

**COUNCIL OPERATING PROCEDURE**  
**Methodology and Data Review Process for Coastal Pelagic Species**

26

---

PURPOSE

To establish procedures for the review and Council approval of Coastal Pelagic Species (CPS) methodology and data reviews. These reviews are typically related to CPS stock assessments, although they may be applied to methods in other areas, e.g., economic analysis or ecosystem-based fishery management models. The procedure is intended to provide peer review of survey and analytical methods to ensure that research surveys, data collection, data analyses, and other scientific techniques in support of CPS stock assessments represent the best scientific information available. The procedure is also intended to provide technical peer review of other methodologies that could be considered under this structure.

OBJECTIVES AND DUTIES

For new methodologies that have not been approved by the Council, the proponents of such new methodologies will submit a brief proposal for inclusion in the appropriate briefing book for consideration by advisory bodies and the Council. The timing of the proposal submission is synchronized with the stock assessment schedule established by the Council (see schedule below). For existing methodologies that the CPSMT and Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) together agree should be reviewed, the proponents of any such methodology should be notified suitably in advance of the appropriate briefing book deadline in order to submit a brief description of the methodology. For either new or existing methodologies, the proposal should include:

- Title
- Name of proposers (including researchers who will participate at the methodology review and will be expected to conduct analyses during that review;
- A description of how the proposed methodology will improve assessment and/or management of the stock(s) in questions; and
- Outline of the field and/or analytical methods to be employed.

Proponents of methods to be reviewed should be prepared to present their proposal to the SSC, the CPSMT, and the full Council. Proponents should also include a description of the funding, logistics, or other factors that would indicate the likelihood of success of a proposed methodology. The proposed methodology should be field tested, and preferably there will be available data for one or more years. Untested or experimental methods are typically not appropriate for this type of review.

If the Council approves a methodology to be reviewed, the appropriate Staff Officer will work with the methodology proponents, the SSC, and the Southwest Fisheries Science Center (SWFSC) to schedule the review.

Methodology proponents are responsible for providing a draft report at least two weeks in advance of the panel review meeting, and a final report within three weeks following the panel review meeting. The final report will be included in the briefing book materials for the appropriate Council meeting. ~~The responsibilities of the methodology proponents and other review participants are further described in the~~ corresponding Terms of Reference (TOR) includes detailed descriptions of the responsibilities of methodology proponents and other participants, the mechanism for identifying review panel members, the format and contents for the panel’s report, requirements for making meeting materials available, and other information germane to conducting the methodology review meeting.

The panel Chair and the appropriate Staff Officer may utilize the existing TOR, or may develop a TOR specific to the methodology to be reviewed, to provide additional guidance for conducting the panel meeting. The panel normally includes a Chair, at least one “external” member (i.e., someone outside the Council family and not involved in management or assessment of West Coast fisheries, often designated by the Center for Independent Experts), and at least two additional members. In addition, the Chair of the Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team (CPSMT) and the Chair of the Coastal Pelagic Species Advisory Subpanel (CPSAS) may each appoint one member of ~~each~~ their respective advisory body to be official representatives to the review panel meeting. Although they are not considered members of the review panel, they are expected to contribute to the discussion, serve as subject area experts, and may submit a brief statement for inclusion in the MRP’s report, at the discretion of the Panel Chair. The review panel will develop and submit a report to the Council for consideration at the appropriate Council meeting. The report will include recommendations about whether the methodology should be used, and guidance on any additional work necessary before the methodology should be used.

**Schedule**

<b>Month</b>	<b>Activity</b>
November Council meeting	Proponents submit brief proposal for Council consideration. If approved for review, Council staff schedules methodology review panel (MRP) meeting, independent reviewers, and logistics.
March-May	MRP convenes to review the methodology. Documents should receive internal entity review before being sent to the Council. To provide adequate review time for the reviewers, materials must be received in the Council office at least two weeks before scheduled review meetings.
June Council meeting	Council considers MRP report; considers approving the methodology.
September Council meeting	If necessary, the Council considers any unresolved methodology issues.