TILADOM

Towards Integrative and Local Application of Dynamic Ocean Management

SCOR working group proposal submitted April 2017

Prepared by co-chairs:

Alistair Hobday
CSIRO, Australia
Email: Alistair.Hobday@csiro.au

Stephanie Brodie
University of California Santa Cruz, USA
Email: sbrodie@ucsc.edu

1. Summary

(max. 250 words)
Oceans are physically and biologically dynamic, yet strategies to manage oceans are often implemented at overly coarse spatiotemporal scales. Dynamic Ocean Management (DOM) is a management strategy that rapidly changes in space and time in response to changes in the ocean and its users. DOM is an emerging field of research that has been demonstrated to have wide application to ocean users around the globe. To date, DOM applications have rapidly expanded across a diverse range of timescales, biota, levels of data availability, and objectives, yet these applications have occurred as independent efforts which has resulted in limited application in areas with reduced capacity. The TILADOM initiative proposed here aims to understand the success of existing DOM applications, and determine the barriers to DOM implementation in areas with ocean use conflict. The primary goal of TILADOM is to develop a “How-To Guide” to explain DOM as a management choice, and provide a suite of tools in which to develop and implement DOM. In doing so, we will provide a means to overcome the barriers to DOM implementation and encourage wider uptake of DOM applications around the globe. We believe the working group deliverables will support enduring DOM uptake, minimize ocean conflict, and support sustainable social, economic, and ecological objectives. The international experience required is expansive, and a SCOR working group provides the ideal mechanism to achieve our aims.

2. Scientific Background and Rationale

(max 1250 words: explain in detail the background for the topic of the WG; why it is scientifically important, interesting, and relevant to SCOR; and why a SCOR WG is a good mechanism for the activities proposed.)

2.1 Dynamic Ocean Management

Oceans are physically and biologically dynamic, yet strategies to manage ocean resources are often implemented at overly coarse spatiotemporal scales. Spatial management is one strategy to regulating ocean use and provide for protection of vulnerable species and habitats. Traditionally, spatial management options are often implemented as a static approach that seeks to spatially separate apparently incompatible activities, such as fisheries, from conservation zones. To be effective, static boundaries often need to encompass very large areas in order to ensure year-round protection for highly mobile and migratory species. With increasing pressure and ocean activities, this may be inefficient as some activities (e.g. fishing, shipping) can be excluded from areas at times when the protection is not needed, as the target species is absent. There is often resistance to placing restrictions on ocean activities that provide significant economic and social benefits, as such there is a need in both developed and developing economies, for additional management tools that offer flexibility and efficiency in ocean management.

Dynamic Ocean Management (DOM) is one such tool that allows management strategies to rapidly change in space and time in response to changes in the ocean and its users (Maxwell *et al.* 2015). DOM can offer a flexible alternative that allows trade-offs between competing objectives (e.g. harvest or conserve) to be met, and has been demonstrated to have wide application around the globe {Dunn, 2014 #2708}. DOM research has rapidly expanded across a diverse range of biota (e.g. from scallops to tuna to whales), objectives (e.g. conservation outcomes to industry adaptation to climate variability), spatiotemporal scales (e.g. from real-time observations to seasonal forecasts), and levels of data availability (e.g. data poor to fishery-independent). As such there is a need to move towards an integrative approach to DOM applications to support wider uptake globally.

Climate change is changing the distribution of marine species, and causing new and more variable environmental conditions, which has created unique challenges for ocean-users and managers {Pecl, 2017 #2707}. DOM offers a strategy to allow ocean-users and managers to adapt to the challenges a changing ocean. Historically DOM has been implemented on a near real-time basis but improvements in ocean forecasting on time scales of weeks to decades offer additional opportunities to develop approaches to resolve ocean conflicts. For example, seasonal forecasting of ocean conditions and animal habitats has been used as a decision-support tool in marine industries adapting to climate variability {Hobday, 2016 #1882} . There is opportunity to clarify, expand, and integrate more timescales and more applications under the definition of DOM, and as such likely improve future users understanding and uptake of DOM.

2.2 The Challenge

To date, published literature indicates there has been a disproportionate application of DOM among countries, with many applications of DOM in developed nations. While reviews and syntheses on DOM and seasonal forecasting have been published (e.g. Hobday *et al.* 2014; Lewison *et al.* 2015; Maxwell *et al.* 2015), these reviews focus on DOM examples from developed nations and there is currently limited knowledge on if, or what, DOM strategies are used in developing nations and nations with emerging economies.

There may be barriers that limit the uptake of DOM across new regions and in developing nations. Although investigation of barriers is required as part of the proposed working group activities, they are likely to include: 1) Knowledge - limited knowledge transfer between researchers and managers/policymakers (Cvitanovic *et al.* 2015); 2) Fiscal – potential DOM applications are expensive to research and implement (Hobday *et al.* 2014); 3) Expertise – DOM approaches can be diverse and complex, and difficulties can arise from limited expertise and issues with data (e.g. scarcity, biases, quality) ; 4) Communication - communication between users and managers needs to be possible and occur at timescales relevant to the management approach (e.g. cell phones, printed maps, email, website access).

2.3 The TILADOM initiative

Our vision is to provide a means to increase uptake of DOM globally. To do so we aim to understand and overcome barriers to DOM uptake by identifying and individually addressing the barriers, such as: 1) Knowledge – reviewing how existing DOM applications have become operational, which will inform guidelines on how to increase knowledge transfer and improve operationalization (Objective 1); 2) Fiscal – providing code and guidelines on how to access freely-accessible data sources, thus reducing many of the initial and ongoing costs of DOM (Objectives 2 and 3); 3) Expertise – creating a How-To Guide that provides instructional information on how to develop and apply DOM applications (Objectives 2, 3, and 4); 4) Communication – reviewing existing DOM applications and the levels of communication required to maintain an operational product (Objective 1). We will draw upon the existing knowledge of international partners, and seek to support and encourage implementation DOM in new regions and new applications.

2.4 Why a SCOR working group?

The work proposed here aims to understand the barriers to implementation of dynamic ocean management in areas with ocean use conflict. We seek to enable uptake of DOM by those seeking approaches to complement traditional spatial management approaches, particularly in areas where implementation of extensive static management areas, such as closed areas, will lead to considerable social and economic harm. This SCOR effort will bring together an interdisciplinary group of scientists with an established track record in development and application of DOM to unify disparate approaches and tools. A primary goal is to understand the success of existing applications and package the tools to allow wider uptake where useful. To date, perhaps as DOM is an emerging research field, independent efforts have been the norm which limits DOM applications in areas that may have limited capacity. Thus a primary goal is to develop a “How-To Guide” to explain DOM as a management choice. The breadth of international collaboration proposed here is unique, yet without SCOR funding is unlikely to be realised. We believe the working group deliverables will support enduring DOM uptake, minimize ocean conflict, and support sustainable social, economic, and ecological objectives.

[steph to populate intro with references when online version ends]

3. Terms of Reference

(max. 250 words; one sentence per point; 4-6 ToRs that describe goals)

Objective 1: Review and synthesize the current state of operational ecology, including how existing dynamic ocean management tools have become operational, and to publish the results in a peer-reviewed journal.

Objective 2: Develop a code library that provides freely accessible and easy ways to connect environmental data sets and specific local data sets.

Objective 3: Create a How-To Guide for dynamic ocean management, drawing on the general code library (Objective 2), which encompasses both operational (Objective 1) and research

(Objective 4) aspects, and provide this Guide as an online open-access and updatable resource.

Objective 4: Demonstrate the applicability of the How-To Guide by creating case studies of dynamic ocean management in developing nations, including a data poor case study, and publish these case studies in a peer-reviewed journal.

4. Working plan

(logical sequence of steps to fulfil terms of reference, with timeline. Max. 1000 words)

To deliver Objective 1 we will review and synthesize how existing dynamic ocean management applications transitioned from a research output to an operational tool. An operational tool is one that is ready or being used in a real-time application. The transition from a research output to an operational tool is often an obstacle when attempting to implement DOM. The synthesis will aim to include examples from developing nations and artisanal fisheries. This will help to summarise what formats DOM takes across a broad spectrum of ocean users, and will inform the scope of the proceeding objectives. As a part of this objective we will work with a wide range of stakeholders and countries to identify barriers to DOM uptake. We will also review levels of stakeholder involvement in planning and implementation of existing DOM applications. The synthesis will help new projects plan for and achieve the transition from a research output to an operational product, and ultimately support a greater implementation of DOM. The results of Objective 1 will be published in a peer-reviewed open access journal.

To deliver Objective 2 we will use the groups knowledge, experience, skills, and existing code to develop a code library. The code library will focus on ways in which to connect environmental data sets, environmental forecasts, and local data sets, and will be written in R language but can be expanded to include other software (e.g. Matlab, ArcGIS) should the need arise. The creation of the code library will develop in conjunction with Objectives 3 and 4 so as to ensure useful linkages between code, the How-To Guide (Objective 3), and case studies (Objective 4). The code library will be hosted on a freely accessible public platform, such as an R vignette or on Github, and will be maintained beyond the lifetime of the SCOR working group.

Objective 3, entitled the How-To Guide, will be a guidance document to provide instructional information on how to apply DOM. The Guide will have a simplistic core structure, with complexity added incrementally to ensure that all levels of user-experience are able to effectively and constructively use the Guide. The Guide will be centered around 1) a decision tree (e.g. {Dunn, 2011 #2703}); and 2) an idealized workflow (e.g. {Hobday, 2014 #1881}). The decision tree will step through various spatio-temporal scales of management interest, and will ultimately identify DOM approaches that best suit specific applications. The workflow will show an idealized step-wise approach to achieving DOM that will reference leaves on the decision tree. Each step within the workflow will be expanded upon, with a description of potential data sources and methods. For example, issues surrounding species data (e.g. data poor fisheries, data with inherent biases) will be summarised and potential solutions suggested. The workflow will form the backbone of the How-To Guide, and will be targeted towards overcoming the barriers to DOM implementation. For example, the Guide will describe ways in which to source freely accessible environmental products for multiple time scales (e.g. historical, real time, forecast); and outline methods for building species distribution models using freely accessible software (e.g. R, Maxent) and/or existing global habitat models (e.g. raquamaps). The Guide will: integrate results from Objective 1 using examples of how to operationalize and communicate DOM; draw on the general code library (Objective 2); and outline examples of how to use the Guide to implement DOM (Objective 4). The Guide will be an online, updatable resource, to be managed beyond the lifetime of the SCOR working group by a steering group. The online Guide will allow for updates as information changes and new products become available (e.g. links to access new global or regional environmental products; or links to new operational DOM tools and applications). The Guide will be uploaded as a resource that self-organises content based on user keywords. We will explore options for an existing organisation to host the Guide (e.g. https://www.openchannels.org/), which will extend the reach of this guide, as well as provide a long-term location beyond the lifetime of the SCOR working group.

To deliver Objective 4 we will seek additional partners from developing nations to identify and collaborate on case studies in regions where DOM has not yet been applied. We will use the How-To Guide to implement a stepwise approach to the creating DOM for these case studies, ultimately ending with an application of DOM that can be transitioned to an operational stage. Potential regions for creation of case studies include southern Africa, south-east Asia, and South America, and working group members from these regions to cultivate collaborations. The collaborations will focus on a two-way knowledge exchange to ensure that knowledge of existing DOM applications in developing nations (part of Objective 1) is integrated into the How-To Guide (Objective 3). The case studies, in collaboration with regional partners from participating countries, will be published in a peer-reviewed open access journal. The case studies will also be integrated into How-To Guide and code library.

Month 1: 1st WG meeting. The meeting will include planning for the entire project with a focus on Objective 1 and 4. Task oriented sub-groups will be organized to progress Objective 1 during and after the meeting. The meeting will aim to be held in an region where creation of a first case study can be supported (Objective 4), as such sub-groups will be allocated to progress Objective 4.

Months 2-11: Continue work on Objective 1 and submit to a peer-reviewed journal within this period. Continue work on Objective 4.

Month 12: 2nd WG meeting – discuss framework for Objectives 2 and 3. Use framework to create sub-groups to progress work during and after the meeting. The meeting will aim to be held in an region where creation of a second case study can be supported (Objective 4), as such sub-groups will be allocated to progress Objective 4.

Month 13 – 23: Continue work on Objectives 2, 3, and 4.

Months 24: 3rd WG meeting – discuss and plan the finalisation of Objectives 2, 3, and 4. The meeting will aim to be held in an region where creation of a third case study can be supported (Objective 4), as such sub-groups will be allocated to progress Objective 4.

Months 25 – 36: Release code (Objective 2) and How-To Guide (Objective 3) as freely accessible resources online. Continue work on Objective 4 and submit to a peer-reviewed journal.

5. Deliverables

(state clearly what products the WG will generate. Should relate to the terms of reference. Max 250 words). A workshop is not a deliverable. Please note that SCOR prefers that publications be in open-access journals.

1. Publish a review/synthesis paper on operationalizing dynamic ocean management and stakeholder involvement (Objective 1)
2. Release a code library as a freely accessible resource (e.g. R vignette; github) (Objective 2)
3. Release the DOM How-To Guide as a freely accessible online resource (Objective 3)
4. Collaboration with developing nations by completing case studies of dynamic ocean management implemented using the stepwise approach in the How-To Guide. To be published open-access in a peer-reviewed journal (Objective 4).
5. Coordinate a session and/or Town Hall meeting at an international conference to showcase the application and capacity of the website and the How-To Guide.

6. Capacity Building

(How will this WG build long-lasting capacity for practicing and understanding this area of marine science globally. Max 1500 words)

Dynamic ocean management has immense potential for current and future ocean management globally. However, one of the barriers to uptake of DOM is limited knowledge on how to create and implement DOM applications. The vision of our proposal is to remove the barriers to DOM implementation, and create better communication and applicability between researchers and stakeholders. We believe our proposed code library and How-To Guide will be important in supporting global uptake of DOM. The WG will actively build capacity by seeking participants from developing nations in which to identify and create case studies for these regions. The working group meetings will be hosted in developing nations which will ultimately foster international collaborations into the future and also foster wider uptake of the How-To Guide and DOM by association. The proposed How-To Guide has global applications, and the online, updatable resource will ensure the WG outputs are recorded and globally accessible into the future.

7. Working Group composition (as table). Divide by Full Members (10 people) and Associate Members, taking note of scientific discipline spread, geographical spread, and gender balance. (max. 500 words)

7.1 Full Members:

Name	Gender	Place of work	Expertise relevant to proposal
1 Alistair Hobday (co-chair)	M	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, **Australia**	Dynamic ocean management; Ecological forecasting; climate adaptation
2 Stephanie Brodie (co-chair)	F	University of California Santa Cruz, **USA**	Spatial ecology; ecological forecasting
3 Mark Payne	M	Technical University of Denmark, **Denmark**	Statistical modelling; oceanography; fisheries.
4 Lynne Shannon	F	University of Cape Town, **South Africa**	Ecosystem dynamics; fisheries management

5 Sei-Ichi Saitoh	M	Hokkaido University, **Japan**	Fisheries science; biological oceanography; remote sensing
6 Priscila Lopes	F	Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, **Brazil**	Fisheries research; ecosystem services
7 Kylie Scales	F	University of the Sunshine Coast, **Australia**	Spatial ecology; dynamic ocean management
8 Jon Lopez	M	AZTI-Tecnalia, **Spain**	fisheries ecology; statistical modelling; bycatch mitigation
9 Desiree Tommasi	F	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, **USA**	Biological oceanography; dynamic ocean management
10 Jean-Noel Druon	M	European Commission, **Italy**	Spatial fisheries management; remote sensing

7.2 Associate Members:

Name	**Gender**	**Place of work**	**Expertise relevant to proposal**
1 Jason Hartog	M	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, **Australia**	Ecological forecasting; dynamic ocean management
2 Claire Spillman	F	Bureau of Meteorology, **Australia**	Seasonal forecasting; dynamic ocean management; remote sensing
3 Mike Jacox	M	University of California Santa Cruz, **USA**	Oceanography; ocean modeling; remote sensing
4 Kristin Kaschner	F	University of Freiburg, **Germany**	Spatial ecology; Conservation biology
5 Haritz Arrizabalaga	M	AZTI-Tecnalia, **Spain**	Fisheries management; population dynamics
7 Daniel Dunn	M	Duke University, **USA**	Dynamic Ocean Management
8 Marta Coll	F	Institute of Marine Science, **Spain**	Ecosystem functioning; Fisheries; Conservation biology.
9 Ryo Kawabe	M	Nagasaki University, **Japan**	Fisheries management; animal behaviour
10 Emmanuel Chassot	M	Institute of Research for Development, **Seychelles**	Population dynamics; fisheries ecology

8. Working Group contributions (max. 500 words)
Detail for each Full Member (max. 2 sentences per member) why she/he is being proposed as a Full Member of the Working Group, what is her/his unique contribution?

Alistair Hobday:

Stephanie Brodie:

Mark Payne:

Lynne Shannon: Expert in ecosystem dynamics and the application of the ecosystem approach to fishing in an African case study (Benguela upwelling system, South Arica) in an international context. Brings ecological indicator and food web modelling expertise to the group.

Sei-Ichi Saitoh:

Kylie Scales:

Priscila Lopes is an ecologist working on interdisciplinary approaches to small-scale fisheries. Her work has focused on understanding fishers' behavior and their socio-ecological resilience to changes (e.g.: changes in fish stocks or in management), socioeconomic incentives to fisheries and to (non-)compliance, and also on providing solutions to co-management using local ecological knowledge and the ecosystem services approach. Her work relies on existent fishing databases and on direct contact with fishers from small villages in different environments (oceanic, coastal, semi-arid and Amazonian).

Jon Lopez is a fisheries ecologist working on tropical tunas and has been involved in several EU projects of bycatch mitigation and tuna and tuna-like behavior and ecology, using both fisheries (VMS, logbooks, etc.) and unconventional data (local ecological knowledge, alternative acoustics platforms, etc.). He is currently member of various ICCAT and IOTC working groups, including the subcommittee on ecosystems and FAD groups, among others, and works towards the sustainability of tropical tuna fisheries.

Desiree Tommasi is a fisheries oceanographer whose interdisciplinary research centers on understanding the impacts of climate variability on marine ecosystems and the development of environmentally-informed fisheries management frameworks. Her current work uses management strategies evaluations to assess the value of integrating seasonal to multi-annual climate forecasts into fisheries management decisions.

Jean-Noel Druon:

9. Relationship to other international programs and SCOR Working groups

(max. 500 words)

9.1 IMBeR Activities

Science Plan and Implementation Strategy: Our proposed WG directly relates to the IMBeR Science Plan and Implementation Strategy, specifically Theme 4 “Responses of Society”. Our proposed WG deliverables will help clarify what human institutions can do to mitigate or adapt to anthropogenic impacts on ocean systems.

Working Groups: Our proposed WG directly complements two of the IMBeR working groups - the Capacity Building Task Team and the Human Dimensions Working Group (HDWG). Our proposed collaborations are relevant to the objectives of the Capacity Building Task Team which aim to enhance research capabilities in developing nations and in activities that help to implement IMBeR science plan. Our proposed WG deliverables can be informed by the integrated assessment framework and learning platform for global change response developed by the HDWG.

Regional Programmes: The Climate Impacts on Top Ocean Predators (CLIOTOP) is an IMBeR regional programme, and currently has a Task Team on seasonal forecasting. We anticipate that the Task Team outputs can directly contribute to the proposed code library and How-To Guide. The links between CLIOTOP and the proposed WG will be supported by concurrent membership of certain WG members (Hobday, Scales, Arrizabalaga).

9.2 WG149 Changing Ocean Biological Systems (COBS)

SCOR WG149 focuses on understanding how biological systems will respond to a changing ocean. The proposed WG compliments WG149 by focusing on dynamic strategies to support management and industry adaptation to a changing ocean. The proposed WG can directly use the WG149 glossary of terms and implementation guide (TOR 8) to better align language and ensure greater uptake and understanding of DOM by manager and policy makers.

9.3 United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 14: Life Below Water

The outputs of the proposed working group will be useful for, and directly contribute to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 14. Specifically, by facilitating the wider uptake of DOM globally we will support the 2020 targets of sustainable management (target 2), effective regulation of marine resources (target 4), and greater conservation of coastal regions (target 5). Our proposed collaboration with developing countries will also support increased economic benefits of ocean sustainability (target 7) and transfer of marine technology (target 8) to such countries.

9.4 ICES and PICES Working Groups on Seasonal to Decadal Predictability

Working groups within ICES and PICES are focusing on various levels of spatio-temporal ecosystem predictability. The ICES working group investigation of seasonal to decadal forecasts is directly relevant to this WG proposal, and links will be supported by concurrent membership (Payne and Jean-Noel). The PICES investigation into ocean products for use in marine ecosystem predictions is relevant to the proposed WG and outputs can be integrated into the How-To Guide and case studies.

9.5 FiSCAO: Fish Stocks in the Central Arctic Ocean

New areas in the Arctic ocean have become accessible to ocean-users due to the retreat of sea ice. FiSCAO is an international collaborative group to ensure sustainable commercial harvest in the pan-Arctic ecosystem. There is potential for the proposed WG outputs to directly inform current and future management in the pan-Arctic ecosystem, and support dynamic ocean management at the initial stages of new management regimes.

9.6 ICCAT and IOTC Working groups on Ecosystems and Bycatch

ICCAT and IOTC Regional Fisheries Management Organizations are responsible of the conservation and management of tuna and tuna-like species in the Atlantic and Indian Oceans, including target and non-target species. The application of DOM in regions of interest would provide key material to work towards the sustainability of both intentionally and unintentionally exploited resources.

10. Key References

(max. 500 words)

Cvitanovic, C., Hobday, A., van Kerkhoff, L., Wilson, S., Dobbs, K. & Marshall, N. (2015) Improving knowledge exchange among scientists and decision-makers to facilitate the adaptive governance of marine resources: A review of knowledge and research needs. *Ocean & Coastal Management,* **112,** 25-35.

Hobday, A., Maxwell, S., Forgie, J., McDonald, J., Darby, M., Seto, K., Bailey, H., Bograd, S., Briscoe, D. & Costa, D. (2014) Dynamic Ocean Management: Integrating Scientific and Technological Capacity with Law, Policy and Management. *Stanford Environmental Law Journal,* **33,** 125-168.

Hobday, A.J., Spillman, C.M., Hartog, J.R. & Eveson, J.P. (2016) Seasonal forecasting for decision support in marine fisheries and aquaculture. *Fisheries Oceanography*.

Lewison, R., Hobday, A.J., Maxwell, S., Hazen, E., Hartog, J.R., Dunn, D.C., Briscoe, D., Fossette, S., O'Keefe, C.E. & Barnes, M. (2015) Dynamic ocean management: identifying the critical ingredients of dynamic approaches to ocean resource management. *Bioscience***,** biv018.

Little, A.S., Needle, C.L., Hilborn, R., Holland, D.S. & Marshall, C.T. (2015) Real-time spatial management approaches to reduce bycatch and discards: experiences from Europe and the United States. *Fish and Fisheries,* **16,** 576-602.

Maxwell, S.M., Hazen, E.L., Lewison, R.L., Dunn, D.C., Bailey, H., Bograd, S.J., Briscoe, D.K., Fossette, S., Hobday, A.J. & Bennett, M. (2015) Dynamic ocean management: Defining and conceptualizing real-time management of the ocean. *Marine Policy,* **58,** 42-50.

Appendix

For each Full Member, indicate 5 key publications related to the proposal.

Alistair Hobday:

1. Hobday, A. J. and J. R. Hartog (2014). "Dynamic Ocean Features for use in Ocean Management." Oceanography **27**(4): 134–145.
2. Hobday, A. J., J. Hartog, C. Spillman and O. Alves (2011). "Seasonal forecasting of tuna habitat for dynamic spatial management." Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences **68**: 898-911.
3. Hobday, A. J., C. M. Spillman, J. P. Eveson and J. R. Hartog (2016). "Seasonal forecasting for decision support in marine fisheries and aquaculture." Fisheries Oceanography **25**(S1): 45-56.
4. Hobday, A. J., S. M. Maxwell, J. Forgie, J. McDonald, M. Darby, K. Seto, H. Bailey, S. J. Bograd, D. K. Briscoe, D. P. Costa, L. B. Crowder, D. C. Dunn, S. Fossette, P. N. Halpin, J. R. Hartog, E. L. Hazen, B. G. Lascelles, R. L. Lewison, G. Poulos and A. Powers (2014). "Dynamic ocean management: Integrating scientific and technological capacity with law, policy and management." Stanford Environmental Law Journal **33**(2): 125-165.
5. Lewison, R. L., A. J. Hobday, S. M. Maxwell, E. L. Hazen, J. R. Hartog, D. C. Dunn, D. K. Briscoe, S. Fossette, C. E. O'Keefe, M. Barnes, M. Abecassis, S. J. Bograd, N. D. Bethoney, H. Bailey, D. Wiley, S. Andrews, L. Hazen and L. B. Crowder (2015). "Dynamic Ocean Management: Identifying the Critical Ingredients of Dynamic Approaches to Ocean Resource Management." BioScience **65**: 486-498. doi:410.1093/biosci/biv1018.

Stephanie Brodie:

1. Brodie, S., Hobday, A.J., Smith, J.A., Spillman, C.M., Hartog, J.R., Everett, J.D., Taylor, M.D., Gray, C.A. and Suthers, I.M. (2017). “Seasonal forecasting of dolphinfish distribution in eastern Australia to aid recreational fishers and managers.” Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2017.03.004
2. Brodie, S., Taylor, M.D., Smith, J.A., Suthers, I.M., Gray, C.A. and Payne, N.L. (2016). “Improving consumption rate estimates by incorporating wild activity into a bioenergetics model.” Ecology and evolution **6**(8): 2262-2274.
3. Brodie, S., Hobday, A.J., Smith, J.A., Everett, J.D., Taylor, M.D., Gray, C.A. and Suthers, I.M. (2015). “Modelling the oceanic habitats of two pelagic species using recreational fisheries data.” Fisheries Oceanography **24**(5): 463-477.

Mark Payne:

Lynne Shannon:

1. Shannon, L.J., Coll, M., Neira, S., Cury, P.M., and Roux, J.-P. (2009). Impacts of fishing and climate change explored using trophic models. Chapter 8, pp. 158-190 in Checkley, D.M., C. Roy, J. Alheit, and Y. Oozeki (eds.), Climate Change and Small Pelagic Fish. Cambridge University Press 7.
2. Shannon, L.J., Jarre, A.C., and Petersen, S.L. (2010). Developing a science base for implementation of the ecosystem approach to fisheries in South Africa. In Perry, R.I., Barange, M., Hofmann, E., Moloney, C., Ottersen, G. and Sakurai, Y. (Editors). GLOBEC Special Issue, Progress in Oceanography 87(1-4): 289-303.
3. Shannon, L.J., Coll, M., Bundy, A., Gascuel, D., Heymans, J.J., Kleisner, K., Lynam, C., Piroddi, C., Tam, J., Travers, M. and Shin, Y.-J. Trophic level-based indicators to track fishing impacts across marine ecosystems. (2014). Marine Ecology Progress Series **512**: 115–140. doi: 10.3354/meps10821
4. Shin, Y.-J., Shannon, L. J., Bundy, A., Coll, M., Aydin, K., Bez, N., Blanchard, J.L., Borges, M.-F., Diallo, I., Diaz, E., Heymans, J.J., Hill, L., Jogannesen, E., Jouffre, D., Kifani, S., Labrosse, P., Link, J., Mackinson, S., Masski, H., Mollmann, C., Neira, S., Ojaveer, H., Abdallahi, K.o.M., Perry, I., Thiao, D., Yemane, D. and Cury, P. (2010). Using indicators for evaluating, comparing and communicating the ecological status of exploited marine ecosystems. 2. Setting the scene. ICES Journal of Marine Science **67**: 692-716.
5. Lockerbie, E., Shannon, L.J., Jarre, A. (2016). The Use of Ecological, Fishing and Environmental Indicators in Support of Decision Making in Southern Benguela Fisheries. Ecological Modelling **69**: 473-487.

Sei-Ichi Saitoh:

1. Alabia, I. D., S.-I. Saitoh, H. Igarashi, Y. Ishikawa, N. Usui, M. Kamachi, T. Awaji and M. Seito (2016). Ensemble squid habitat model using three-dimensional ocean data. ICES Journal of Marine Science**,** doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsw075.
2. Liu Y., S.-I. Saitoh, Y. Ihara, S. Nakada, M. Kanamori, X. Zhang, K. Baba, Y. Ishimawa, T. Hirawake (2015). Development of a three-dimensional growth prediction model for the Japanese scallop in Funka Bay, Japan, using OGCM and MODIS, ICES Journal of Marine Science**,** fsv153 doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsv153.
3. Mugo, R., Saitoh, S.-I., Takahashi, F., A. Nihira, A., and Kuroyama, T. (2014). Evaluating the role of fronts in habitat overlaps between cold and warm water species in the western North Pacific: A proof of concept, Deep-Sea Research II, doi:10.1016/j.dsr2.2013.11.005.

4. Saitoh, S.-I., R. Mugo, I. N. Radiarta, S. Asaga, F. Takahashi, T. Hirawake, Y. Ishikawa, T. Awaji, T. In and S. Shima. (2011). Some operational use of remote sensing and marine-GIS for sustainable fisheries and aquaculture, ICES Journal of Marine Science, doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsq190
5. Saitoh, S.-I., Chassot, E., Dwivedi, R., Fonteneau, A., Kiyofuji, H., Kumari, B., Kuno, M., Matsumura, S., Platt, T., Raman, M., Sathyendranath, S., Solanki, H., Takahashi, F. (2009). Remote sensing applications to fish harvesting. In: Forget M-H., Stuart V., Platt T., (eds). Remote Sensing in Fisheries and Aquaculture. Dartmouth, Canada: IOCCG Report 8. IOCCG; 2009. pp. 57–76.

Priscila Lopes:

1. Silvano, RAM; Nora, V; Andreoli, TB; Lopes, PFM & Begossi, A. (2017). The “ghost of past fishing”: small-scale fisheries and conservation of threatened groupers in sub-tropical islands. Marine Policy 75: 125-132.
2. Damásio, LMA; Lopes, PFM; Pennino, MG, Carvalho, AR & Sumaila, R. (2016). Size matters: fishing less and yielding more in smaller-scale fisheries. ICES Journal of Marine Science: fsw016.
3. Roos, NC; Pennino, MG; Lopes, PFM & Carvalho, AR. (2016). Multiple management strategies to control selectivity on parrotfishes harvesting. Ocean & Coastal Management 134: 20-29.
4. Lopes, P.F.M.; Pacheco, S.S.; Clauzet, M.; Silvano, R.A.M. & Begossi, A. (2015). Fisheries, tourism, and marine protected areas: Conflicting or synergistic interactions? Ecosystem Services 16: 333-340.
5. Karper, M. & Lopes, P.F.M. (2014). Punishment and compliance: exploring scenarios to improve the legitimacy of small-scale fisheries management rules on the Brazilian coast. Marine Policy 44: 457-464.

Kylie Scales:

Jon Lopez:

1. Lopez J, Moreno G, Boyra G, Dagorn L (2016) A model based on data from echosounder buoys to estimate biomass of fish species associated with fish aggregating devices. Fishery Bulletin 114: 166-178 doi doi:10.7755/FB.114.2.4
2. Lopez J, Moreno G, Ibaibarriaga L, Dagorn L (2017) Diel behaviour of tuna and non-tuna species at drifting fish aggregating devices (DFADs) in the Western Indian Ocean, determined by fishers’ echo-sounder buoys. Marine Biology 164: 44 doi 10.1007/s00227-017-3075-3
3. Lopez J, Moreno G, Lennert-Cody C, Maunder M, Sancristobal I, Caballero A, Dagorn L (2017) Environmental preferences of tuna and non-tuna species associated with drifting fish aggregating devices (DFADs) in the Atlantic Ocean, ascertained through fishers’ echo-sounder buoys. Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography doi http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2017.02.007
4. Lopez J, Moreno G, Sancristobal I, Murua J (2014) Evolution and current state of the technology of echo-sounder buoys used by Spanish tropical tuna purse seiners in the Atlantic, Indian and Pacific Oceans. Fisheries Research 155: 127-137 doihttp://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2014.02.033
5. Moreno G, Dagorn L, Capello M, Lopez J, Filmalter J, Forget F, Sancristobal I, Holland K (2015) Fish aggregating devices (FADs) as scientific platforms. Fisheries Research doi http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2015.09.021

Desiree Tommasi:

1. Tommasi, D., Stock, C., Pegion, K., Vecchi, G., Methot, R.D., Alexander, M., and Checkley, D. (2017). Improved management of small pelagic fisheries through seasonal climate prediction. Ecological Applications 27, 378-388.
2. Tommasi, D., Stock, C., Hobday, A.J., Methot, R., Kaplan, I.C., et al. (2017). Managing marine resources in a dynamic environment: the role of seasonal to decadal climate forecasts. Progress in Oceanography 152, 15-49.
3. Tommasi, D., Jacox, M.G., Alexander, M.A., Siedlecki, S., Werner, F.E., Stock, C.A., Bond, N.A. (2017). Seasonal forecasts of ocean conditions in the California Current Large Marine Ecosystem. US CLIVAR Variations Newsletter 15, 41-46.
4. Stock, C. A., Pegion, K., Vecchi, G. A., Alexander, M.A., Tommasi, D., Bond, N. A., Fratantoni, P., Gudgel, R., Kristiansen, T., O'Brien, T., Xue, Y., Yang, X. *(2015).* Seasonal sea surface temperature anomaly prediction for coastal ecosystems. Progress in Oceanography, 137: 219-236.
5. Tommasi, D., Nye, J. A., Stock, C.A., Hare, J. A., Alexander, M., Drew, K. (2015). Effect of Environmental Conditions on Juvenile Recruitment of Alewife (Alosa pseudoharengus) and Blueback Herring (A. aestivalis) in Freshwater: A Coastwide Perspective. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 72: 1037-1047.

Jean-Noel Druon: