
TERMS OF REFERENCE

FOR THE

GROUND FISH AND COASTAL PELAGIC
SPECIES STOCK ASSESSMENT AND
REVIEW PROCESS FOR ~~2013~~2015-
20142016



DRAFT

~~NOVEMBER~~MAY, ~~2012~~2014



Published by the Pacific Fishery Management Council

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	4
2. STOCK ASSESSMENT PRIORITIZATION	6
3. STAR GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	6
4. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF STAR PARTICIPANTS	7
4.1. SHARED RESPONSIBILITIES	7
4.2. STAR PANEL RESPONSIBILITIES	8
4.3. STOCK ASSESSMENT TEAM RESPONSIBILITIES	13
4.4. NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE RESPONSIBILITIES	15
4.5. COUNCIL STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES	16
4.6. MANAGEMENT TEAM RESPONSIBILITIES	16
4.7. ADVISORY PANEL RESPONSIBILITIES	17
4.8. SCIENTIFIC AND STATISTICAL COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES	17
5. DATA-MODERATE ASSESSMENTS	17
6. UPDATE ASSESSMENTS	18
7. CATCH REPORTS	20
APPENDIX A: 2013 GROUND FISH AND CPS STOCK ASSESSMENT REVIEW CALENDAR	22
APPENDIX B: OUTLINE FOR STOCK ASSESSMENT DOCUMENTS	23
APPENDIX C: TEMPLATE FOR AN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	28
APPENDIX D: TEMPLATE FOR A DATA-MODERATE ASSESSMENT	29
APPENDIX E: DEFINITIONS OF SPECIES CATEGORIES FOR GROUND FISH ASSESSMENTS	30

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this document is to outline the guidelines and procedures for the Pacific Fishery Management Council's (Council) groundfish and coastal pelagic species (CPS) stock assessment review (STAR) process and to clarify expectations and responsibilities of the various participants. This document applies to assessments of species managed under the Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan and Management Plan for the CPS. The STAR process has been designed to provide for peer review as referenced in the 2006 Reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (RMSA), which states that "the Secretary and each Regional Fishery Management Council may establish a peer review process for that Regional Fishery Management Council for scientific information used to advise the Regional Fishery Management Council about the conservation and management of the fishery (see Magnuson-Stevens Act section 302(g)(1)(E))." [-National Standard 2 \(NS2\) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act \(MSA\) \(published July 19, 2013\) provides guidance and standards to be followed when establishing a peer review process pursuant to MSA section 302\(g\)\(1\)\(E\) including guidance on the timing, scope of work, peer reviewer selection and transparency. The STAR process follows these standards and is fully compliant with NS2.](#)

The ~~STAR's peer review~~ process is designed to investigate the technical merits of stock assessments and other scientific information used by the Council's Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC). The process outlined here is not a substitute for the SSC, but should work in conjunction with the SSC. This document is included in the Council's Statement of Organization, Practices and Procedures as documentation of the review process that underpins scientific advice from the SSC.

The review of stock assessments requires a routine, dedicated effort that simultaneously meets the needs of NMFS, the Council, and others. Program reviews, in-depth external reviews, and peer-reviewed scientific publications are used by federal and state agencies to provide quality assurance for the basic scientific methods employed to produce stock assessments. The extended time frame required for such reviews is not suited to the routine examination of assessments that are, generally, the primary basis for harvest recommendations. The SSC has developed a separate terms of reference for reviewing new methods that might be used in stock assessments, including methods and tools to incorporate ecosystem processes.

The STAR process is a key element in an overall procedure designed to review the technical merits of stock assessments and other relevant scientific information. This process allows the Council to make timely use of new fishery and survey data, analyze and understand these data as thoroughly as possible, provide opportunity for public comment, assure that the results are as accurate and error-free as possible, and identify the best available science for management decisions. Parties involved in implementing the STAR process are Council members, Council staff, members of Council Advisory Bodies, including the SSC, the Groundfish and CPS Management Teams (GMT and CPSMT), the Groundfish Advisory SubPanel (GAP) and CPS Advisory Subpanel (CPSAS), the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), state agencies, and interested persons.

This current version of the STAR terms of reference (TOR) reflects recommendations from previous participants in the STAR process, including STAR panel members, SSC members, stock assessment teams (STATs), Council staff, and Council advisory groups. Nevertheless, no

set of guidelines can be expected to deal with every contingency, and all participants should anticipate the need to be flexible and address new issues as they arise.

Stock assessments are conducted to assess the abundance and trends of fish stocks, and provide the fundamental basis for management decisions regarding appropriate harvest levels. Assessments use statistical population models to integrate and simultaneously analyze survey, fishery, and biological data. Environmental and ecosystem data may also be integrated in stock assessments. Hilborn and Walters (1992)¹ define stock assessments as “the use of various statistical and mathematical calculations to make quantitative predictions about the reactions of fish populations to alternative management choices.” In this document, the term “stock assessment” includes activities, analyses and reports, beginning with data collection and continuing through to scientific recommendations presented to the Council and its advisors. To best serve their purpose, stock assessments should attempt to identify and quantify major uncertainties, balance realism and parsimony, and make best use of the available data.

There are four distinct types of assessments, which are subject to different review procedures. A “full assessment” is a new assessment or an assessment that may be substantially different from the previously conducted assessment. A full assessment involves a re-examination of the underlying assumptions, data, and model parameters previously used to assess the stock. Full assessments are reviewed via the full STAR process. There is a limit on the number of full assessments that can be conducted and reviewed during an assessment cycle. Some assessment models have relatively few modeling or data issues and provide relatively stable results as new data are added, such that it is not necessary to develop a completely new assessment every time the species is assessed. In these cases, an “update assessment” may be preferable. An “update assessment” is defined as an assessment that maintains the model structure of the previous full assessment and is generally restricted to the addition of new data to previously evaluated time series that have become available since the last assessment. Update assessments are reviewed by the relevant subcommittee of the SSC (Groundfish or CPS) rather than by a STAR panel. A “data-moderate assessment” is a third type of assessment that incorporates historical catch data and one or more indices of abundance (e.g., trawl survey or fishery CPUE indices). Data-moderate assessments are limited in that compositional data (i.e., length or age data) are restricted from the assessment to make such assessments less complicated and enable more expeditious review. Conceptually, data-moderate assessments are designed for groundfish stocks to be reviewed by the SSC Groundfish Subcommittee. However, in 2013, data-moderate assessments will be reviewed by a full STAR panel since these assessment methodologies will be used for the first time in the Council process. A “catch report” is a fourth type of assessment product that applies when only limited new information is available to inform the assessment. Catch reports are reviewed by the relevant subcommittee of the SSC (Groundfish or CPS).

The RMSA recently changed the terminology and process for determining harvest levels. The previous Allowable/Acceptable Biological Catch (ABC) has been replaced by the Overfishing Limit (OFL). However, the largest allowable harvest level is still the ABC (now “Acceptable Biological Catch”), which is buffered from the OFL based on the risk of overfishing adopted by the Council (which must be less than 50%). The P* (overfishing probability) approach uses a probability of overfishing (which the Council has set to be less than or equal to 45% or 0.45) and a measure of uncertainty in the assessment of current stock status (σ , the standard error of the

¹ Hilborn, R., and C. J. Walters. 1992. Quantitative fisheries stock assessment: Choice, dynamics and uncertainty. Chapman and Hall.

biomass estimate in log space) to determine the appropriate buffer with which to reduce the harvest level from the OFL to the ABC (Ralston et al. 2011²). The Annual Catch Limit (ACL) is equivalent to what the Council previously called the Optimum Yield (OY). For groundfish species, the upper limit for the ACL is calculated using the 40-10 harvest control rule (and 25-5 rule for flatfish species) while for CPS, each species has a specific control rule to calculate the Harvest Guideline (HG), which is the upper limit for the ACL for CPS. The Annual Catch Target (ACT) is the targeted catch level, representing a further reduction from the ACL to account for management/implementation uncertainty. The OFL must be given in the stock assessment (along with, in some cases, σ). The ABC is determined from the OFL given σ and P^* . For CPS, the assessment reports the application of the HG control rule. The OFL, ABC, ACL, any ACTs, and (for CPS) the HGs are reported in the Council's Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation (SAFE) report or the relevant National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis of alternative harvest specifications.

2. STOCK ASSESSMENT PRIORITIZATION

Stock assessments for Pacific sardine and Pacific mackerel are conducted annually, with full assessments occurring every third year, and update assessments during interim years. Assessments for groundfish species are conducted every other year as part of the biennial harvest specification cycle. A relatively small number of the more than 90 species in Council's Groundfish Fishery Management Plan are selected each cycle for full or update assessments. To implement the RMSA requirements to establish ABCs and OFLs for all species in fishery management plans, simple assessment methods such as Depletion-Corrected Average Catch (DCAC)³ and Depletion-Based Stock Reduction Analysis (DB-SRA)⁴ have now been applied to the majority of groundfish species. It is the goal of the Council to substantially increase the number of groundfish stocks with full assessments.

In April 2006, the SSC recommended, and the Council adopted, a new approach to prioritize groundfish species for full and update stock assessments based on: 1) economic or social importance of the species, 2) vulnerability and resilience of the species, 3) time elapsed since the last assessment (NMFS advises assessments to be updated at least every five years), 4) amount of data available for the assessment, 5) potential risk to the stock from the current or foreseeable management regime, and 6) qualitative trends from surveys (when available). It was also recommended that overfished groundfish stocks that are under rebuilding plans be evaluated each assessment cycle to ensure adequate progress towards achieving stock recovery.

The proposed stocks for full, update, and data-moderate assessments should be discussed and finalized by the Council at least a year in advance of a new assessment cycle to allow sufficient time to assemble relevant data and arrange STAR panels. The 2015³ stock assessment plan for groundfish and CPS stocks is provided in Appendix A.

3. STAR GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The goals and objectives of the groundfish and CPS STAR process are to:

² Ralston, S., Punt, A.E., Hamel, O.S., DeVore, J. and R.J. Conser. 2011. An approach to quantifying scientific uncertainty in stock assessment. *Fishery Bulletin* 109: 217-231.

³ MacCall, A. D. 2009. Depletion-corrected average catch: a simple formula for estimating sustainable yields in data-poor situations. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 66: 2267-2271.

⁴ Dick, E. J. and A. D. MacCall. 2011. Depletion-Based Stock Reduction Analysis: A catch-based method for determining sustainable yields for data-poor stocks. *Fisheries Research* 110: 331-341.

- 1) ensure that stock assessments represent the best [scientific information](#) available ~~scientific information~~ and facilitate the use of this information by the Council to adopt OFLs, ABCs, ACLs, (HG)s, and ACTs;
- 2) meet the mandates of the Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation and Management Act (MSA) and other legal requirements;
- 3) follow a detailed calendar and fulfill explicit responsibilities for all participants to produce required reports and outcomes;
- 4) provide an independent external review of stock assessments;
- 5) increase understanding and acceptance of stock assessments and peer reviews by all members of the Council family;
- 6) identify research needed to improve assessments, reviews, and fishery management in the future; and
- 7) use assessment and review resources effectively and efficiently.

4. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF STAR PARTICIPANTS

4.1. Shared Responsibilities

All parties have a stake in assuring adequate technical review of stock assessments. NMFS, as the designee of the Secretary of Commerce, must determine that the best scientific advice has been used when it approves fishery management recommendations made by the Council. The Council uses advice from the SSC to determine that the information on which it bases its recommendations represents the best available science. Scientists and fishery managers providing technical documents to the Council for use in management need to assure that their work is technically correct.

The Council, NMFS and the Secretary of Commerce share primary responsibility to create and foster a successful STAR process. The Council oversees the process and involves its standing advisory bodies, especially the SSC. For groundfish, NMFS provides a stock assessment coordinator (SAC) to facilitate and assist in overseeing the process, while for CPS a designated SWFSC staff member performs this role. Together NMFS and the Council consult with all interested parties to plan and prepare TOR, and develop a calendar of events with a list of deliverables for final approval by the Council. NMFS and the Council share fiscal and logistical responsibilities and both should ensure that there are no conflicts of interest in the process⁵.

The STAR process is sponsored by the Council, because the Federal Advisory Committee Act

⁵ ~~The proposed final NS2 guidelines state: "Peer reviewers who are federal employees must comply with all applicable federal ethics requirements. Peer reviewers who are not federal employees must comply with the following provisions. Peer reviewers must not have any real or perceived conflicts of interest with the scientific information, subject matter, or work product under review, or any aspect of the statement of work for the peer review. For purposes of this section, a "[A] conflict of interest is any financial or other interest which conflicts with the service of the individual on a review panel because it: (A) Could significantly impair the reviewer's objectivity; or (B) Could create an unfair competitive advantage for a person or organization; (C) Except for those situations in which a conflict of interest is unavoidable, and the conflict is promptly and publicly disclosed, no individual can be appointed to a review panel if that individual has a conflict of interest that is relevant to the functions to be performed. Conflicts of interest include, but are not limited to, the personal financial interests and investments, employer affiliations, and consulting arrangements, grants, or contracts of the individual and of others with whom the individual has substantial common financial interests, if these interests are relevant to the functions to be performed". Potential reviewers must be screened for conflicts of interest in accordance with the procedures set forth in the NOAA Policy on Conflicts of Interest for Peer Review subject to OMB's Peer Review Bulletin."~~

(FACA) limits the ability of NMFS to establish advisory committees. FACA specifies a procedure for convening advisory committees that provide consensus recommendations to the federal government. The intent of FACA was three-fold: to limit the number of advisory committees; to ensure that advisory committees fairly represent affected parties; and to ensure that advisory committee meetings, discussions, and reports are carried out and prepared in full public view. Under FACA, advisory committees must be chartered by the Department of Commerce through a rather cumbersome process. However, the Sustainable Fisheries Act exempts the Council from FACA per se, but requires public notice and open meetings similar to those under FACA.

4.2. STAR Panel Responsibilities

The role of the STAR panel is to conduct a detailed technical evaluation of a full stock assessment to advance the best available scientific information to the Council. The specific responsibilities of the STAR panel are to:

- 1) review draft stock assessment documents, data inputs, and analytical models along with other pertinent information (e.g., previous assessments and STAR panel reports, when available);
- 2) discuss the technical merits and deficiencies of the input data and analytical methods during the open review panel meeting, work with the STATs to correct deficiencies, and, when possible, suggest new tools or analyses to improve future assessments; and
- 3) develop STAR panel reports for all reviewed species to document meeting discussion and recommendations.

The STAR panel chair has, in addition, the responsibility to: 1) develop a STAR panel meeting agenda; 2) ensure that STAR panel participants follow the TOR; 3) guide the STAR panel and the STAT to mutually agreeable solutions; and 4) coordinate review of revised stock assessment documents before they are forwarded to the SSC.

Groundfish and CPS STAR panels include a chair appointed from the relevant SSC subcommittee (Groundfish or CPS), and three other experienced stock assessment analysts knowledgeable of the specific modeling approaches being reviewed. Of these three other members, at least one should be appointed from the Center for Independent Experts (CIE) and at least one should be familiar with west coast stock assessment practices. Selection of STAR panelists should be based on expertise, independence ~~aim for a~~ balance between outside expertise and in-depth knowledge of west coast fisheries, data sets available for those fisheries, and modeling approaches applied to west coast groundfish and CPS, and be free of conflicts of interest. Expertise in ecosystem models or processes, and knowledge of the role of groundfish and CPS in the ecosystem is also desirable, particularly if the assessment includes ecosystem models or environmental processes. For groundfish, an attempt should be made to identify one reviewer who can consistently attend all STAR panel meetings in an assessment cycle. The pool of qualified technical reviewers is limited; therefore, staffing of STAR panels is subject to constraints that can make it difficult to meet the conditions above.

Selected Rreviewers should not have financial or personal conflicts of interest with the scientific information, subject matter, or work product under review, either current to the meeting, within the previous year (at minimum), or anticipated. –STAR panel reviewers who are federal employees should comply with all applicable federal ethics requirements. Reviewers who are

not federal employees will be screened for conflicts of interest either through existing financial disclosure processes used by the SSC and CIE, or under the NOAA Policy on Conflicts of Interest for Peer Review Subjects.

Reviewers should not have contributed or participated in the development of the work product or scientific information under review and reviewer responsibilities should rotate across the available pool of qualified reviewers, when possible.

STAR panel meetings should also include representatives of the relevant management team (MT) and advisory panel (AP), with responsibilities as laid out in these TOR, and a Council staff member to help advise the STAR panel and assist in recording meeting discussions and results. The STAR panel, STATs, the MT and AP representatives, and the public are all legitimate meeting participants who should be accommodated in discussions. It is the STAR panel chair's responsibility to coordinate discussion and public comment so that the assessment review is completed on time.

The STAR process is by design a transparent process. STAR panel meetings are open to the public and are announced on the Council's website, through Council meeting notices and in the Federal Register at least 14 days prior to the panel meeting. The Council posts background materials on its ftp site prior to the panel meeting and makes hard copies available upon request. A STAR panel normally meets for one week. The number of assessments reviewed per panel should not exceed two, except in extraordinary circumstances if the SSC and NMFS agree that it is advisable, feasible, and/or necessary. When separate assessments are conducted at the sub-stock level (i.e., black rockfish), each assessment is considered an independent full assessment for review purposes. Contested assessments, in which alternative assessments are brought forward by competing STATs using different modeling approaches, would typically require additional time (and/or panel members) to review adequately, and should be scheduled accordingly. While contested assessments are likely to be rare, they can be accommodated within the STAR process. The STAR panel should thoroughly evaluate each analytical approach, comment on the relative merits of each, and, when conflicting results are obtained, identify the reasons for the differences. The STAR panel is also charged with selecting a preferred base model.

STAR Panel Requests for Additional Analyses

STAR panel meetings are not workshops. In the course of a meeting, the panel may ask the STAT for a reasonable number of sensitivity runs, request additional details on the proposed base model presented, or ask for further analyses of alternative runs. It is not unusual for the review to result in a change to the initial base model (given that both the STAR panel and the STAT agree). However, the STAR panel is not authorized to conduct an alternative assessment representing its own views that are distinct from those of the STAT, nor can it impose an alternative assessment on the STAT. Similarly, the panel should not impose their preferred methodologies when this is a matter of professional opinion. Rather, if the panel finds an assessment to be inadequate, it should document its opinion and suggest potential remedial measures for the STAT to take to rectify perceived shortcomings of the assessment. For groundfish species, the SSC reviews the STAR panel report and recommends whether an assessment should be further reviewed at the so-called "mop-up" panel meeting, a meeting of the SSC's Groundfish subcommittee that occurs after all of the STAR panels, primarily to review rebuilding analyses for overfished stocks. If a recommendation on whether to send the

assessment to the mop-up panel meeting is needed before the full SSC is able to review the STAR panel report, the SSC Chair, Vice Chair, and Groundfish Subcommittee Chair will make a preliminary decision. This recommendation is subject to confirmation by the full SSC at its next scheduled meeting. For CPS, if an assessment is found not to be acceptable for use in management, a full assessment would be conducted the following year.

The STAR panels are expected to be judicious in their requests of the STATs. Large changes in data (such as wholesale removal of large data sets) or in analytical methods often result in such great changes to the assessment that they cannot be adequately reviewed during the course of the STAR panel meeting. Therefore, caution should be exercised in making such changes, and in many cases such changes should be relegated to future research recommendations and/or methodology review. If a groundfish STAR panel agrees that significant changes are necessary, and the assessment is not otherwise acceptable, a recommendation for further review at the mop-up panel is warranted. Similarly, if the STAR panel agrees that the assessment results strongly indicate that current F_{MSY} value or management target and threshold are inappropriate, it should identify this in its report and recommend further analysis to support a change to more appropriate values.

STAR panel requests to the STAT for additional model runs or data analyses must be clear, explicit, and in writing. They should reflect the consensus opinion of the entire panel and not the minority view of a single individual or individuals. The STAR panel requests and recommendations should be listed within the STAR panel's report along with rationale and the STAT response to each request.

To the extent possible, analyses requested by the STAR panel should be completed by the STAT during the STAR panel meeting. It is the obligation of the STAR panel chair, in consultation with other panel members, to prioritize requests for additional analyses. In situations where a STAT arrives with a well-constructed, thoroughly investigated assessment, it may be that the panel finishes its review earlier than scheduled (i.e., early dismissal of a STAT). If follow-up work by the STAT is required after the review meeting (such as MCMC integration of an alternative model created during the STAR panel meeting), this should be completed before the briefing book deadline for the Council meeting at which the assessment is scheduled for review. It is the STAR panel chair's responsibility to track STAT progress. In particular, the chair is responsible for communicating with the STAT to determine if the revised stock assessment document is complete. Any post-STAR drafts of the stock assessment must be reviewed by the STAR panel chair. The assessment document can only be given to Council staff for distribution after it has been endorsed by the STAR panel chair, and when it is accompanied by a complete and approved STAR panel report. Likewise, the final draft that is published in the Council's SAFE document must also be approved by the STAR panel chair prior to being accepted by Council staff.

For some stocks selected for full assessments, the available data may prove to be insufficient to support a category 1 assessment. In such cases, the STAT should consider whether simpler approaches appropriate for a category 2 assessment can be applied. Simpler approaches usually make stronger assumptions and estimate fewer parameters, but are less demanding of data. It is the responsibility of the STAR panel, in consultation with the STAT, to consider the strength of inferences that can be drawn from analyses presented, and identify major uncertainties. If useful results have been produced, the STAR panel should review the appropriateness and reliability of the methods used to draw conclusions about stock status and/or exploitation rates, and either

recommend or reject the analysis on the basis of its ability to provide useful information into the management process. If the STAR panel agrees that important results have been generated, it should forward its findings and conclusions to the SSC and the Council for consideration in setting of OFLs, ABCs, and ACLs (for groundfish) and HGs (for CPS). A key section of the assessment is that on research needed to improve the assessment. Highlighting research priorities should increase the likelihood that future stocks assessments can be raised to category 1.

Uncertainty and Decision Tables in Groundfish Stock Assessments

The STAR panel review focuses on technical aspects of the stock assessment. It is recognized that no model or data set is perfect or issue free. Therefore, outputs of a broad range of model runs should be evaluated to better define the scope of the accepted model results. The panel should strive for a risk-neutral perspective in its deliberations, and discuss the degree to which the accepted base model describes and quantifies the major sources of uncertainty in the assessment. Confidence intervals for model outputs, as well as other measures of uncertainty that could affect management decisions, should be provided in completed stock assessments and the reports prepared by STAR panels. The STAR panel may also provide qualitative comments on the probability of results from various model runs, especially if the panel does not consider the probability distributions calculated by the STAT capture all major sources of uncertainty. However, as a scientific peer review body, the STAR panel should avoid matters of policy. Assessment results from model runs that are technically flawed or questionable on other grounds should be identified by the panel and excluded from the alternatives upon which management advice is to be developed.

During the review meeting, the STAR panel and the STAT should strive to reach a consensus on a single base model. Once a base model is agreed upon, it is essential that uncertainty around the base model be captured and communicated to managers. One way to accomplish this objective is to bracket the base model with what is agreed to be the major axis of uncertainty (e.g., spawner-recruit steepness, the virgin level of recruitment, the natural mortality rate, survey catchability, etc.; and, less often, recent year-class strength, weights on conflicting CPUE series, etc.). Alternative models should show contrast in their management implications, which, in practical terms, means that they should result in different estimates of current stock size and status, and the OFL. Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) integration, where possible, is an acceptable method for reporting uncertainty about the base model. However, point estimates from the Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE) method should be used for status determinations even when MCMC outputs are available.

Once alternative models, which capture the overall degree of uncertainty in the assessment, are formulated, a 2-way decision table (alternative models versus management actions) should be developed to illustrate the repercussions of uncertainty to managers. The ratio of probabilities of alternative models should be 25:50:25, with the base model being twice as likely as the low and high stock size alternatives. Potential methods for assigning probabilities to alternative models include using the statistical variance of the model estimates of stock size, posterior Monte Carlo simulation, or expert judgment, but other approaches are acceptable as long as they are fully documented. An ideal bracketing of the base model is one for which the geometric mean of the high and low stock size alternative model final biomass levels approximates the base model biomass level. This is because the distribution of possible stock sizes is necessarily bounded at the low end, while the right tail can extend much further from the point estimate, and thus the

probability density should look more log-normal than normal. If the bracketing models are far from this ideal (e.g., if the base model is closer to the upper bracketing model in absolute terms than to the lower bracketing model), the three levels should be reconsidered and either one or more of them adjusted (such that, in certain cases, if there is a great deal of confidence in the bracketing models, the base model could be reconsidered), or a justification for the severely non-lognormal structure of alternatives be given. Similarly, if more than one dimension is used to characterize uncertainty, resulting in, for example, a 3-by-3 decision table, careful consideration of how the complete table brackets the uncertainty should be undertaken.

Areas of Disagreement

STATs and STAR panels are required to make an honest attempt to resolve any areas of disagreement during the meeting. Occasionally, fundamental differences of opinions may remain between the STAR panel and STAT that cannot be resolved during the STAR panel meeting. In such cases, the STAR panel must document the areas of disagreement in its report. While identifying areas of disagreement, the following questions should be discussed at the meeting:

- 1) Are there any differences in opinion about the use or exclusion of data?
- 2) Are there any differences in opinion about the choice of the base model?
- 3) Are there any differences in opinion about the characterization of uncertainty?

The STAT may choose to submit a supplemental report supporting its view, but in that case, an opportunity must be given to the STAR panel to prepare a rebuttal. These documents would then be appended to the STAR panel report as part of the record of the review meeting. In some cases STAR panel members may have fundamental disagreements among themselves that cannot be resolved during the review meeting. In such cases, STAR panel members may prepare a minority report that would also become part of the record of the review meeting. The SSC would then review all information pertaining to STAR panel and STAR panel/STAT disputes, and issue its recommendation.

STAR Panel Report

The STAR panel report should be developed and approved by the full panel shortly after the STAR panel meeting. The STAR panel chair appoints members of the panel to act as rapporteurs and draft the report (or specific sections thereof) according to the STAR panel chair guidance on format and level of detail. The STAR panel chair is responsible for preparing the final draft of the panel report, obtaining panel approval, providing a copy for STAT review and comment, and submitting it to the Council in a timely fashion (i.e., by briefing book deadline).

The STAR panel report should include:

- Summary of the STAR Panel meeting:
 - Names and affiliations of STAR panel members, STAT and STAR panel advisors;
 - Brief overview of the meeting (where the meeting took place, what species was assessed, what was the STAR panel recommendation, etc.);
 - Brief summary of the assessment model and the data used;
 - List of analyses requested by the STAR panel, the rationale for each request, and a brief summary of the STAT response to the request;

- Description of the base model and, for groundfish species, the alternative models used to bracket uncertainty;
- Comments on the technical merits and/or deficiencies in the assessment and recommendations for remedies;
- Areas of disagreement regarding STAR panel recommendations:
 - Between the STAR panel and STAT(s).
 - Among STAR panel members (including concerns raised by MT and AP representatives);
- Unresolved problems and major uncertainties, e.g., any special issues that complicate the assessment and/or interpretation of results;
- Management, data, or fishery issues raised by the MT or AP representatives during the STAR panel; and
- Prioritized recommendations for future research and data collection, including methodology and ecosystem considerations for the subsequent assessment.

For groundfish species, the STAR panel also makes a recommendation on whether the next assessment of the same species should be full or update, and explain reasons for its recommendation.

The STAR panel report should be made available for review by the STAT with adequate time prior to the briefing book deadline (i.e., a week in most circumstances, but at minimum a full 24 hours, in cases when the time between the STAR panel and the deadline is particularly compressed) so that the STAT can comment on issues of fact or differences in interpretation. If differences of opinion come up during review of the STAR panel report, the STAR panel and STAT should attempt to resolve them. Otherwise, the areas of disagreement must be documented in the STAR panel report.

The chair will also solicit comment on the draft report from the MT and AP representatives. The purpose of this is limited to ensuring that the report is technically accurate and reflects the discussion that occurred at meeting, and should not be viewed as an opportunity to reopen debate on issues. The STAR panel chair is the final arbiter on wording changes suggested by STAT and the MT and AP representatives as the report is the panel's report of the meeting. Any detailed commentary by MT and AP representatives should be drafted separately, reviewed by the full advisory body, and included in the briefing book.

The STAR panel chair is responsible for providing the Council staff with the final version of the STAR panel report. The STAR panel chair is also expected to attend the SSC meeting and, if requested, MT meetings and the relevant portions of the Council meetings, where stock assessments and harvest projections are discussed, explain the reviews, and provide technical information and advice. [The final STAR panel reports](http://www.pcouncil.org/groundfish/stock-assessments/) ~~is~~ [are posted on the Council's website at](http://www.pcouncil.org/groundfish/stock-assessments/) <http://www.pcouncil.org/groundfish/stock-assessments/> and <http://www.pcouncil.org/coastal-pelagic-species/stock-assessment-and-fishery-evaluation-safe-documents/>. [COMMENT: The CPS STAR panel reports are not posted here as of now; they are posted in the respective briefing books. Can they be posted here for parity and to make them easy to find?]

4.3. Stock Assessment Team Responsibilities

The STAT is responsible for conducting a complete and technically sound stock assessment that conforms to accepted standards of quality, and in accordance with these TOR. The STAT is

responsible for preparing three versions of the stock assessment document:

- 1) a “draft” for discussion during the STAR panel meeting;
- 2) a “revised draft” for presentation to the SSC, the Council, and relevant MT and AP;
- 2) and
- 3) a “final version” to be published in the Council’s SAFE document or posted on the Council’s web site.

The draft assessment document should follow the outline in Appendix B with an executive summary as in the template in Appendix C. In the draft document, the STAT should identify a candidate base model, fully-developed and well-documented, for the STAR panel to review. For CPS, the STAT should submit a draft assessment document to the STAR panel chair and Council staff two weeks prior to the STAR panel meeting. For groundfish, a draft assessment document should be submitted by the STAT to the STAR panel chair, Council staff, and the NMFS Stock Assessment Coordinator (SAC) three full weeks prior to the STAR panel meeting, to determine whether the document is sufficiently complete to undergo review. If the draft assessment is judged complete, the draft assessment and supporting materials would be distributed to the STAR panel and relevant MT and AP representatives two weeks prior to the STAR panel meeting. If the assessment document does not meet minimum criteria of the TOR, the review would be postponed to a subsequent assessment cycle or to the mop-up panel. The mop-up panel generally is not able to review more than two assessments. Therefore, the review options are limited for assessments not completed on time. The STAT is also responsible for bringing model files and data (in digital format) to the STAR panel meeting so that they can be analyzed on site.

In most cases, the STAT should produce a revised draft of the assessment document within three weeks of the end of the STAR panel meeting. The revised draft must include a point-by-point response of the STAT to each of the STAR panel’s recommendations. The revised draft must be finalized before the briefing book deadline for the Council meeting at which the assessment is scheduled for review. Post-STAR drafts must be reviewed and approved by the STAR panel chair prior to being submitted to Council staff. This review is limited to editorial issues, verifying that all required elements are included, and confirming that the document reflects the discussion and decisions made during the STAR panel.

The final version of the assessment document is produced after the assessment has been reviewed by the SSC. Other than changes recommended by the SSC, only editorial and other minor alterations should be made to the revised draft for the final version. Electronic versions of the final assessment document, model files, and key output files should be submitted by the STATs to Council staff (for CPS) and to Council staff and the SAC (for groundfish) for inclusion in a stock assessment archive. Any tabular data that are inserted into the final documents in an object format should also be submitted in alternative forms (e.g., spreadsheets), which allow selection of individual data elements.

A STAT for which no base model was endorsed by a STAR panel should, in most cases, provide the pre-STAR draft assessment (or corrected/ updated version thereof, as agreed upon with the STAR panel) to the Council by the briefing book deadline. If the STAR panel, nonetheless, recommends using outputs of certain sensitivity runs to bracket uncertainty in the assessment, the results of those runs should be appended to the draft assessment and provided to the Council and its advisory bodies.

STATs are strongly encouraged to develop assessments in a collaborative environment by forming working groups, holding pre-assessment workshops, and consulting with other stock assessment and ecosystem assessment scientists. STAT meetings with Integrated Ecosystem Assessment (IEA) teams are strongly encouraged to evaluate alternative models and analyses that incorporate ecosystem considerations and cross-FMP interactions that may affect stock dynamics. When new data sources or methods, which could be used in many assessments or are likely contentious, are planned for inclusion in the assessment, they should ideally be reviewed by a methodology panel. STATs should identify whether such new data sources or methods will be proposed for inclusion in assessments as early as feasible so that it is possible to hold a methodology review panel if one is needed. Irrespective of whether a methodology review panel takes place, the STAR panel should be provided with model runs with and without the new data sources so that it can evaluate the sensitivity of model outputs to these data sources.

STATs should coordinate early in the process with state representatives and other data stewards to ensure timely availability of data. STATs are also encouraged to organize independent meetings with industry and interested parties to discuss data and issues. The STAT should initiate contact with the AP representative early in the assessment process, keep the AP informed of the data being used and respond to any concerns that are raised. The STAT should also contact the MT representative for information about changes in fishing regulations that may influence model structure and the way data are used in the assessment. The STAT should be well represented at the STAR panel meeting to ensure timely completion of the STAR panel requests. Barring exceptional circumstances, STAT members who are not attending the STAR panel meeting, should be available remotely to assist with responses when needed. Each STAT conducting a full assessment should appoint a representative to attend the Council meeting where the assessment is scheduled to be reviewed and give presentations of the assessment to the SSC and other Council advisory bodies. In addition, the STAT should be prepared to respond to MT requests for model projections for the MT's to develop ACL alternatives.

For stocks that are estimated to be below overfished thresholds (or those previously declared overfished and not yet rebuilt), the STAT must complete a rebuilding analysis according to the SSC's TOR for Rebuilding Analyses and prepare a document that summarizes the analysis results. For groundfish, it is recommended that this rebuilding analysis be conducted using the software developed by Dr. André Punt (University of Washington). Groundfish rebuilding analyses are reviewed at the mop-up panel.

4.4. National Marine Fisheries Service Responsibilities

The NMFS Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFS) and the Southwest Fisheries Science Center (SWFSC) assist in organizing stock assessment reviews of groundfish and CPS, respectively. For groundfish, the NMFS provides a stock assessment coordinator (SAC) to facilitate and assist in overseeing the STAR process.

The NMFS (through the SAC for groundfish and a designated SWFSC staff member for CPS) works with the STATs and other STAR process participants to develop a proposed list of stocks to be assessed for the consideration by the Council. NMFS also develops a draft STAR panel schedule for the Council review. NMFS identifies STAR panel members based on criteria for reviewer qualifications, and, for groundfish, makes every effort to designate one independent reviewer who can attend all STAR panel meetings to provide consistency among reviews. The costs associated with these reviewers are borne by the NMFS. The NMFS also helps organize STAR panel meetings and develops meeting schedules.

The NMFS (along with the Council staff and the STAR panel chair) coordinates with the STATs to facilitate delivery of required materials by scheduled deadlines and in compliance with the TOR. The NMFS also assists Council staff and the STAR panel chair in a pre-review of assessment documents, to assure they are received on time and complete, and in a post-STAR review of the revised assessment document for consistency with the TOR.

4.5. Council Staff Responsibilities

The role of Council staff is to coordinate, monitor, and document the STAR process to ensure compliance with these TOR.

Council staff coordinates with the STAR panel chair and the NMFS (the SAC in the case of groundfish; a designated SWFSC staff member for CPS) in a pre-review of assessment documents, to assure they are complete and received on time. If an assessment document is not in compliance with the TOR, Council staff returns the assessment document to the STAT with a list of deficiencies, a notice that the deadline has expired, or both. Council staff also coordinates with the STAR panel chair, STAT, and the NMFS in a post-STAR review of the revised assessment document for consistency with the TOR. When inconsistencies are identified, the STAT is requested to make appropriate revisions in time for briefing book deadlines.

Council staff attends and monitors all STAR panel meetings to ensure continuity and adherence to the TOR and the independent review requirements of Council Operating Procedure 4. If inconsistencies with the TOR occur during STAR panel meetings, Council staff coordinates with the STAR panel chair to develop solutions to correct the inconsistencies. Council staff also attends and monitors the SSC review of stock assessments to ensure compliance with the TOR.

Council staff is responsible for timely issuance of meeting notices and distribution of stock assessments and other appropriate documents to relevant groups. Council staff also collects and maintains electronic copies of assessment documents, STAR panel, SSC, MT and AP reports, as well as letters from the public and any other relevant documents. These documents are typically published in the Council's SAFE document or posted on the Council's web site.

4.6. Management Team Responsibilities

The MT is responsible for identifying and evaluating potential management actions based on the best available scientific information. Particularly, the MT uses stock assessment results and other information to make ACL and ACT recommendations to the Council.

A MT representative, usually appointed by the MT chair, is responsible to attend the STAR panel meeting and serve as advisor to the STAT and STAR panel on changes in fishing regulations that may influence data used in the assessment and the nature of the fishery in the future. The MT representative does not serve as a member of the STAR panel.

Successful separation of science (e.g., STAT and STAR panels) from management (e.g., MT) depends on assessment reviews being completed by the time the MT meets to discuss preliminary ACL and ACT recommendations. The MT should not seek revision or additional review of the stock assessments after they have been endorsed by the STAR panel. The MT chair should communicate any unresolved issues to the SSC for consideration. The MT, however, can request additional model projections from the STAT, to fully evaluate potential

management actions.

4.7. Advisory Panel Responsibilities

An AP representative, usually appointed by the AP chair, is responsible to attend the STAR panel meeting and serve as advisor to the STAT and STAR panel. The AP representative should review the data sources being used in the assessment prior to development of the stock assessment model and insure that industry concerns regarding the adequacy of data used by the STAT are communicated and addressed early in the assessment process. The AP representative does not serve as a member of the STAR panel, but, as a legitimate meeting participant, may provide appropriate information and advice to the STAT and STAR panel during the meeting.

The AP representative (along with STAT and STAR panel chair, if requested) is expected to attend the MT meeting at which preliminary ACL and ACT recommendations are developed. The AP representative is also expected to attend subsequent MT and Council meetings where the relevant harvest recommendations are discussed.

4.8. Scientific and Statistical Committee Responsibilities

The Council's SSC plays multiple roles within the STAR process and provides the Council and its advisory bodies with technical advice related to the stock assessments and the STAR process. The SSC assigns a member of its relevant subcommittee (Groundfish or CPS) to act as the STAR panel chair. The STAR panel chair attends the assigned STAR panel meeting and fulfills responsibilities described in the section "STAR Panel Responsibilities".

The STAR panel chair presents the STAR panel report at the SSC and Council meetings at which stock assessments are reviewed. If requested, the STAR panel chair also attends the MT meeting, at which preliminary ACL and ACT recommendations are developed, to discuss the STAR panel report and assist with interpreting the assessment results.

The full SSC conducts a final review of the stock assessment. This review should not repeat the detailed technical review conducted by the STAR panel. The SSC also reviews the STAR panel recommendations and serves as arbitrator to resolve disagreements between the STAT and the STAR panel if such disagreements occurred during the review meeting. The SSC is responsible for reviewing and endorsing any additional analytical work requested from the STAT by the MT after the stock assessment has been reviewed by the STAR panel. To insure independence in the SSC review, the SSC members who served on the STAT or STAR panel for the stock assessment being reviewed are required to recuse themselves; their involvement in the review being limited to providing factual information and answering questions.

The SSC is responsible for making OFL recommendations to the Council. The SSC is also responsible for assigning groundfish species managed by the Council to a specific category (or tier) based on definitions of species categories in Appendix E. It is also the SSC's responsibility to determine when it is appropriate to make changes to proxies or the use of estimated values of F_{MSY} and B_{MSY} .

5. DATA-MODERATE ASSESSMENTS FOR GROUND FISH SPECIES

Data-moderate assessments for groundfish species are a refinement over the adopted data-poor methods (i.e., Depletion-Corrected Average Catch (DCAC) and Depletion-Based Stock Reduction Analysis (DB-SRA)) that use catch data to inform harvest specifications for category

3 stocks. Data-moderate assessments are used for category 2 stocks; the defining distinction between category 2 and category 3 stocks is that abundance trend information is incorporated in a category 2 assessment (Appendix E).

Two data-moderate assessment methods have been endorsed for the 2013-14 assessment cycle: 1) extended DB-SRA (XDB-SRA) and 2) extended Simple Stock Synthesis (exSSS). In both cases, abundance trend information (e.g., survey or fishery CPUE indices) is included in the assessment.

ExSSS assumes that recruitment is related deterministically to the stock-recruitment relationship and allows index data to be used for maximum likelihood status and parameter estimation. The Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) or Sample Importance Resample (SIR) algorithm (perhaps implemented using Adaptive Importance Sampling) can be used to quantify uncertainty for exSSS-based assessments. XDB-SRA can be implemented within a Bayesian framework, with the priors for the parameters updated based on index data. The additional parameters in XDB-SRA compared with DB-SRA include the catchability coefficient (q), and the extent of observation variance additional to that inferred from sampling error (a). The priors for these parameters are a weakly informative log-normal and a uniform distribution, respectively.

While data-moderate assessments are less complicated than full assessments, and can potentially be reviewed more expeditiously than full assessments, a full STAR panel is scheduled in 2013 to review data-moderate assessments for the first time (see Appendix A). Comparison of alternative methods (XDB-SRA and exSSS) is encouraged, but it is acceptable to present an assessment using a single modeling approach. The STAR panel can make requests of the STATs for additional runs, but should not impose an alternative method if STATs consider this is not appropriate for the stock concerned. In the event that more than one model is presented, the panel should recommend adoption of a preferred model, if one can be identified, for use in management.

Data-moderate stock assessment reports should follow the template in Appendix D.

6. UPDATE ASSESSMENTS

For CPS, update assessments typically occur during two years out of every three. For groundfish, the initial recommendation whether the next assessment should be full or update is made by the STAR panel during the STAR panel meeting. The final recommendation is made by the SSC.

An update assessment is generally restricted to the addition of new data that have become available since the last full assessment. It must carry forward the fundamental structure of the last full assessment reviewed and endorsed by a STAR panel, the SSC, and the Council. Assessment structure here refers to the population dynamics model, data sources used as inputs to the model, the statistical platform used to fit model to the data, and how the management quantities used to set harvest specifications are calculated. Particularly, when an update assessment is developed, no substantial changes should be made to:

- 1) the particular sources of data used;
- 2) the software used in programming the assessment;
- 3) the assumptions and structure of the population dynamics model underlying the stock assessment;
- 4) the statistical framework for fitting the model to the data and determining goodness of fit; and
- 5) the analytical treatment of model outputs in determining management reference points.

Major changes to the assessment should be postponed until the next full assessment. Minor alternations to the input data and the assessment can be considered as long as the update assessment clearly documents and justifies the need for such changes. A step-by-step transition (via sensitivity analysis) from the last full assessment to an update assessment under review should be provided. Minor alterations can be considered under only two circumstances: first, when the addition of new data reveals an unanticipated sensitivity of model, and second, when there are clear and straightforward improvements in the input data and how it is processed and analyzed for use in the model. Examples of minor alterations include: 1) changes in how compositional data are pooled across sampling strata; 2) the weighting of the various data components (including the use of methods for tuning the variances of the data components); 3) changes in the time periods for the selectivity blocks; 4) correcting data entry errors; and 5) bug fixes in software programming. This list is not meant to be exhaustive, and other alterations can be considered if warranted. Ideally, improved data or methods used to process and analyze data would be reviewed by the SSC prior to being used in assessments.

Review of Update Assessments

Update assessments are reviewed by members of the relevant SSC subcommittee (Groundfish or CPS), during a single meeting. Review typically requires one or two days with an option of early dismissal of a STAT. The STAT is responsible for producing the update assessment document and submitting it to Council staff in a timely manner, before the relevant SSC subcommittee reviews the assessment. The document should follow the outline in Appendix B. The STAT, however, can reference the last full assessment (or other relevant documentation) for description of methods, data sources, stock structure, etc., given that they have not been changed. Any new information to the assessment must be presented in sufficient detail for the subcommittee to determine whether the update meets the Council's requirement to use the best available scientific information.

The document must include a retrospective analysis illustrating the model performance with and without the most recent data (new to the update assessment) and discuss whether the new data and update assessment results are sufficiently consistent with those from the last full assessment. The assessment document should include a detailed step-by-step transition from the last full assessment to the update under review. The updated decision table, if there is one, should be of the same format as in the last full assessment; it should highlight differences among alternative models defined using the same axes of uncertainty as those in the last full assessment.

In addition to the update assessment document, Council staff will also provide the subcommittee with a copy of the last full stock assessment reviewed via the STAR process and the associated STAR panel report. The chair of the subcommittee designates a lead reviewer from the subcommittee members for each update assessment to document the meeting discussion, produce a review report, and ensure that each review is conducted according to the TOR. MT and the AP representatives also participate in the review.

The review of update assessments is not expected to require additional model runs or extensive analytical requests during the meeting, although changes in assessment outputs may necessitate some model exploration. The review focuses on two main questions:

- 1) Does the assessment meet the criteria of a stock assessment update?
- 2) Can the results of the update assessment form the basis of Council decision making?

If the answer to either of these questions is negative, a full stock assessment for the species would typically be recommended for the next assessment cycle (for groundfish) or the next year (for CPS). For groundfish, if the subcommittee agrees that the update assessment results require additional, but limited exploration before being endorsed for management use, further review at the mop-up meeting, at the end of the assessment cycle, could be recommended. In cases like this, the subcommittee needs to develop a list of requests for the STAT to address before the mop-up meeting.

Shortly after the meeting, the subcommittee issues a review report that includes: 1) comments on the technical merits and/or deficiencies of the update assessment; 2) explanation of areas of disagreement between the subcommittee and STAT (if any); and 3) recommendations on the adequacy of the update assessment for use in management. The report may also include subcommittee recommendations for modifications that should be made when the next full assessment is conducted.

The report is reviewed by the full SSC at the next Council meeting. If the subcommittee review concludes that it is not possible to use the update assessment, the SSC is responsible for evaluating all model runs examined during the review meeting and providing recommendations on an appropriate fishing level to the Council.

7. CATCH REPORTS

In certain cases (e.g., cowcod in 2011) only limited new data are available to inform the assessment. In such cases, it is appropriate for the STAT to provide a catch report, which documents recent removals and compares them to the ACLs established for the stock. For a catch report, the STAT does not need to conduct model runs since, if the estimated removals of a species are near the value projected by the previous assessment/rebuilding analysis, no new insight would be obtained by rerunning the assessment model.

Catch reports are reviewed by the relevant SSC subcommittee (Groundfish or CPS) during a single meeting (that during which update assessments are reviewed). The STAT is responsible for producing the catch report and submitting it to Council staff in a timely manner, before the relevant subcommittee reviews it. The report should be brief, but provide enough details on how total removals were estimated. It should provide only essential information about the stock and refer to the last assessment (or other relevant documentation) for full description of methods, data sources, model structure, etc. used to estimate the status of the stock and generate projections.

In common with a review of an assessment update, Council staff will provide the subcommittee with the catch report, along with a copy of the last full stock assessment reviewed via the STAR process, and the associated STAR panel report. The chair of the subcommittee will designate a

lead reviewer from the subcommittee members for each catch report to document the meeting discussion, produce a review report, and ensure that each review is conducted according to the TOR. The report is reviewed by the full SSC at the next Council meeting. The MT and AP representatives also participate in the review.

APPENDIX A: 2013-2015 GROUND FISH AND CPS STOCK ASSESSMENT REVIEW CALENDAR

Review Meeting	Initial Review Deadline	Document Distribution Dates	STAR Panel Dates	Location	Species
Data-Moderate Panel <u>TBD</u>	April 8	April 15	April 22-26	Santa Cruz, CA	Brown rockfish, China rockfish, copper rockfish, English sole, rex sole, sharpchin rockfish, stripetail rockfish, vermilion rockfish, and yellowtail rockfish
GF Panel 1	April 22	April 29	May 13-17	Seattle, WA	Petrale sole and darkblotched rockfish
GF Update and catch reports	May 22	May 29	June 18	Garden Grove, CA	Bocaccio rockfish update; canary rockfish, Pacific ocean perch, and yelloweye rockfish catch reports
GF Panel 2	June 17	June 24	July 8-12	Seattle, WA	Rougheye rockfish and aurora rockfish
GF Panel 3	July 1	July 8	July 22-25	Seattle, WA	Shortspine thornyheads and longspine thornyheads
GF Panel 4	July 15	July 22	August 5-9	Santa Cruz, CA	Cowcod and Pacific sanddabs
GF Mop-Up Panel	Sept. 2	Sept. 9	Sept. 23-27	Seattle, WA	Rebuilding analyses and continuing issues

APPENDIX B: OUTLINE FOR STOCK ASSESSMENT DOCUMENTS

This is a general outline of elements that should be included in stock assessment reports for groundfish and CPS managed by the Pacific Fishery Management Council. Not every item listed in the outline is relevant (or available) for every assessment. Therefore, this outline should be considered a flexible guideline on how to organize and communicate stock assessment results. Items with asterisks (*) are optional for draft assessment documents prepared for STAR panel meetings but should be included in the final document.

- A. Title page and list of preparers – the names and affiliations of the stock assessment team (STAT) either alphabetically or as first and secondary authors.

- B. Executive Summary (should follow the template in Appendix B).

- C. Introduction
 - 1. Scientific name, distribution, the basis for the choice of stock structure, including regional differences in life history or other biological characteristics that should form the basis of management units.
 - 2. A map showing the scope of the assessment and depicting boundaries for fisheries or data collection strata.
 - 3. Important features of life history that affect management (e.g., migration, sexual dimorphism, bathymetric demography).
 - 4. Ecosystem considerations (e.g., ecosystem role and trophic relationships of the species, habitat requirements/preferences, relevant data on ecosystem processes that may affect stock or parameters used in the stock assessment, and/or cross-FMP interactions with other fisheries). This section should note if environmental correlations or food web interactions were incorporated into the assessment model. The length and depth of this section would depend on availability of data and reports from the IEA, expertise of the STAT, and whether ecosystem factors are informational to contribute quantitative information to the assessment.
 - 5. Important features of current fishery and relevant history of fishery.
 - 6. Summary of management history (e.g., changes in mesh sizes, trip limits, or other management actions that may have significantly altered selection, catch rates, or discards).
 - 7. Management performance, including a table or tables comparing Overfishing Limit (OFL), Annual Catch Limit (ACL), Harvest Guideline (HG) [CPS only], landings, and catch (i.e., landings plus discard) for each area and year
 - 8. Description of fisheries for this species off Canada, Alaska and/or Mexico, including references to any recent assessments of those stocks.

- D. Assessment
 - 1. Data
 - a. Landings by year and fishery (PacFIN is the standard source for all commercial landings), historical catch estimates, discards (generally specified as a percentage of total catch in weight and in units of mt), catch-at-age, weight-at-age, abundance indices (typically survey and CPUE data), data used to estimate biological parameters (e.g., growth rates, maturity schedules, and natural mortality) with coefficients of variation (CVs) or variances if available. Include complete tables and figures and date of extraction.

- b. Sample size information for length and age composition data by area, year, gear, market category, etc., including both the number of trips and fish sampled.
 - c. All data sources that include the species being assessed, which are used in the assessment, and provide the rationale for data sources that are excluded.
 - d. Clear description of environmental or ecosystem data if included in the assessment.
2. History of modeling approaches used for this stock – changes between current and previous assessment models
 - a. Response to STAR panel recommendations from the most recent previous assessment.
 - b. Report of consultations with AP and MT representatives regarding the use of various data sources in the stock assessment.
 - c. If environmental or ecosystem data are incorporated, report of consultations with technical teams that evaluated ecosystem data or methodologies used in the assessment.
3. Model description
 - a. Complete description of any new modeling approaches.
 - b. Definitions of fleets and areas.
 - c. Assessment program with last revision date (i.e., date executable program file was compiled).
 - d. List and description of all likelihood components in the model.
 - e. Constraints on parameters, selectivity assumptions, natural mortality, treatment of age reading bias and/or imprecision, and other fixed parameters.
 - f. Description of stock-recruitment constraints or components.
 - g. Description of how the first year that is included in the model was selected and how the population state at the time is defined (e.g., B_0 , stable age structure, etc.).
 - h. Critical assumptions and consequences of assumption failures.
4. Model selection and evaluation
 - a. Evidence of search for balance between model realism and parsimony.
 - b. Comparison of key model assumptions, include comparisons based on nested models (e.g., asymptotic vs. domed selectivities, constant vs. time-varying selectivities).
 - c. Summary of alternate model configurations that were tried but rejected.
 - d. Likelihood profile for the base-run (or proposed base-run model for a draft assessment undergoing review) configuration over one or more key parameters (e.g., M , h , Q) to show consistency among input data sources.
 - e. Residual analysis for the base-run configuration (or proposed base-run model in a draft assessment undergoing review) e.g., residual plots, time series plots of observed and predicted values, or other approaches. Note that model diagnostics *are* required in draft assessments undergoing review.
 - f. Convergence status and convergence criteria for the base-run model (or proposed base-run).
 - g. Randomization run results or other evidence of search for global best estimates.
 - h. Evaluation of model parameters. Do they make sense? Are they credible?
 - i. Are model results consistent with assessments of the same species in Canada and Alaska? Are parameter estimates (e.g., survey catchability) consistent with estimates for related stocks?
5. Point-by-point response to the STAR panel recommendations.* **Not required in draft assessment undergoing review.**

6. Base-model(s) results
 - a. Table listing all explicit parameters in the stock assessment model used for base model, their purpose (e.g., recruitment parameter, selectivity parameter) and whether or not the parameter was actually estimated in the stock assessment model.
 - b. Population numbers at age \times year \times sex (if sex-specific M , growth, or selectivity) (May be provided as a text or spreadsheet file).* **Not required in draft assessment undergoing review.**
 - c. Time-series of total, 1+ (if age 1s are in the model), summary, and spawning biomass (and/or spawning output), depletion relative to B_0 , recruitment and fishing mortality or exploitation rate estimates (table and figures).
 - d. Selectivity estimates (if not included elsewhere).
 - e. Stock-recruitment relationship.
 - f. OFL, ABC and ACL (and/or ABC and OY or HG) for recent years.
 - g. Clear description of units for all outputs.
 - h. Clear description of how discard is included in yield estimates.
 - i. Clear description of environmental or ecosystem data if included in the assessment.
7. Uncertainty and sensitivity analyses. The best approach for describing uncertainty and the range of probable biomass estimates in groundfish assessments may depend on the situation. Important factors to consider include:
 - a. Parameter uncertainty (variance estimation conditioned on a given model, estimation framework, data set choice, and weighting scheme), including likelihood profiles for important assessment parameters (e.g., natural mortality). This also includes expressing uncertainty in derived outputs of the model and estimating CVs using appropriate methods (e.g., bootstrap, asymptotic methods, Bayesian approaches, such as MCMC). Include the CV of spawning biomass in the first year for which an OFL has not been specified (typically end year +1 or +2).
 - b. Sensitivity to data set choice and weighting schemes (e.g., emphasis factors), which may also include a consideration of recent patterns in recruitment.
 - c. Sensitivity to assumptions about model structure, i.e., model specification uncertainty.
 - d. Retrospective analysis, where the model is fitted to a series of shortened input data sets, with the most recent years of input data being dropped.
 - e. Historical analysis (plot of actual estimates from current and previous assessments).
 - f. Subjective appraisal of the magnitude and sources of uncertainty.
 - g. If a range of model runs is used to characterize uncertainty it is important to provide some qualitative or quantitative information about relative probability of each. If no statements about relative probability can be made, then it is important to state that all scenarios (or all scenarios between the bounds depicted by the runs) are equally likely
 - h. If possible, ranges depicting uncertainty should include at least three runs: (a) one judged most probable; (b) at least one that depicts the range of uncertainty in the direction of lower current biomass levels; and (c) one that depicts the range of uncertainty in the direction of higher current biomass levels. The entire range of uncertainty should be carried through stock projections and decision table analyses.

E. Harvest control rules (CPS only)

The OFL, ABC and HG harvest control rules for actively managed species apply to the U.S. (California, Oregon, and Washington) harvest recommended for the next fishing year and are defined as follows:

- $OFL = BIOMASS * F_{MSY} * U.S. \text{ DISTRIBUTION}$
- $ABC = BIOMASS * BUFFER * F_{MSY} * U.S. \text{ DISTRIBUTION}$
- ACL LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO ABC
- $HG = (BIOMASS - CUTOFF) * FRACTION * U.S. \text{ DISTRIBUTION}$
- ACT EQUAL TO HG OR ACL, WHICHEVER VALUE IS LESS

where F_{MSY} is the fishing mortality rate that maximizes catch biomass in the long-term.

Implementation for Pacific Sardine

1. BIOMASS is the estimated stock biomass (ages 1+) at the start of the next year from the current assessment,
2. CUTOFF (150,000 mt) is the lowest level of estimated biomass at which harvest is allowed,
3. FRACTION is an environment-based percentage of biomass above the CUTOFF that can be harvested by the fisheries. Given that the productivity of the sardine stock has been shown to increase during relatively warm-water ocean conditions, the following formula has been used to determine an appropriate (sustainable) FRACTION value:

$$FRACTION = 0.248649805(T_2) - 8.190043975(T) + 67.4558326,$$

where T is the running average sea-surface temperature at Scripps Pier, La Jolla, California during the three preceding years. Under the harvest control rule, FRACTION is constrained and ranges between 5% and 15% depending on the value of T.

4. U.S. DISTRIBUTION is the percentage of BIOMASS in U.S. waters (87%).

Implementation for Pacific Mackerel

1. BIOMASS is the estimated stock biomass (ages 1+) at the start of the next year from the current assessment,
2. CUTOFF (18,200 mt) is the lowest level of estimated biomass at which harvest is allowed,
3. FRACTION (30%) is the fraction of biomass above CUTOFF that can be taken by fisheries, and
4. U.S. DISTRIBUTION (70%) is the average fraction of total BIOMASS in U.S. waters.

The CUTOFF and FRACTION values applied in the Council's harvest policy for mackerel are based on simulations published by MacCall et al. in 1985.

F. Reference points (groundfish only)

1. Unfished spawning stock biomass, summary age biomass, and recruitment, along with unfished spawning stock output.
2. Reference points based on $B_{40\%}$ for rockfish and roundfish and on $B_{25\%}$ for flatfish (spawning biomass and/or output, SPR, exploitation rate, equilibrium yield).
3. Reference points based on default SPR proxy (spawning biomass and/or output, SPR, exploitation rate, equilibrium yield).

4. Reference points based on MSY (if estimated) (spawning biomass and/or output, SPR, exploitation rate, equilibrium yield).
5. Equilibrium yield curve showing various B_{MSY} proxies.

G. Harvest projections and decision tables (groundfish only) * **Not required in draft assessment undergoing review.**

1. Harvest projections and decision tables (i.e., a matrix of alternative models (states of nature) versus management actions) should cover the plausible range of uncertainty about current stock biomass and a set of candidate fishing mortality targets used for the stock. See section “*Uncertainty and Decision Tables in Groundfish Stock Assessment*” (this document, pp.12-13) on how to define alternative states of nature. Management decisions in most cases represent the sequence of catches including estimate of OFL based on F_{MSY} (or its proxy) and those obtained by applying the Council 40-10 harvest policy to each state of nature; however other alternatives may be suggested by the GMT as being more relevant to Council decision making. OFL calculations should be based on the assumption that future catches equal ABCs and not OFLs.
2. Information presented should include biomass, stock depletion, and yield projections of OFL, ABC and ACL for ten years into the future, beginning with the first year for which management action could be based upon the assessment.

H. Regional management considerations.

1. For stocks where current practice is to allocate harvests by management area, a recommended method of allocating harvests based on the distribution of biomass should be provided. The MT advisor should be consulted on the appropriate management areas for each stock.
2. Discuss whether a regional management approach makes sense for the species from a biological perspective.
3. If there are insufficient data to analyze a regional management approach, what are the research and data needs to answer this question?

I. Research needs (prioritized).

J. Acknowledgments: include STAR panel members and affiliations as well as names and affiliations of persons who contributed data, advice or information but were not part of the assessment team. * **Not required in draft assessment undergoing review.**

K. Literature cited.

L. An appendix with the complete parameter and data in the native code of the stock assessment program. (For a draft assessment undergoing review, these listings can be provided as text files or in spreadsheet format.)

APPENDIX C: TEMPLATE FOR AN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Items with asterisks (*) are optional for draft assessment documents prepared for STAR panel meetings but should be included in the final document.

Stock	Species/area, including an evaluation of any potential biological basis for regional management.
Catches	Trends and current levels - include table for last ten years and graph with long term data.
Data and assessment	Date of last assessment, type of assessment model, data available, new information, and information lacking.
Stock biomass	Trends and current levels relative to virgin or historic levels, description of uncertainty-include table for last 10 years and graph with long term estimates.
Recruitment	Trends and current levels relative to virgin or historic levels-include table for last 10 years and graph with long term estimates
Exploitation status	Exploitation rates (i.e., total catch divided by exploitable biomass, or the annual SPR harvest rate) - include a table with the last 10 years of data and a graph showing the trend in fishing mortality relative to the target (y-axis) plotted against the trend in biomass relative to the target (x-axis).
Ecosystem considerations	A summary of reviewed environmental and ecosystem factors that appear to be correlated with stock dynamics, e.g., variability in the physical environment that directly or indirectly affects the vital rates (growth, survival, productivity/recruitment) of fish stocks, and/or trophic interactions that affect predators and prey. Note what, if any, ecosystem factors are used in the assessment and how.
Reference points (groundfish)/ Harvest control rules (CPS)	<u>Groundfish</u> : Management targets and definition of overfishing, including the harvest rate that brings the stock to equilibrium at $B_{40\%}$ (the B_{MSY} proxy) and the equilibrium stock size that results from fishing at the default harvest rate (the F_{MSY} proxy). Include a summary table that compares estimated reference points for SSB, SPR, Exploitation Rate and Yield based on SSB proxy for MSY, SPR proxy for MSY, and estimated MSY values. <u>CPS</u> : Results of applying the control rule to compute the harvest guideline, including specification of each of the quantities on which the harvest guideline is based (BIOMASS, CUTOFF, FRACTION, U.S. DISTRIBUTION)
Management performance	Catches in comparison to OFL, ABC, [HG], and OY/ACL values for the most recent 10 years (when available), overfishing levels, actual catch and discard. Include OFL (encountered), OFL (retained) and OFL (dead) if different due to discard and discard mortality.
Unresolved problems and major uncertainties	Any special issues that complicate scientific assessment, questions about the best model scenario, etc.
Decision table (groundfish only)*	Projected yields (OFL, ABC and ACL), spawning biomass, and stock depletion levels for each year. OFL calculations should be based on the assumption that future catches equal ABCs and not OFLs.
Research and data needs	Identify information gaps that seriously impede the stock assessment.
Rebuilding Projections*	Reference to the principal results from rebuilding analysis if the stock is overfished. For groundfish, see Rebuilding Analysis terms of reference for detailed information on rebuilding analysis requirements.

APPENDIX D: TEMPLATE FOR A DATA-MODERATE ASSESSMENT

1. Title page and list of preparers – the names and affiliations of the stock assessment team (STAT).
2. Introduction: Scientific name, distribution, basic biology (growth, longevity, ecology), the basis for the choice of stock unit(s)(no more than 1-2 paragraphs).
3. Development of indices (used and rejected). Novel approaches should be fully documented.
4. Survey of other data available for assessment: sample sizes by year and source of lengths, and ages (read and unread)--in case there is interest in conducting a full assessment in the future.
5. Selection of method (exSSS or XDB-SRA; authors “encouraged” to do both).
6. Assessment model
 - a. Specification of priors / production function (defaults OK)
 - b. Initial runs using catch-only methods (DB-SRA or SSS (or both))
 - c. Diagnostics
 - i. Evaluation of convergence
 - ii. Residual plots
 - iii. Posterior predictive intervals (if Bayesian)
 - iv. Time-trajectories of biomass, depletion, etc.
 - v. Sensitivity analyses using alternative catch streams, alternative priors for depletion, etc.
7. Estimates of OFL (median of the distribution), and
8. Estimates of stock status.

APPENDIX E: DEFINITIONS OF SPECIES CATEGORIES FOR GROUND FISH ASSESSMENTS

<p>Category 3: Data poor. OFL is derived from historical catch.</p>	a	No reliable catch history. No basis for establishing OFL.
	b	Reliable catches estimates only for recent years. OFL is average catch during a period when stock is considered to be stable and close to BMSY equilibrium on the basis of expert judgment.
	c	Reliable aggregate catches during period of fishery development and approximate values for natural mortality. Default analytical approach DCAC.
	d	Reliable annual historical catches and approximate values for natural mortality and age at 50% maturity. Default analytical approach DB-SRA.
<p>Category 2: Data moderate. OFL is derived from model output (or natural mortality).</p>	a	M*survey biomass assessment (as in Rogers 1996).
	b	Historical catches, fishery-dependent trend information only. An aggregate population model is fit to the available information.
	c	Historical catches, survey trend information, or at least one absolute abundance estimate. An aggregate population model is fit to the available information.
	d	Full age-structured assessment, but results are substantially more uncertain than assessments used in the calculation of the P* buffer. The SSC will provide a rationale for each stock placed in this category. Reasons could include that assessment results are very sensitive to model and data assumptions, or that the assessment has not been updated for many years.
<p>Category 1: Data rich. OFL is based on F_{MSY} OR F_{MSY} proxy from model output. ABC based on P* buffer.</p>	a	Reliable compositional (age and/or size) data sufficient to resolve year-class strength and growth characteristics. Only fishery-dependent trend information available. Age/size structured assessment model.
	b	As in 1a, but trend information also available from surveys. Age/size structured assessment model.
	c	Age/size structured assessment model with reliable estimation of the stock-recruit relationship.