

REPORT OF THE FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

3

8

The Finance and Administration Committee (F&A) met from 09:30-13:00 hours on October 12, from 09:00-13:00 on October 14, and from 13:30-14:30 on October 16, under the chairmanship of Dr. Richard J. Marasco. Dr. Alexander S. Bychkov acted as rapporteur.

Agenda Item 1. Welcome and opening remarks

The Chairman called the meeting to order, welcomed participants and requested an introduction of members for each delegation. All Contracting Parties except the People's Republic of China were represented at all sessions (*F&A Endnote 1*).

Agenda Item 2. Adoption of agenda

The Committee reviewed and adopted the agenda (*F&A Endnote 2*).

Agenda Item 3. Audited accounts for fiscal year 2002

The Auditor's Report for *FY 2002* (*F&A Endnote 3*) was circulated to all Contracting Parties on March 31, 2003, and distributed again at the 2003 interim Governing Council meeting on April 9. In the auditor's opinion, the financial statements are an accurate representation of the financial position of the Organization as of December 31, 2002. The Report was reviewed and adopted by the Committee. The Committee recommends that Council approve the Report. The Committee was informed that Council selected *Flader & Hale* as the auditor for *FY 2003-2005*.

Agenda Item 4. Annual contributions

National contributions for 2003 and beyond

The Executive Secretary provided historical statistics on the payment schedule of annual fees

to the Organization and reported on the 2003 annual fee payment dates. As stated in Financial Regulation 5(ii), all national contributions to PICES "*shall be considered due as of the first day of the financial year (January 1) to which they relate*". Unfortunately, every year in the last 11 years, some national contributions were not received until the second, third, or even the fourth, quarter of our fiscal year (*F&A Endnote 4*). Following the instruction of Council (Decisions 02/A/2(i)), the Executive Secretary sent a letter to member countries advising on the benefits of timely payments and requesting the payment of contributions by January 1. Nevertheless, for *FY 2003* only two contributions (U.S.A. and Japan) arrived prior to this date, one payment (Canada) was received in the first part of January, one partial (~96.5%) payment in early April (Russia; the remainder was paid in July), one payment (Korea) in early May, and a partial contribution (~78%, plus the remaining \$4,000 of 2002 fee) from China was received in early October.

The Chairman noted that there has been an overall improvement in the timeliness of payment. He also asked members to advise on problems they are facing in remitting the annual contribution on time. The Committee is concerned over the increased frequency of partial payments of annual fees. In some cases, these partial payments are remitted without explanation or an indication of when the outstanding balance will be paid. The operation of the Secretariat is structured around the receipt of full annual due payments at the beginning of the PICES fiscal year. Late payments cause the Secretariat to function conservatively to avoid cash flow problems. This approach could adversely affect its operations.

The Committee recommends that Council instruct the Executive Secretary to send a letter to each Contracting Party commending them for their improved performance in submitting

annual contributions in 2003. In addition, the letter should describe the difficulties that partial payments cause for the Secretariat.

Proposed changes to PICES' Rules of Procedure and Financial Regulations

At PICES XI, to ensure timely payment of annual contributions, F&A recommended, and Council approved, that *starting from the next Annual Meeting, Council will consider and adopt the budget for the ensuing and subsequent financial years* (Decision 02/A/2(iii)). This action requires changes in the Rules of Procedure (Rule 15) and the Financial Regulations (Regulation 3(v)), and the Executive Secretary was requested to develop the appropriate wording changes for consideration at PICES XII.

In the process of preparing budgets for consideration at PICES XII, a serious problem was discovered as a result of the previous year's decision to have budgets for ensuing and subsequent financial years approved. The preparation of realistic budgets requires knowledge of programmatic activities. This is difficult enough for a coming year and would be highly speculative for the succeeding year, with the end result being inaccurate funding requests made to the Contracting Parties.

The Committee recommends returning to the previous practice, currently reflected in the Rules of Procedure and Financial Regulations, where Council will adopt its budget for the ensuing fiscal year, and only consider the forecast budget for the subsequent fiscal year. For planning purposes, Contracting Parties should continue to use the guideline generally accepted at the Eighth Annual Meeting (Decision 99/A/2(ii)), which states that the annual contributions will increase at the rate of inflation (about 3%) in Canada.

Inflation-adjusted annual contributions from 1992-2002

At PICES XI, the F&A Chairman introduced an analysis of inflation-adjusted contributions since 1992. The adjusted contributions were

calculated by dividing annual contributions by the Consumers Price Index (CPI) for each member country (data were obtained from the IMF International Financial Data Base at <http://ifs.apdi.net/imf>). This analysis indicated that the inflation-adjusted contributions in national currency have actually decreased for Canada, China, Japan and the United States, remained about constant for Russia, and increased slightly for Korea. The Committee requested that the inflation-adjusted annual contribution tables be updated regularly.

Agenda Item 5. Fund-raising

PICES has grown into an internationally renowned organization and has to anticipate and plan for even further growth. The current practice of a 3% increase in annual contributions covers inflation only. Funding constraints can impede improvement and development of the Organization. Therefore, fund-raising is becoming an important component of PICES activities. Additional resources could include extra-budgetary contributions from member states, and grants from international organizations and private foundations. The Committee noted the significant increase in the level of external funding for various activities initiated by PICES since 2000, but all these funding offers have specific product/service requirements. Serious concern was expressed about how the Secretariat, the size and structure of which have remained unchanged for the last 10 years, can handle the extra workload related to the growing number of projects. The Committee recommends that Council request delegates to determine the possibility of obtaining additional funding to support PICES activities.

The Executive Secretary reported on fund-raising efforts in 2003. External and additional funding received for various activities initiated by PICES is reflected in F&A *Endnote 5*. The Committee commended the Science Board Chairman and the Secretariat for their efforts. The Committee suggests that future reports on external funding activity contain information on costs (both staffing and non-staffing) incurred by PICES for undertaking these projects.

Further, serious attempts should be made to recover PICES' expenses that are associated with involvement in the activity.

At PICES X, Council assigned fund-raising functions to the Finance and Administration Committee. The Committee recommends that Science Board should identify and prioritize activities that are strong candidates for external funding. The list could be used by members of the PICES family to raise funds. Such an attempt, if successful, would make it possible for PICES to expand its programmatic content.

Agenda Item 6. Completion of items from the report of PICES Review Committee

Upon analyzing the draft Review Committee Report at PICES XI, F&A indicated that a few items might have budgetary implications:

Interim Science Board/Governing Council Meeting

Council strongly supported a proposal by Science Board to hold an interim Science Board meeting, with participation of Governing Council, in spring 2003 (Decision 02/A/4(iv)). F&A concluded that the interim meeting would have minimal budgetary implications for the Organization, since member countries will cover travel expenses for Council and Science Board members. This joint meeting was convened April 7-9 (noon), 2003, in Victoria, Canada, followed immediately by a ½-day Governing Council meeting in the afternoon of April 9.

The Executive Secretary reported that the overall expenses for the 2003 interim meeting were at a level of \$10,000. The interim meeting was a success and met its objectives of engaging Science Board and Council in discussions of broad and long-term importance to PICES. The reports of both meetings and summaries of recommended actions were circulated to participants and Council members in early May 2003. An article entitled "PICES Science Board and Governing Council hold their first joint meeting" was prepared by the Science Board Chairman, Dr. Ian Perry, and published in PICES Press (Vol. 11, No. 2) in July 2003. The

Committee supports a second inter-sessional meeting to be held in spring 2004, provided that Science Board and Council concur. Costs should be carefully considered in selecting a venue for the interim meeting.

Review of current publication practices of the Organization

Publication activities of the Organization have expanded significantly in the last several years. The Review Committee recommended an external review of current publication practices of PICES. At PICES XI, F&A supported this action and requested the Secretariat to explore the potential costs of having such a review. At the 2003 interim Governing Council meeting, the Executive Secretary reported that with the assistance from Fisheries & Oceans Canada and the National Marine Fisheries Service (U.S.A.), two bids were received: at the level of \$4,000-4,500 from the Canadian expert, and about \$3,500 from the US team. Council agreed to proceed with the review, and it was conducted by two NMFS experts from September 16-19, 2003. PICES' expenses for the review were about \$2,000, as some of the costs were covered by the Alaska Fisheries Science Center.

The Report (see *F&A Endnote 6*), which contains a number of recommendations, was circulated to all Contracting Parties on October 1. The addition of a full time professional editor was the report's main recommendation. While supporting this recommendation in principle, the Organization's funding situation cannot support this action at the present time. In the interim, F&A recommends the use of contract services.

Re-naming of positions at the PICES Secretariat

At PICES XI, F&A supported the re-naming of staff positions at the PICES Secretariat if the action is budget-neutral, and requested the Secretariat and Canada to explore this issue. Discussions between the Executive Secretary and Canadian Delegate, Dr. Laura Richards, indicated that the re-naming of positions would cause no changes in the salary levels.

Publication of Review Committee Report

Pending full consideration of the Review Committee Report by the Science Board, action on its disposition was postponed until the 2003 interim Science Board meeting. F&A recommends that the Review Committee Report be included in this year's PICES Annual Report.

Agenda Item 7. Budget

a. Estimated accounts for fiscal year 2003

The Committee reviewed the estimated accounts for *FY* 2003 and recommends their acceptance by Council.

b. Interest and other income

During a fiscal year, the amount of funds in PICES accounts may be increased by miscellaneous income, voluntary contributions and grants. Miscellaneous income (tax rebates, income tax levies from foreign staff, bank interest and registration fees for PICES XII) in 2003 is estimated to be about \$77,500. The Committee noted significant external funding (\$99,000) and additional contributions (\$27,200) for various activities initiated by PICES.

c. Home Leave and Relocation Fund

The status of the Home Leave and Relocation Fund was reviewed. It was noted that expenditures (\$7,540) will be offset by interest earned by the Fund and, in part, by the foreign staff tax levies. The Fund will be at its required level of \$110,000 by the end of the fiscal year. No relocation expenses are expected in *FY* 2004.

d. Trust Fund

In *FY* 2003, approximately \$71,700 from the Trust Fund will be used to finance the Intern Program, to bring young scientists from PICES member countries and scientists from countries with "economies in transition" to scientific meetings. These expenditures are compensated for partly by the voluntary contributions from Canada and the United States for the Intern Program (totaled \$27,200), and by travel grants

from SCOR (\$14,900). A transfer of \$11,600 from the Working Capital Fund to the Trust Fund is recommended. With this transfer, the Trust Fund balance will be \$110,000 at the end of the fiscal year.

e. Working Capital Fund

The balance in the Working Capital Fund is expected to be about \$218,600 at the end of 2003. The Committee recommends a transfer of \$79,000 from the Working Capital Fund to the General Fund for 2004. This amount includes external funds, \$67,500, allocated for PICES projects that will be completed in 2004. The Committee also recommends that \$11,600 be transferred to the Trust Fund. After these transfers, the Working Capital Fund will total approximately \$128,000.

f. Budget for fiscal year 2004

The Committee reviewed the proposed *FY* 2004 budget of \$679,000 (*F&A Endnote 7*) and recommends its approval by Council. A transfer of \$79,000 from the Working Capital Fund is recommended to reduce the total annual contribution to \$600,000, setting the 2004 fees at \$100,000 per Contracting Party. A modest increase of about 3% in annual fees over the previous year is consistent with the guideline generally accepted at the PICES Eighth Annual Meeting (Decision 99/A/2(ii)).

g. Forecast budget for fiscal year 2005

The *FY* 2005 forecast budget of \$725,000 was examined by the Committee and is submitted to Council for information only. Per the guideline adopted in 1999, the 2005 contributions would be set at \$103,000 per Contracting Party. A transfer of about \$107,000 from the Working Capital Fund would be required to balance funds. A transfer of this magnitude will only be possible if additional funds can be raised.

Agenda Item 8. Report of Study Group on PICES Capacity Building

At PICES XI, Council established a Study Group on *PICES Capacity Building* under the

direction of Science Board to develop a capacity building strategy and an implementation plan for the Organization (Decision 02/S/5). The report of the Study Group (*SB Endnote 14*) was circulated to the Chairmen of the Scientific Committees and CCC Program on August 21, 2003. F&A reviewed the document and noted that PICES is currently engaged in numerous capacity building activities. While agreeing in principle to the need to expand capacity building activities, the Committee cautions that the current budget warrants careful consideration of the demands placed on the Organization before initiating additional activities.

Agenda Item 9. PICES Intern Program

The Committee reviewed the current status of the Intern Program and recommends that interested Contracting Parties give equal consideration to both administrative and scientific staff when making nominations. It was also suggested that all Contracting Parties should advertise the Program broadly to ensure the selection of high quality candidates.

The Committee recommends keeping the stipend at the current level of \$2,000 per month, and given the modest stipend, advises that Contracting Parties consider whether personal circumstances warrant supplementation.

Agenda Item 10. PICES Visiting Scientist Program

The Visiting Scientist Program, while attractive to the Organization, has not drawn interest. F&A suggests that Science Board be requested to develop specific project proposals. These proposals should be sent to each Contracting Party. When circulating these proposals, it should be pointed out that relocation to the Secretariat may not be required.

Agenda Item 11. Schedule and financing of future Annual Meetings

At PICES XI, Council requested that the Russian Federation explore the possibility of holding the Fourteenth Annual Meeting in 2005, and inform the Secretariat on this matter by May

31, 2003 (Decision 01/A/4(ii)). A letter from Dr. Lev Bocharov indicated Russia’s willingness in hosting PICES XIV, and further proposed that the meeting be held in Vladivostok. The Committee concurs and recommends that the meeting be scheduled from September 30 to October 8, 2005.

F&A recommends that in keeping with the six-year rotation cycle, Japan be invited to explore the feasibility of hosting PICES XV in 2006, and inform the Secretariat on this matter by May 31, 2004.

Canada indicated a preference to hold the Annual Meeting in 2008, to link it to the celebration of the centennial anniversary of the Pacific Biological Station. This would require an alteration to the existing rotation cycle.

F&A reviewed the current registration fee structure and recommends that fees for the next Annual Meeting be set at the following level:

Type	CDN \$
Registration fee	225
Early registration fee	150
Students	50

The Committee believes that this increase is warranted by the growing monetary needs of the Organization. Fees will be collected by the Secretariat and credited to the Working Capital Fund. These funds will be used to support the Intern Program and other high priority projects.

Canada re-iterated its proposal from PICES XI to discontinue the practice of transferring funds from PICES to member countries to partially cover Annual Meeting costs. The proposal was discussed, but no recommendation was made.

Agenda Item 12. Space, facilities and services for the Secretariat

Space and general administrative services are provided to the Secretariat by the Government of Canada through Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO). The original agreement commenced on April 1, 1992, and continues indefinitely with a review every three years. In 2001, PICES and

DFO signed a new agreement that covers the period between April 1, 2001, and March 31, 2004. Considering a rise in postage fees and a substantial increase in the size of PICES mail-outs, PICES and DFO consented to adjust the agreement, effective April 1, 2002. According to the amended agreement, PICES is to pay an annual sum of \$28,000 (in quarterly payments of \$7,000), which includes \$23,500 for postage. Figures for telephone and fax lines (\$2,500) and janitorial/ maintenance services stay the same.

In June 2001, PICES registered "*pices.int*" as its domain name to maintain the Home Page and e-mail addresses. The initial cost of equipment and installation was \$2,700. The monthly cost of operation is about \$140.

Agenda Item 13. Administrative matters

Tax levy for Canadian personnel

Tax levies are an important source of alternative "revenue" for PICES, but this practice currently extends only to the foreign personnel. It was noted that other international organizations with headquarters in Canada, like NAFO and INPFC, have had such a practice for all staff members. Adoption of such a practice by PICES would greatly increase PICES' revenue (with the current level of salaries, to about \$70,000 per year). Canada was requested to explore the feasibility of an amendment to the Headquarters Agreement that will allow the extension of the tax levy practice to all staff of the Secretariat.

Tax exemption for PICES in member countries

Tax rebates from the federal and provincial governments in Canada are another important source of alternative "revenue" for PICES (*e.g.*, about \$10,000 in 2001 and \$14,000 in 2002). It would be beneficial for PICES' financial status if the Organization could be exempt from sales tax in some of our other member countries, especially the US. The United States will explore the possibility of tax exemption for PICES.

Canadian "Acceptance" for foreign personnel

From the first foreign staff being hired at the Secretariat, they and members of their families have been granted a special "Acceptance" status

by the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade. Unfortunately, such a status is only granted on an annual basis, even though there is proof that the foreign staff are offered a 3-year or 5-year term of office. The process of having to renew this status every year creates great personal and administrative inconvenience, because not only is the staff and family without any personal identification during the process, but the provincial medical insurance also promptly discontinues medical coverage on the day the "Acceptance" expires, and it takes 3-6 months to re-instate the coverage. Canada will inform the Secretariat of the process required to request a change in the term of "Acceptance" status.

US Visa for foreign personnel

The United States recognizes PICES as an international organization, yet treats PICES' Russian staff as a "Russian diplomat" instead of an international organization employee when issuing visas. The United States was requested to resolve this problem.

Agenda Item 14. Appointment of Finance and Administration Committee Chairman

According to the Rules of Procedure (Rule 15), "*The Chairman of the Finance and Administration Committee (F&A) shall be appointed by the Council from amongst the Committee's members for a term of two years and shall be eligible for re-appointment only once for a successive term.*" Dr. Richard J. Marasco of U.S.A. was appointed as the F&A Chairman at PICES VII in 1998 (Fairbanks, U.S.A.), and re-appointed at PICES IX in 2000 (Hakodate, Japan). At PICES XI, at the recommendation of F&A, Council extended his term for one year (Decision 02/A/7). Russia stated that Dr. Marasco is doing an excellent job as the F&A Chairman and suggested that Council extended his term for one more year. This motion was supported by all countries.

Agenda Item 15 Adoption of F&A report and recommendations to Council

The Committee approved the F&A Report and its recommendations to Council.

F&A Endnote 1

Participation List

Canada

Robin Brown (advisor)
Laura Richards

Japan

Tatsu Kishida (advisor)
Tokimasa Kobayashi
Motobumi Manabe (advisor)
Tokio Wada (advisor)

People's Republic of China

Not represented

Republic of Korea

Keun-Oh Kim (advisor)
Yong-Ju Lee (advisor)
Hyun-Churl Lim

Russia

Igor I. Shevchenko

U.S.A.

Elizabeth J. Tirpak

Other

Richard J. Marasco (Chairman, F&A)
Alexander Bychkov (Executive Secretary)

F&A Endnote 2

F&A Committee Meeting Agenda

1. Welcome and opening remarks
2. Adoption of agenda and meeting procedures
3. Audited accounts for fiscal year 2002
4. Annual contributions
 - a. National contributions for 2003 and beyond
 - b. Proposed changes to PICES' Rules of Procedure and Financial Regulations
 - c. Analysis of inflation-adjusted annual contributions from 1992-2002
5. Fund-raising activities
6. Completion of items from the report of PICES Review Committee
 - a. Interim Science Board/Governing Council Meeting
 - b. Review of current publication practices of the Organization
 - c. Re-naming of positions at the PICES Secretariat
7. Budget
 - a. Estimated accounts for fiscal year 2003
 - b. Interest and other income
 - c. Home Leave and Relocation Fund
 - d. Trust Fund
 - e. Working Capital Fund
 - f. Proposed budgets for fiscal year 2004 and fiscal year 2005
8. Report of Study Group on *PICES Capacity Building*
9. PICES Intern Program
10. PICES Visiting Scientist Program
11. Schedule and financing of future Annual Meetings of the Organization
12. Space, facilities and services for the Secretariat office
13. Administrative matters
 - a. Tax levy for Canadian personnel
 - b. Tax exemption for the Organization in member countries
 - c. Canadian "Acceptance" status for foreign personnel
 - d. US visa for foreign personnel
14. Appointment of F&A Chairman
15. Adoption of F&A report and recommendations
16. Other business

F&A Endnote 3

Auditor's report (2002) to the Organization



To the Council of the
North Pacific Marine Science Organization

We have audited the statement of financial position of North Pacific Marine Science Organization as at December 31, 2002 and the statement of operations and changes in fund balances for the year then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of the organization's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform an audit to obtain reasonable assurance whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation.

In our opinion, these financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the organization as at December 31, 2002 and the results of its operations and changes in fund balances for the year then ended in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

Flader & Greene
Chartered Accountants
9768 Third Street
Sidney, B.C.,
Canada. V8L 3A4

Sidney, B.C.
March 13, 2003

**STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION
AS AT DECEMBER 31, 2002**

ASSETS	2002	2001
CURRENT ASSETS		
Cash and short term deposits	\$ 637,748	\$ 559,620
Accounts receivable	21,387	36,240
Prepaid expenses	5,253	2,350
	\$ 664,388	\$ 598,210

LIABILITIES		
CURRENT LIABILITIES		
Accounts payable	\$ 9,624	\$ 14,401
Funds held for contracting parties (Note 3)	194,000	188,000
	203,624	202,401

FUND BALANCES		
WORKING CAPITAL FUND	223,264	180,809
TRUST FUND	127,500	105,000
HOME LEAVE RELOCATION FUND	110,000	110,000
	460,764	395,809
	\$ 664,388	\$ 598,210

**STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES
FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2002**

	General Fund	Working Capital Fund	Trust Fund	Home Leave Relocation Fund	2002 Total	2001 Total
FUND BALANCES , beginning of year	-	\$ 180,809	\$ 105,000	\$ 110,000	\$ 395,809	\$ 425,560
SOURCES OF FUNDS						
Contributions from Contracting Parties	560,000	-	-	-	560,000	574,800
Budgeted transfer to General Fund	59,000	(59,000)	-	-	-	-
Additional transfer to General Fund	4,000	(4,000)	-	-	-	-
Voluntary contributions and grants (Note 4)	-	115,210	35,301	-	150,511	93,872
Interest and other income (Note 5)	-	110,810	326	2,053	103,189	63,221
FUND BALANCES , before expenditures	623,000	333,829	140,627	112,053	1,209,509	1,157,453
EXPENDITURES						
Personnel services	304,000	17,113	-	-	321,113	307,604
Travel	82,152	-	31,873	-	114,025	104,513
Communication	30,753	-	-	-	30,753	29,879
Contractual services	14,719	-	-	-	14,719	10,490
Printing	68,901	-	-	-	68,901	63,871
Supplies	7,447	-	-	-	7,447	5,720
Equipment	6,512	1,701	-	-	8,213	5,849
Annual Meeting	45,866	4,124	-	-	49,990	113,807
Workshops	58,992	9,058	-	-	68,050	65,756
Relocation	-	-	-	-	-	4,830
Miscellaneous	3,563	-	-	-	3,563	2,912
PICES X Anniversary	-	31,144	-	-	31,144	33,680
Intern program	-	-	26,986	-	26,968	17,512
Ecosystem Status Report	-	10,581	-	-	10,581	-
Unrealized losses on foreign exchange	(6,722)	-	-	-	(6,722)	(4,689)
	616,183	73,721	58,841	-	748,745	761,644
NET FUNDS AVAILABLE	6,817	260,108	81,786	112,053	460,764	395,809
TRANSFER TO WORKING CAPITAL FUND (Note 6)	(6,817)	8,870	-	(2,053)	-	-
INTERFUND TRANSFERS (Note 7)	-	(45,714)	45,714	-	-	-
FUND BALANCES , end of year (Note 8)	-	\$ 223,264	\$ 127,500	\$ 110,000	\$ 460,764	\$ 395,809

**NORTH PACIFIC MARINE SCIENCE ORGANIZATION
NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
DECEMBER 31, 2002**

1. PURPOSE OF ORGANIZATION

The North Pacific Marine Science Organization (PICES) is an intergovernmental non-profit scientific organization whose present members include Canada, Japan, the People's Republic of China, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation and the United States of America. The purpose of the organization is to promote and coordinate marine scientific research in order to advance scientific knowledge of the North Pacific and adjacent seas.

2. ACCOUNTING POLICIES

The financial statements are prepared in accordance with the North Pacific Marine Science Organization's Financial Regulations and are prepared in accordance with Canadian generally accepted accounting principles. The following is a summary of the significant accounting policies used in the preparation of these financial statements:

(a) Fund Accounting

The Working Capital Fund represents the accumulated excess of contributions provided from Contracting Parties over expenditures in the General Fund. The purposes of the General Fund and Working Capital Fund are established by Regulation 6 of the Organization Financial Regulation.

The Trust Fund was established in 1994 for the purpose of facilitating participation of a broad spectrum of scientists in activities of the Organization.

The Home Leave Relocation Fund was established in 1996 to pay relocation and home leave expenses of new employees and their dependents to the seat of the Secretariat and removal after period of employment has ended, and to provide home leave for international staff. This fund is set at \$110,000.

(b) Capital Assets

Capital assets acquired by the Organization are expensed in the year of acquisition.

(c) Income Tax

The Organization is a non-taxable organization under the Privileges and Immunities (International Organizations) Act (Canada).

(d) Foreign Exchange

Transactions originating in foreign currencies are translated at the exchange rate prevailing at the transaction dates. Assets and liabilities denominated in foreign currency are translated to equivalent Canadian amounts at the current rate of exchange at the statement of financial position date.

3. FUNDS HELD FOR CONTRACTING PARTIES

The funds held for contracting parties are advance contributions from Japan (\$97,000) and U.S.A. (\$97,000) for their 2003 fees.

4. VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS AND GRANTS

	Working Capital Fund	Trust Fund
NMFS contribution to NPESR/VSP	\$ 22,976	-
GEM/EVOS contribution to NPESR/VSP	13,691	-
GEM/EVOS contribution to VOS Workshop	6,006	-
GLOBEC contribution to Gijon Symposium	3,052	-
Grant from Alfred P. Sloan Foundation	69,485	-
Grant from SCOR for PICES X	-	7,840
Contributions to Intern Program:		
Fisheries and Ocean Canada	-	10,000
Alaska Fisheries Science Center, NMFS	-	15,164
TINRO - Center	-	2,297
	\$ 115,210	35,301

5. INTEREST AND OTHER INCOME

	Working Capital Fund	Trust Fund	Home Leave Relocation Fund
Interest income	\$ 1,974	326	2,053
Income tax levies	28,670	-	-
GST, PST & WCB rebates	14,334	-	-
Other Income	98	-	-
Douglas & McIntyre Rebate	18,488	-	-
Registration fees	37,246	-	-
	\$ 100,810	326	2,053

6. TRANSFER TO WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Pursuant to Financial Regulation 6 (iii), the Working Capital Fund is to be increased by the surplus in the General Fund.

Pursuant to the decision of the Governing Council, \$2,053 was transferred to the Working Capital Fund to restore the Home Leave Relocation Fund to a maximum level of \$110,000.

7. INTERFUND TRANSFERS

Pursuant to decision 02/A/3(iii) of the Governing Council, an amount to keep the Trust Fund at the level of \$100,000 was transferred from the Working Capital Fund. In addition, Council approved the transfer of \$27,500 to bring the Trust Fund balance to \$127,500.

8. WORKING CAPITAL FUND SURPLUS

Pursuant to decision 02/A/3(ii) of the Governing Council, \$110,500 of the funds held in the Working Capital Fund will be transferred to the General Fund to reduce 2003 contributions.

9. COMMITMENTS

General administrative and communications services are provided to the Secretariat of the Organization by the Government of Canada through the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. The agreement was amended April 1, 2002 and continues until March 31, 2004. The fixed cost for services is \$28,000 per year which are paid quarterly as invoiced.

10. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

A statement of cash flows has not been presented, as the required information is readily apparent from the other financial statements presented and the notes to the financial statements.

F&A Endnote 4

Payment Schedule of National Contributions

	Canada	China	Japan	Korea	Russia	U.S.A.
1992 ¹	June 9, 92	Sept. 29, 92	March 23, 92			April 24, 92
1993	Dec. 14, 92	July 30, 93	March 12, 93			Jan. 8, 93
1994	Feb. 22, 94	March 14, 94	Jan. 28, 94			Feb. 14, 94
1995	Jan. 4, 95	May 29, 95	March 4, 95		July 18, 95	March 21, 95
1996	Feb. 21, 96	May 23, 96	Jan. 12, 96	July 9, 96	Feb. 21, 96	Feb. 29, 96
1997	Dec. 20, 96	March 27, 97	April 21, 97	May 6, 97	Oct. 8, 97	Jan. 20, 97
1998	Feb. 3, 98	May 8, 98	Jan. 13, 98	Dec. 5, 98; Jan. 6, 99²	July 22, 98	May 7, 98
1999	Nov. 30, 98	Nov. 26, 99	March 29, 99	Aug. 16, 99	Dec. 13, 99	Jan. 27, 99
2000	Feb. 9, 00	Aug. 29, 00	Nov. 30, 99	June 1, 00	Nov. 2, 00	Jan. 18, 00
2001	Jan. 24, 01	Dec. 10, 01	Dec. 13, 00	Aug. 23, 01	May 18, 01	Jan. 3, 01
2002	Jan. 21, 02	Oct. 8, 02⁴	Nov. 27, 01	Aug. 26, 02	June 10, 02³	Dec. 24, 01
2003	Jan 13, 03	Oct. 2, 03⁵	Dec. 11, 02	May 5, 03	Apr. 2, 03⁶	Dec. 6, 02

¹ partial year from March 23-December 31, 1992;

² partial payment in 1998, remainder paid in 1999;

³ partial payment (72%), remainder paid October 10, 2002;

⁴ partial payment (95.7%), remainder paid October 3, 2003;

⁵ partial payment (78%), remainder still unpaid;

⁶ partial payment (96.5%), remainder paid July 18.

F&A Endnote 5

External funding and special contributions for various PICES projects in 2003

Continuous Plankton Recorder (CPR) Program

- A grant of US \$185,000 from the North Pacific Research Board (U.S.A.) was received to maintain the east-west transect of the PICES Continuous Plankton Recorder (CPR) survey of the North Pacific and the southern Bering Sea from July 2003 to June 2005.
- The Gulf of Alaska Ecosystem Monitoring and Research Program (GEM) of EVOS (Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council,

U.S.A.) agreed to fund the sample collection and analysis for the north-south transect of the PICES CPR survey from 2004 to 2006, at a level of US \$120,000 per year.

North Pacific Ecosystem Status Report

- Alaska Fisheries Science Center (AFSC) of National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS, NOAA, U.S.A.) and EVOS/GEM Program contributed US \$12,450 and US \$32,600 (\$16,000 from US FY 03 and \$16,600 from

US FY 04) respectively, to support the development of the North Pacific Ecosystem Status Report.

Reminder: Earlier AFSC contributed US \$24,260 (US \$9,260 in 2001 and US \$15,000 in 2002), and EVOS/GEM provided US \$10,000 to finance the production of a pilot North Pacific Ecosystem Status Report.

Census of Marine Life Report

- A grant of US \$45,000 from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation (approved in 2002), will be used in 2003 to produce a report for the Census of Marine Life entitled “Marine life in the North Pacific Ocean: The known, unknown and unknowable”. This report is closely linked to the North Pacific Ecosystem Status Report.

Ecosystem modeling

- A grant from the Nakajima Foundation (approved in 2001) was used to finance a MODEL/REX Workshop on “Improvements to the PICES NEMURO model” (January 24-27, 2002, Nemuro/Yokohama, Japan) and a MODEL workshop to “Embed NEMURO and NEMURO.FISH into a 3-D circulation model” (March 3-6, 2003, Yokohama, Japan).
- Japan Fisheries Research Agency provided a grant of JPY 6,000,000 (from April 2003 to March 2006) to support international collaboration on the development of a model on the coupled response of lower and higher trophic level ecosystems for climate variability in the North Pacific. This grant will be used to convene 3 workshops – two in Japan (2003 and 2005) and one in the United States (2004).

Biogeochemical data integration and synthesis

- IOC (Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission) provided US \$6,000 to PICES for the publication of “Guide of best practices for oceanic CO₂ measurements and data reporting” being prepared by the PICES WG 17 on *Biogeochemical data integration*

and synthesis to ensure a large print run. This publication is expected in 2004.

Intern Program

- In addition to their annual fees, Canada and U.S.A. contributed \$10,000 and \$17,200, respectively, to finance the 2003 PICES Intern Program.

Reminder: So far, 3 countries have contributed to the Trust Fund to support the Intern Program: Canada - \$27,500 (2000-2002), the Russian Federation - \$2,300 (2002), and the United States - \$34,500 (2000-2002).

Travel grants for scientists from countries with “economies in transition”

- SCOR (Scientific Committee on Oceanic Research) approved two grants to support the travel of scientists from countries with “economies in transition” to scientific meetings organized by PICES: US \$7,000 (US \$5,285 was expensed through PICES) for the PICES/GLOBEC/ICES Zooplankton Production Symposium (May 19-23, 2003, Gijón, Spain) and US \$5,000 for PICES XII (October 10-18, 2003, Seoul, Republic of Korea).

Other

- The Southwest Fisheries Science Center (National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA, U.S.A.) offered US \$18,200 to facilitate the gathering and coordination of potential international PaCOS (Pacific Coastal Observing System) contributions, and to design basic governance structure options for coordinating biological observations between the United States, Canada and Mexico.
- GLOBEC contributed about \$4,630 to finance the production of a special joint PICES/GLOBEC issue of PICES Press that focused on results from the PICES Eleventh Annual Meeting and the Second GLOBEC Open Science Meeting, held sequentially in Qingdao, People’s Republic of China, in October 2002.

F&A Endnote 6

Review of PICES Publication Program

Executive Summary

At the request of PICES, a review of the PICES publication program was conducted from September 16-19, 2003. During its first 10+ years, PICES has published a growing number of documents now totaling more than 65 (14 peer-reviewed) in six different publication series and 22 issues of the newsletter, PICES Press. Considering the very small PICES Secretariat staff (4 plus an intern), the publication record of high-level scientific materials is exceptional, and the staff has made creative use of co-publishing ventures to advance the Organization's publishing program. However, the workload for the Secretariat staff has become a serious burden that must be addressed and alleviated. Most important is the addition to the Secretariat staff of a professional editor to assume control of editorial production duties, and who can introduce up-to-date editorial methods and new desktop publishing technology to the Organization. Also important will be an updating of the PICES website so PICES publications can be made broadly available worldwide on it. This may necessitate utilizing a contract webmaster and, in the future, perhaps a part-time staff webmaster. Additionally, PICES staff, when augmented with a full-time editor, can take several steps to emphasize PICES identity and recognition of its publications. In the future, PICES may need to hire a second full-time staff member who would attend to website management as well as assisting with editorial duties.

Background

The North Pacific Marine Science Organization (PICES) was established in 1992 to promote international cooperative research efforts to solve key scientific problems in the North Pacific Ocean. In slightly over 10 years, PICES has become a recognized and major international science organization, and its publication activities have expanded significantly in recent years to advance and support its goals.

Accordingly, in 2002, the PICES Review Committee recommended an external review of current publication practices and needs of PICES. At the 2002 Annual Meeting, the Finance and Administration Committee supported this action and requested that the Executive Secretary secure the external review of these activities and examine both the financial and technological aspects of PICES's approach to publishing. The review was to examine:

- PICES Publications -- Annual Report, newsletter, Scientific Report Series, primary journal publications, meeting announcements/flyers, and abstract books;
- Costs, methods, and efficiencies of distributing these publications;
- The human, financial, and technological resources used to produce and distribute PICES publications;
- Efficiencies in each of these areas that could be achieved via new or altered technology;
- Plans (and costs) for the Executive Secretary on the implementation of such changes.

PICES Publications Review Team

At the request of PICES, a critical review of the Organization's publication program was conducted from September 16-19, 2003 by two officials with the U.S. Department of Commerce's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS): W. L. Hobart, Chief, NMFS Scientific Publications Office, and G. J. Duker, Director, Publications Program, NMFS Alaska Fisheries Science Center. The NMFS has been involved in the editing and publication of peer-reviewed marine science literature since its founding in 1871.

The review team has examined PICES' publications and publishing procedures developed in the first 10 years of service, and has identified strengths that can be reinforced and needs that must be addressed as PICES moves into its second decade of growth.

PICES Publications

PICES regularly publishes seven categories of general, scientific, and technical information in the following publications:

1) **PICES ANNUAL REPORT** – This document provides detailed reports of both the administrative and scientific components of the Organization. Reports from the Governing Council, Finance & Administration Committee, and planning reports from Scientific and Technical Committees, Scientific Programs, and Working Groups are included.

2) **PICES SCIENTIFIC REPORTS** – This information series includes PICES workshop proceedings, data reports, planning reports, etc. Issues are usually reviewed by convenors or committee members and have full-color graphics.

3) **SPECIAL ISSUES** – These publications (approximately four per year) are published cooperatively with peer-reviewed scientific journals. Individual manuscripts provide extensive detail and research findings.

4) **BOOKS** – These hard-bound volumes are peer-reviewed or journal quality publications that are produced for PICES by recognized professional publishing houses.

5) **PICES PRESS** – This semi-annual newsletter highlights current PICES research, describes the general activities of PICES, and lists new PICES publications. It is published in full color.

6) **COLLECTED MEETING ABSTRACTS** – This series provides abstracts of oral presentations and posters from meetings organized and sponsored by PICES. This information lacks extensive detail and may be preliminary or partial, but it is an unofficial record of information planned for the meetings.

7) **PICES ECOSYSTEM STATUS REPORTS** – These reports summarize the

current state or knowledge on different topics by North Pacific region and also receive peer reviews.

In slightly over 10 years the PICES Secretariat has published 27 Scientific Reports (25 of them in the PICES Scientific Report Series), coordinated and edited 10 Special Issues (5 in *Progress in Oceanography*, 2 in *Journal of Oceanography*, 1 in *Deep-Sea Research II*, 1 in *Marine Environmental Research* and 1 in the *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*; 3 more Special Issues are in progress and will be published in early 2004). PICES has also produced 2 books, published 11 Annual Reports, 16 volumes of collected abstracts (12 for Annual Meetings and 4 for large inter-sessional symposia), and 22 issues of the PICES Press newsletter. The current cost to PICES for printing these publications is about CD\$ 90,000 per year.

PICES Staffing

The entire staff of the PICES Secretariat includes four regular members: Executive Secretary, Deputy Executive Secretary, Deputy on Administration, and Administrative Assistant. In addition, an intern is on staff via the PICES Intern Program. Given such a small staff, the editorial production that they have been able to achieve, without a full-time editor, is phenomenal. Because the PICES Secretariat serves also as PICES editors, the increasing level of editorial production has taken over an inordinate amount of their time.

Complicating and aggravating this development is the problem that all science editors have authors for whom English is a second language. These manuscripts require 4-5 times more editorial attention and effort to prepare them for publication. And because PICES is an international organization, a large percentage of the manuscripts it publishes fall into this category. This growing editorial load, which cannot be avoided, has become a serious drain on the time of the PICES Secretariat that needs to be resolved.

PICES Publishing

PICES utilizes two methods for publishing its documents: direct publishing and co-publishing. In direct publishing, PICES has established contracts with local (British Columbia) printers to produce its Annual Reports, PICES Scientific Report series, newsletter (PICES Press), and abstract volumes.

Co-publishing has been developed by the PICES Secretariat to utilize the expertise of recognized book and/or journal publishers and reduce the unit cost of publishing its peer-reviewed science. This type of arrangement both increases the distribution of Special Issues and adds prestige to the journal publisher that works with PICES. Co-publishing, for PICES, has proven to be an effective way to off-load some editorial work (onto journal and book editors) and editorial production and distribution costs (onto journal publishers). To ensure publication within 12-16 months, the PICES Executive and Deputy Executive Secretary routinely serve as coordinating guest editors with these journals.

Review Observations

The reviewers were surprised to learn, given the large output of high-quality science publications, that PICES did not have a professional editorial staff, and that routine editorial work (including the extensive re-writing and revision of many manuscripts prepared by scientists for whom English is a second language) had to be performed by the PICES executives. They certainly deserve commendation for coping effectively with a difficult and growing editorial workload and for finding creative and successful ways to deal with those tasks. We firmly believe, however, that PICES is at an editorial crossroads, and that it must add more resources to handle the increasing editorial needs of the North Pacific community. The alternative, reduction in the output of important North Pacific science, would be a poor option.

The extent and variety of PICES publications and the volume of contributions published seem very well adapted to the mission and goals of the organization, to the scope of its activities, and to

PICES geographical range. The newsletter, PICES Press, is an effective tool for communication to PICES constituents. Likewise, the Scientific Reports, Annual Reports, and Annual Meeting Abstracts well serve PICES needs.

Co-publishing, the utilization of outside agencies (i.e., university or Sea Grant presses) and private publishers (peer-reviewed scientific journals) to publish and disseminate PICES science has been very creative and efficient and should be continued and expanded if possible. Using such outlets brings greater recognition and prestige to both the publisher and to PICES. Perhaps of equal importance is that it shifts large publishing costs to those outside organizations and thereby allows PICES to reach a broad audience at a much lower cost than if it had to do the publishing itself in separate publications.

The current use of guest editors and outside peer-reviewed journals is a most appropriate way to publish PICES science, and we were impressed with the extent to which the PICES Secretariat has successfully employed this technique. Likewise, the use of hard-cover books, published by private organizations, has been successfully used to make special topics readily available to the scientific community. The acceptance of these PICES initiatives by the private sector is a fine testament to the high level of PICES scientific communications and to the Organization itself.

We were further impressed with the judicious use of historical materials. Science is not conducted in a vacuum; rather, it is a continuous process whose foundations can be traced back in time through earlier publications. And the review of those early foundational works and initiatives often stimulates the creative thoughts that lead to further scientific advancements.

The proposed North Pacific Ecosystem Status Report is also an exceptionally ambitious project that will require a considerable investment in editorial work. The concept is an excellent one, and it is somewhat analogous to the "Our Living Oceans" (OLO) publications of the U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service. The OLO

began as a biological report (on the fisheries status) (<http://spo.nwr.noaa.gov/olo99.htm>), and it has been extended into an Economic Report and now (in press) a report on the Status of Marine Habitats. However, the PICES North Pacific Status Report covers a vastly broader realm and additional aspects that the OLO does not address, and it will provide a fine benchmark that can be used to chronicle and track North Pacific environmental issues.

Recommendations

PICES editorial needs and practices have obviously grown over time, and there are some important steps that can be taken now that will help update PICES editorial practices and allow it to cope effectively with future publishing needs.

PICES Staff and Management

It quickly became obvious in our review that the current professional staff of PICES is seriously overloaded with editorial duties required by the very large volume of materials (both informal and peer reviewed) that are generated by scientists for whom English is a second language at best. These contributions are extremely valuable, but they require an immense amount of time to put them into readable form while not changing the intent of the author.

This overloading of the PICES Secretariat seriously limits its participation in other activities, and PICES is long overdue to add at least one professional editor to coordinate and perform these and other important editorial duties. PICES has several options to obtain the needed editorial expertise.

1) The obvious step would be to hire a full-time professional editor with a strong background in the biological sciences. The cost would likely be in the salary range of US\$45,000-70,000, not including benefits (retirement, health program, etc.). Not only would such a staff person be able to strengthen PICES editorial work and products, but they would very likely be able to achieve significant cost savings in publications production.

- 2) Alternatively, PICES could establish an official “PICES Editorial Board” of volunteer scientists/editors and charge them with editing manuscripts and providing them in publishable form (a stipend might be provided for such work). However, we do not view this as a good option because few scientists have the time to spend on such “extra” work unless their agency grants them the time to perform such duties. In most cases, scientists are heavily taxed already in preparing their own manuscripts.
- 3) PICES could seek out local (Victoria or Vancouver, B.C.) university students to perform editorial duties at low or no cost as part of their university studies. Our experience with such an option, however, is that this is only a short-term “answer” to a large editorial workload, and it also does not give an organization the needed editorial continuity.
- 4) PICES could hire professional contract editors to perform the needed editorial duties. This has been done by the CalCOFI organization, but they only have one publication per year, generally, whereas PICES has many. It is also likely that there would be little cost savings with this option, but it could greatly ease the editorial demands now placed on the PICES Secretariat.
- 5) PICES could also establish a contract with a company that provides professional editorial work for a fee. Again, there would be little cost savings and insufficient editorial continuity (the company would likely assign different editors to different editorial projects). Our experience with this option is that it can be used to process a one-time editorial overload (or backlog), but that it is not the best long-term solution.

Finally, our experiences over the years with each of these alternatives to solve editorial needs that have grown over the years leaves no doubt that the most appropriate option to handle PICES’ extremely high editorial workload is to hire a full-time editor for the PICES staff. This would give the further benefit of allowing PICES to plan for future publications, handle its now-large publishing enterprise, bring consistency to its

editorial products, and achieve appropriate recognition for PICES publications and programs.

Additionally, a publications professional on the PICES staff could redesign some of the PICES publications and find ways to reduce the use of 4-color printing, both of which together could reduce the costs of some PICES publications as much as 50-70%. Further, such an individual could explore the use of 3- to 5-year renewable printing contracts. Seeking such bids on printing contracts would also help reduce PICES printing costs. Managing such printing procurement processes is a laborious one that PICES current staff does not have time to conduct.

Publication Standards

PICES does not have a “Style Manual” for use internally (in manuscript editing) and externally (for authors to follow). All editorial offices have such a manual or follow one of the standard ones. Standard style guides and other important reference materials are listed in Appendix 1, and PICES can augment them by adapting its own style guide to serve its needs. Use of a manual will also help authors prepare their manuscripts in a format that will require less editorial work. Examples of specialized style manuals are available from many sources (e.g, Alaska Fisheries Science Center and the Council for Biological Editors) and these can be customized to meet the PICES needs. We therefore recommended that the PICES Secretariat develop an online style manual for its authors, editors, and contributors, and this would be a first task for a new editor.

Another practice that saves time is editing in manuscript form (double-spaced, page width text). Once edited, the manuscripts should then be put into page format. It is far more difficult and time consuming to try to edit text when it is already set into a publication’s format.

Publication Identity and Recognition

Agency recognition is an important issue in scientific publishing. Many PICES publications,

from Scientific Reports to the hardbound books and journal articles, lack sufficient PICES identity. While there is nothing wrong with this, “per se”, it does not accord PICES full credit for the work it has generated or supported. In some cases, PICES-generated articles have a “contribution number” for a different organization which gives most credit to the other organization, and readers do not know of PICES’ involvement.

For PICES own publications, pertinent information, such as mission statement, a list of PICES publications, contact information, etc. should be featured consistently in a common place. Another recognition item to include would be a short statement of “How to cite this document”.

Examples of these identity signatures or statements used by other agencies are given in Appendix 2.

In many of the peer-reviewed Special Issues co-published by PICES and private journals, authors have not always acknowledged PICES, and this should be done. It can be as simple as a footnote or as an acknowledgment paragraph, and PICES should recommend inclusion of such recognition by authors of publications that it funds or sponsors.

The visibility and prestige of PICES or any scientific organization is linked to how many times its name is published – this is especially true of the times where a Google “simple search” is a primary means of finding literature. Many agencies or societies ensure receiving proper credit by assigning a “contribution number” to each of their publications. We recommend that PICES explore an appropriate way to place a similar tag onto its related publications (i.e., “This paper is PICES Symposium Contribution Number X” or similar wording).

There are additional ways to achieve greater recognition of PICES goals and accomplishments. For example, a PICES Style Guide should also specify the consistent use of the PICES logo on all of its publications—

where, when, and how it is to be used—so readers will become familiar with its use and placement and will automatically recognize PICES publications. We also recommend that the Secretariat explore the possibility of having related marine science organizations put a link on their websites to the PICES website.

Publication Archiving

Because of the continuing growth and demand for PICES publications, online archiving (posting PICES publications on the PICES website) was identified as a key issue. The ability of the PICES Secretariat to produce Adobe pdf versions of all of its publications is supported by the reviewers. It is recommended that PICES work with their existing printers to produce pdf files of its publications for use on the PICES website. It is also recommended that PICES contract a commercial vendor (e.g., Ikon Office Solutions) to scan documents that do not currently exist in a pdf format.

The cost of this service varies (e.g., US\$100 minimum at US0.25 per page up to 2,000 pages) and is subject to a number of set-up charges – similar to a printer. Emphasis should be placed on providing a high quality, tagged, searchable pdf for Web use. The cost (>US\$15,000) of purchasing the appropriate hardware (e.g., Canon ImageRunner 5000) and software (e.g., ‘ecopy’) to do this function in-house is not supported at this time. Additional staffing would also be required to fully utilize and justify this type of system.

Additional Issues

The Worldwide Web now serves as the major avenue for international dissemination of information products (e.g., PICES publications). Unfortunately, the PICES website is currently out-of-date and the lack of timely information is undoubtedly frustrating for those seeking information. Our discussions indicated that a re-design is underway but it must be considered that any re-design will require considerable effort by the staff of the Secretariat to make the web site a valuable resource. A crucial step may be to “appoint” a webmaster and provide the

training needed for this position. The emphasis should be on selecting someone who is interested in web development and management and who already possesses some of the skills needed for the position. Based on the current workload of the PICES Secretariat, the more obvious step would be to hire (or contract) a part-time web developer (<US\$5,000 per year) to manage the PICES web site. This outsourcing would be similar to the current practice for the creation of the PICES Press.

The issue of PICES “content management” also needs to be addressed by the PICES Secretariat. The content of both the PICES Press and the Annual Reports may provide the foundation for providing up-to-date website content. An example of this type of system can be found on the Alaska Fisheries Science Center’s website (<http://www.afsc.noaa.gov>) where much of the web content is derived from the Center’s “Quarterly Report”.

During our review it became clear that the PICES Secretariat staff relies heavily on Microsoft WORD, a word processing program, for the lay-out (design) and production of its internally produced publications. While effective for long text-intensive documents, MS WORD has several shortcomings when compared to full-fledged desktop publishing (DTP) software programs. Fundamentally, MS WORD lacks the fine control over kerning or linespacing and graphic placement that is available in DTP programs. The time spent in work-around issues with MS WORD could be eliminated with the integration of a true DTP program into the PICES publications program. Examples of state-of-the-art DTP programs include Adobe FrameMaker or PageMaker (US\$500), Corel Ventura (US\$630), and QuarkXPress (US\$650). Adobe InDesign has added more long-document publishing capabilities, but those options are still new and it is still primarily considered a program for short documents.

Due to their complexity, these programs have a steep learning curve. However for book length publications (e.g., some PICES Scientific Reports, Abstract Books, or other complex,

structured documents), these DTP programs offer features to cope with repeating elements (e.g., headers and footers), table of content and index generation, page numbering, and integration of graphics and perhaps other elements including spreadsheet and database elements that are characteristic of PICES publications. An up-to-date DTP system would be needed by a new PICES editor, and this individual would already have the knowledge to integrate PICES editorial products into it.

Once a PICES editor is on staff, thought should be given to publishing the PICES Press quarterly, rather than twice a year. The additional issues would give the organization better and more timely communication with its constituents. This would not be an option without additional staff, however.

Summary

This review has identified several strengths in PICES editorial operations, particularly the use of co-publication with outside publishers and the achievement of a high rate of publication with a limited staff. However, PICES editorial workload now requires the addition of another full time staff position to manage its editorial program and to inaugurate a new and modern desktop publishing system. PICES' ongoing efforts to upgrade its website, and particularly to place its publications on its website will be beneficial and should be expedited as time and funding permit. The goal should be to eventually have all PICES publications available online. In addition, special efforts should be made to better identify appropriate publications as PICES Contributions so the organization gets full credit for its published science.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Editorial offices use a variety of reference books to ensure publication and editorial consistency. NMFS offices generally use the CBE Style Manual and the GPO Style Manual, along with other specialized publications. Below is a list of resources that are used for different aspects of scientific writing and editing.

Below is an itemized list of our recommendations for strengthening and augmenting PICES publication program:

- Hire a full-time professional editor to manage the PICES publication program.
- Establish or modify an existing editorial style manual for contributors and editors to follow.
- Update the PICES website.
- Have printers provide pdf files so new PICES publications can be placed on its website.
- As time and money allow, contracts to have earlier PICES publications scanned at high resolution, so all will eventually be posted and accessible on the PICES website.
- Utilize a contract or part-time webmaster to re-design and update the PICES website.
- Continue development of co-publishing and guest editor arrangements.
- Direct the new PICES editor to make publication design modifications to save printing costs.
- Employ up-to-date desktop publishing programs to save time and funds in publication editing and production.
- Direct the new PICES editor to explore use of long-term (3-5 years) printing contracts and put them out for competitive bids to achieve cost savings.
- Task the new PICES editor with developing a standard identification and recognition program for PICES publications and contributions.
- Explore the possibility of having other marine science organizations put links on their web pages to the PICES web page.

Recommended Reference Books

Writing

- Hunter, J. (editor). 1990. Writing for fishery journals. American Fisheries Society, 5410 Grosvenor Lane, Bethesda, MD. 102 p.
- Strunk, W., Jr., and E. B. White. 1979. The elements of style, 3rd edition. Macmillan Publishing Co., New York.
- Tichy, H. J. 1967. Effective writing: For engineers-managers-scientists. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.

Word Usage

- Bernstein, T. M. 1965. The careful writer: A modern guide to English usage. Atheneum, New York. 487 p. (A common sense approach to the English language. Unfortunately this book is out of print).
- Copperud, R. H. 1980. American usage and style: the consensus. Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, New York, NY.

Dictionaries

- Webster's third international dictionary, unabridged. 1964. Merriam-Webster, Inc., Springfield, MA.
- Webster's ninth new collegiate dictionary, desk top. 1983. Merriam-Webster, Inc., Springfield, MA. (This dictionary is revised periodically and is considered an update of the larger Webster's third international.)

Style Manual

- Council of Biological Editors (CBE) Style Manual Committee. 1995. CBE style manual: a guide for authors, editors, and publishers in the biological sciences, 6th edition. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK. 825 p. (In addition to serving as the standard style manual for many biological journals, this book includes useful information on writing scientific papers.).
- Government Printing Office style manual. 1984. Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Gov. Print. Office, Washington, DC.
- Sabin, W. A. 1992. The Gregg reference manual, 7th edition, 502 p.

Scientific Names

- Rice, D. W. 1998. Marine mammals of the world: Systematics and distribution. Soc. Mammal. Spec. Publ. 4, 231 p.
- Robins, C. R. (Chairman), R. M. Bailey, C. E. Bond, J. R. Booker, E. A. Lachner, R. N. Lea, and W. B. Scott. 1991. A list of common and scientific names of fishes from the United States and Canada. Am. Fish. Soc. Spec. Publ. 20, 183 p.
- Turgeon, D. D. (Chair), A. E. Bogan, E. V. Coan, W. K. Emerson, W. G. Lyons, W. L. Pratt, C. F. E. Roper, A. Scheltema, F. G. Thompson, and J. D. Williams. 1988. Common and scientific names of aquatic invertebrates from the United States and Canada: Mollusks. Am. Fish. Soc. Spec. Publ. 16, 277 p.
- Williams, A. B. (Chair), L. G. Abele, D. L. Felder, H. H. Hobbs, Jr., R. B. Manning, P. A. MacLaughlin, and I. Pérez Farfante. 1989. Common and scientific names of aquatic invertebrates from the United States and Canada: Decapod crustaceans. Am. Fish. Soc. Spec. Publ. 17, 77 p.

Appendix 2

Mock-ups of “identity” information that can be provided in PICES Scientific Reports.

Appendix 2A – Recommended example of how to provide a PICES mission statement and identify PICES publications on the back cover of PICES publications (e.g., Scientific Report Series).

Appendix 2B – Recommended example on how to provide contact information and a list of recent publications on the inside back cover of PICES publications.

Appendix 2C – Recommended example of how to provide contact and “how to cite” details on the inside of the front cover of a PICES Scientific Report.

Appendix 2A

PICES SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL PUBLICATIONS (Recommendation for PICES Scientific Reports back cover information)

The North Pacific Marine Science Organization (PICES) was established in 1992 to promote international cooperative research efforts to solve key scientific problems in the North Pacific Ocean.

PICES regularly publishes various types of general, scientific, and technical information in the following kinds of publications:

PICES ANNUAL REPORT – This document provides detailed reports of both the administrative and scientific components of the Organization. Reports from the Governing Council, Finance and Administration Committee and planning reports from Scientific and Technical Committees, Scientific Programs, and Working Groups are included.

PICES SCIENTIFIC REPORTS – This information series includes PICES workshop proceedings, data reports, planning reports, etc.

SPECIAL ISSUES – These are peer-reviewed publications (approximately four per year) published in conjunction with scientific journals. Individual manuscripts provide extensive detail and research findings.

BOOKS – These are peer-reviewed or journal quality publications.

PICES PRESS – This semi-annual newsletter highlights current PICES research, describes the general activities of PICES, and lists new PICES publications.

ANNUAL MEETING ABSTRACTS – This series provides abstracts of oral presentations and posters given at PICES Annual Meetings. This information lacks extensive detail and may be preliminary or partial.

PICES ECOSYSTEM STATUS REPORTS – These reports summarize research on different topics by North Pacific region.

Appendix 2B

RECENT PICES SCIENTIFIC REPORTS (Recommendation for inside back cover)

Copies of this and other PICES Scientific Reports are available from
PICES Secretariat
c/o Institute of Ocean Sciences
P.O. Box 6000,
Sidney, British Columbia
Canada. V8L 4B2
E-mail: secretariat@pices.int
On-line versions of most PICES Scientific Reports can also be found at
<http://www.pices.int/Library/scireps.asp>.

PICES SCI. Rep. – List all current reports (Provide names of editors, etc.).

1
2

23 Taylor, F.J.R., and V.L. Trainer (editors). 2002. Harmful algal blooms in the PICES region of the North Pacific. PICES Sci. Rep. 23, 152 p.

Appendix 2C

PICES SCIENTIFIC REPORTS (Recommendation for inside front cover)

Published since 1993, the PICES Scientific Report series includes workshop proceedings, data reports, planning reports, etc.

A limited number of copies are available from
PICES Secretariat
c/o Institute of Ocean Sciences
P.O. Box 6000,
Sidney, British Columbia,
Canada. V8L 4B2
E-mail: secretariat@pices.int
Online versions of most PICES Scientific Reports can also be found at
<http://www.pices.int/Library/scireps.asp>.

Publication in the PICES Scientific Report series does not preclude later publication in scientific journals in a revised form.

This document should be cited as follows:

Taylor, F.J.R., and V.L. Trainer (editors). 2002. Harmful algal blooms in the PICES region of the North Pacific. PICES Sci. Rep. 23, 152 p.

F&A Endnote 7**Budget for fiscal year 2004**

Category	Allotment
Personnel Services	352,000
Annual Meeting	20,000
Special Meetings	68,000
Travel	85,000
Printing	77,000
Communication	32,000
Equipment	10,000
Supplies	7,500
Contractual Services	24,000
Miscellaneous	3,500
Total	679,000

Source	Contribution
Contributions from six Contracting Parties	600,000
External funds for PICES projects with completion in 2004	67,500
Transfer of Working Capital Fund surplus	11,500
Total	679,000

2004 Annual Fee for each Party	100,000
---------------------------------------	----------------