

COASTAL PELAGIC SPECIES MANAGEMENT TEAM REPORT ON MEMBERSHIP
APPOINTMENTS AND COUNCIL OPERATING PROCEDURES

At the November 2019 and November 2020 Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) meetings, the Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team (CPSMT) made recommendations (Agenda Items I.4.a, Supplemental CPSMT Report 1 and H.2.a, CPSMT Report 1, respectively) about modifying the procedure for the Council's consideration of methodology review proposals. The process is described within Council Operating Procedure (COP) 26. Currently COP 26 schedules the consideration of CPS methodology review proposals as a standing agenda item for the Council's November meetings. The CPSMT notes that most years no proposals are submitted for consideration and the agenda item is cancelled at the outset of the meeting. This results in a situation where Council agenda planning and CPS advisory bodies meeting times, agendas, and travel plans have already been set, before knowing whether that agenda item will take place or not. The CPS Advisory Subpanel also made a recommendation in November 2020 (H.2.a, CPSAS Supplemental Report 2) in which they requested that any modifications to COP 26 include a clarified process for initiating review of existing methodologies.

At the November 2020 meeting, the Council directed Council staff to look into the methodology review COPs for other fishery management plans (FMPs) to identify sections of COP 26 that could be made more consistent with the other COPs, and to provide suggested revisions for Council consideration. After conferring with Council staff and reviewing the other methodology COPs, the CPSMT concludes that methodology review processes associated with each FMP are unique and should be designed appropriately to the schedules and nature of each FMP.

The CPSMT recommends the Council modify COP 26 to require that proponents notify the Executive Director of their intent prior to the first day of the September Council meeting for the Council to keep the review on the November Agenda. The Council and advisory bodies would benefit from this new procedure by not having a November agenda item that is cancelled with little notice and by ensuring the advisory bodies can schedule adequate meeting time for discussion and recommendations when there is a review proposal.

The CPSMT also recommends the Council modify COP 26 to incorporate language that clarifies the process for initiating review of existing methodologies. The CPSMT offers a strikethrough version of COP 26 (attached) which incorporates all these changes.

PFMC
03/23/2021

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

Approved by the Council: 4/12/15

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 should first submit notification to the Council Executive Director, and then will submit a brief proposal for inclusion in the appropriate briefing book (typically November) 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.~~ Existing methodologies may also benefit from the review process. The Council may consider the input of the Council's advisory bodies and the public regarding the need for review of existing methodologies during appropriate Council agenda items throughout the year. The Council's recommendations would then be conveyed to the entity utilizing the existing methodology. When a proposal for an existing methodology to be reviewed is submitted, it will follow the same schedule and process as indicated below for new methodologies.

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, CPSAS, 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. A full report on the outcome of the review, prepared by the methodology review panel (MRP), is typically presented at the June Council meeting.

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 corresponding~~ Methodology Review 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 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.

Proposals for new methodology reviews may be included in a November Council meeting if notice is provided to the Council Executive Director no later than the beginning of the September Council meeting.

Schedule

Month	Activity
September	<u>Proponents provide notice to Council Executive Director, prior to the beginning of the September Council meeting, stating intent to submit a methodology review request at the November Council meeting.</u>
November Council meeting	Proponents submit brief proposal for the advance Briefing Book, 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.