have to be agreed before they can be used.

ACTION POINT: ICES to progress ongoing discussions with DG MARE to clarify the relation between MSY and management plan in top-line advice. This will likely be further discussed at MIRiA in January 2023

4.3 LDAC: Improving science and discard data for deep-water stocks

Rodriguez mentioned an action point from MIAC 2021: *“LDAC, NWWAC, NSAC (and potentially SWWAC) to organise a Task Force to look into the needs and gaps of commercial data on (by)catch and discards. Explore avenues of collaboration with ICES WGDEEP to try to integrate commercial data into the advisory process in time for next biannual advice on fishing opportunities for 2021/2022.”*

The LDAC proposes to follow up on this item to establish next steps. Therefore, Rodriguez asked ICES for suggestions on how to improve collaboration and address the topic. He asked whether ACs could participate in the benchmark and support data compilation work. Rodriguez then mentioned an EASME project on VMEs conservation and deep-sea fisheries management, where the LDAC was invited to participate.

Dickey-Collas replied that ICES just had a VME benchmark and is no working with the Commission, looking at fishing footprint on VMEs. ICES is also liaising with NEAFC on how to interpret advice approach to VMEs. He added that it would be interesting to explore the link between the EASME project and the work carried out by ICES. ICES is also in partnership with a data limited stocks project from FAO.

Rodriguez said that he hadn't received the report from the EASME project yet, but there were many interesting reflections on several indicators for improving quality of data. He also noted the information on the FAO project. He then mentioned LDAC members' concerns on the consultation process, as the Commission was not particularly clear about it. Rodriguez and Dickey-Collas agreed to liaise via email on the topic and share the information available with the other ACs as well.

ACTION POINT: LDAC to share report from EASME project. ICES to explore possible links between their work on VMEs and the EASME project.

4.4 NWWAC: Overview on ICES work supporting the implementation of the EU MSFD

Vallerani explained that the NSAC and the NWWAC had established a Focus Group on the EU Marine Strategy Framework Directive aiming to contribute to its review with knowledge and experience of their members, keeping in mind the ambitions of the EU Green Deal and keeping aligned with the provisions of CFP and objectives of the EU Biodiversity Strategy. In light of this, the NWWAC would appreciate hearing an overview of ICES work related to the MSFD implementation, to strengthen and promote scientific approach to review.

Dickey-Collas explained that ICES has a central role now in being an evidence provider into many of the MSFD processes and this is highlighted through the grant agreement ICES has with DG ENVI, which covers the MSFD and the Habitats and Birds Directive. He mentioned that DG ENVI has been pushing very hard for stakeholder engagement scoping exercises. He then highlighted the fact that in the recently published guidelines for MS, ICES played pivotal roles in providing guidance in terms of commercial fisheries, foodweb and seabed impact. What is still missing is the concept of size and age distribution, where guidance is still very weak. ICES is also doing work on trade-offs which has been resulting in one of the most comprehensive maps of seabed impact and landed catches. Going forward, ICES is going to develop a tool in relation to seabed impact in MPAs. He mentioned the action plan developed by DG MARE and DG ENVI which aims at identifying synergies between the CFP and the MSFD. He concluded by saying that most of ICES work on the topic is done through workshops and working groups that are open to registered observers.

Brouckaert concluded that it would be important to pursue how ACs can be more involved on fisheries related topics that are addressed within DG ENVI and/or other Directorates in the Commission.

ACTION POINT: The ACs should explore opportunities for increasing direct engagement with DG ENVI and other Commission Directorates on fisheries related items.

4.5 PELAC: ICES Workshop on reference points WKREF

O'Donoghue raised concerns relating to the ICES workshop WKREF held online between the 2nd and 4th of

November 2021. WKREF was a series of two workshops intending to examine the basis for setting reference points, with a particular focus on target and limit reference points. This is an important topic as the methods for deriving reference points have been criticized for being in-transparent and subjective.

Concretely, he mentioned two concerns relating to the workshops:

- The first issue relates to the procedural aspects of the workshops. The registration for first workshop (WKREF1), which was open for all participants with ICES observer status, was closed for registration on basis that *"This workshop is now full."* To that end, it should be noted that the registration deadline for meeting number two (WKREF2) the 11-13 of January 2022 was set to the 31st of August 2021. Having such early registrations and limited the number of participants did not facilitate collaboration and stakeholder engagement. The reason for limiting participation to this particular workshop is unclear, especially considering that it was an on-line meeting. O'Donoghue asked on which basis is the selection of participants carried out.
- The second issue relates to the 2020 MIACO meeting, where concerns about ICES's ability to include ecosystem effects into the catch advice was raised (section 7.6 in ICES 2020). The concern partly results from the " F_{msy} project", the results from which indicate that including ecosystem aspects through density dependent effects in growth, maturation and mortality, will produce different F_{msy} values (Sparholt et al., 2020). In response to this, ICES stated *"ICES proposes to collaborate on a workshop for reference points in a changing environment. ICES is working to schedule this workshop for the end of 2020."* However, at the WKREF, several participants were not allowed to present their work, including Henrik Sparholt and his work during the F_{msy} project. O'Donoghue pointed out that this restriction does not facilitate the proposed collaboration. He also referred to the circulation by the NWWAC Secretariat of Sparholt's presentation in advance of the meeting.

Dickey-Collas replied that the workshop was full in numbers, with 45 participants. The Chairs asked to close registration to limit attendance and ensure proper facilitation of the online meeting. There was no selection of individuals, this was purely an operational decision.

Referring to the F_{msy} project, he pointed out that Sparholt's presentation was received with very short notice, which made it difficult from an organizational perspective. In relation to WKREF 1, he explained that *"when you have a workshop that is run by two chairs, they choose and develop how those workshops run following the guidance on conflict of interest. Regrettably, WKREF 1 Chairs chose not to have Sparholt's presentation"*. However, WKREF 2 did allow the presentation and the the F_{msy} project has been brought to the table by other ICES scientists as well. Sparholt will organize a symposium in November and ICES will participate. Dickey-Collas ensured that Sparholt's work is flowing through into the ICES system.

O'Donoghue thanked Dickey-Collas for the explanation and stressed the importance of making sure this information gets into the system and is addressed.

Dickey-Collas confirmed that the project has been receiving great attention at high level, with frequent discussions at ACOM.

Michael Andersen expressed his gratitude to the PelAC for raising the matter and suggested that, when ICES is dealing with such fundamental items, seats be reserved for different stakeholder groups to ensure balanced representation.

ACTION POINT: ICES to use the new stakeholder engagement strategy to evaluate the balance of stakeholders.

ACTION POINT: ICES to continue following the developments F_{msy} project.

4.6 CCRUP: Interpretation at meetings

Costa raised a point regarding meetings language. Considering that most of the small-scale fisheries representatives only speak their native language and in order to ensure that they can attend ICES meetings, she asked whether ICES had been considering having interpretation at their meetings with stakeholders (at least in Portuguese, Spanish and French). This would allow not only the Secretariat, but also the CCRUP president and vice-presidents to attend and fully understand the discussion.

Worsøe Clausen explained that ICES cannot set money aside for interpretation from its budget and there is unfortunately no financial basis to provide interpretation at meetings. However, ACs are welcome to bring their own interpreters. ICES would be happy to facilitate and help if needed.

ACTION POINT: ACs to consider opportunities to provide interpretation at MIAC meetings if needed.

5. Any Other Business

O'Donoghue referred to recent communication of ICES virtual attendance at ACs meeting. He pointed out that the PelAC greatly appreciate the involvement with ICES, however it is unsatisfactory to hear that there will be no in person presentation of ICES advice this year. He asked Dickey-Collas to consider joining the ACs in person again for those key meetings when the ICES advice is presented. NWWAC had exchange on same issue.

Brouckaert mentioned that the NWWAC had exchanged correspondence with ICES on the same issue.

Dickey-Collas replied that the issue was going to be discussed

6. Action Points

3.2 - Reference points are agreed by ACOM as the advice is published. This is when ICES will notify of changes to reference points.

3.4 - BSAC to advise DG MARE for a request to ICES on developing a rebuilding plan for Western Baltic herring.

3.5 - BSAC to liaise with ICES regarding Eastern Baltic cod assessment.

3.6 - NWWAC to follow discussions in SCF regarding survivability of undulate ray.

4.1. - ICES to make list of approved requests available on their website for ACs consultation via the advice forum.

4.2 - ICES to progress ongoing discussions with DG MARE to clarify the relation between MSY and management plan in top-line advice. This will likely be further discussed at MIRiA in January 2023.

4.3 - LDAC to share report from EASME project. ICES to explore possible links between their work on VMEs and the EASME project.

4.4 - The ACs should explore opportunities for increasing direct engagement with DG ENVI and other Commission Directorates on fisheries related items.

4.5 - ICES to use the new stakeholder engagement strategy to evaluate the balance of stakeholders.

4.5 - ICES to continue following the developments F_{msy} project.

4.6 - ACs to consider opportunities to provide interpretation at MIAC meetings if needed.

7. MIAC 2023

The SWWAC and CC RUP pointed out that it wouldn't be possible for their Chairs to host the meeting in English. Costa will report back to the CC RUP Chair and discuss for possible future hosting of MIAC.

Participants agreed to repeat the rotation starting with the Baltic Sea AC, who will chair the next MIAC in January 2023.

8. Participants list

Full Name	Organisation	Job title
Alexandra Philippe	NWWAC	OIG Vice-Chair
Alexandre Rodriguez	LDAC	Executive Secretary
Chloé Pocheau	SWWAC	Executive Secretary
Daniela Sofia Pereira Da Costa	CCRUP	General Secretary
Dorleta Garcia	ICES	ACOM Vice-Chair
Emiel Brouckaert	NWWAC	Chairman
Eugene Nixon	ICES	ACOM Vice-Chair
Ewa Milewska	BSAC	Rapporteur
Fabiana Miranda Nogueira	CCRUP	Administrative and Financial Assistant
Gualberto Costa Rita	CCRUP	Vice-Chair
Guillaume Carruel	BSAC	Executive Secretary
Henn Ojaveer	ICES	ACOM Vice-Chair
Jarek Zieliński	BSAC	Executive Committee Chair
Javier López Santiago	SWWAC	SWWAC member
Jean-Christophe Vandeveld	LDAC	LDAC member
Joanne Morgan	ICES	ACOM Vice-Chair
Justyna Zajchowska	PelAC	Fisheries And Marine Conservation Advisor
Lotte Worsøe Clausen	ICES	Head of Advisory Support
Mark Dickey-Collas	ICES	ACOM Chair
Matilde Vallerani	NWWAC	Deputy Executive Secretary
Michael Andersen	NSAC	Chief Scientific Advisor
Nils Hoglund	BSAC	Chair of the Working Group on Ecosystem Based Management



Pedro Emanuel Dos Reis Santos	MAC	Secretary General
Rui Catarino	ICES	Advisory Programme Professional Officer
Sean O'donoghue	PelAC	Working Group II Chair
Tamara Talevska	NSAC	Executive Secretary