A Guide to the Preparation of Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Crab SAFE Report Chapters

BSAI Crab Plan Team

January 2022

A chapter should be produced for the SAFE report for each crab stock, and should include all sections listed in the "Outline of SAFE Report Chapters" below. This chapter should be based on the limited number of fully described models identified during the meeting preceding provision of the final stock assessment. This o~~O~~utline is intended to provide a consistent structure and logical flow for stock assessments; using the numbering system outlined below will help to standardize the SAFE document and make the review process for assessments more straightforward. Some variation from this outline is permissible if warranted by limitations of data, analytical methods, or other extenuating circumstances; major deviations from the suggested report structure should, however, be justified. Many of the items under Section E are not appropriate for stocks in Tier 5 (see Table 1 of this Appendix for a list of sections needed for different types of assessments). It is particularly important that all of the items listed under "Calculation of the OFL" be included to the maximum extent possible, in that many of these are critical to the fishery management process. Careful consideration should be given to all applicable SSC and CPT comments from the previous assessment(s).

Important notes:

- To maintain consistency among SAFEs, the documents should report biomass in metric tons. The executive summary and the data used in the harvest strategy should be presented in both metric tons (abbreviated t) and pounds (lb). Use the appropriate conversion factors and significant digits in the result.
- By convention the CPT uses the following conversions to include tables in both pounds (lb) and metric tons (t) in the status summary sections: million lb to 1000 t [/2.204624], 1000 t to million lb [/0.453592].
- Dates should be specified as "2008" for the 2008 calendar year and "2008/09" for the 2008/09 fishing year. By default crab assessments are based on fishing years, but the notation 2xxx/yy should nevertheless be adopted.
- Fishing mortality values (F) are always full selection fishing mortalities (the F at fishing selection equal to 1.0).

Outline of SAFE Report Chapters

Title page and list of preparers

Executive Summary

1. Stock: species/area.
2. Catches: trends and current levels.

Formatted: Font color: Black
Formatted: Space After: 12 pt
Formatted: Normal
Formatted: Font: Italic
Formatted: Font: Italic, Font color: Black
Formatted: Normal, Centered
Formatted: Font: Italic
Formatted: Font: Italic
Formatted: Centered
Formatted: Font color: Auto
Formatted: List Paragraph, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.5" + Indent at: 0.75"
Formatted: Font color: Auto

2.3. Data sources: Provide single plot of all model data sources and years applicable for each.
3.4. Stock biomass: trends and current levels relative to virgin or historic levels, description of uncertainty.
4.5. Recruitment: trends and current levels relative to virgin or historic levels.
5.6. Management performance: a table showing estimates of mature male biomass (at the time of mating), overfishing levels (OFL and MSST), allowable biological catch (ABC), TACs, retained catch and discards in all fisheries; show results for five years prior to and including the current year (Table 2 of this Appendix lists examples of how these tables should be constructed for stocks in each Tier) in 1000 t (first) then million lb (second). For the current assessment, provide only the OFL and ABC for the author's preferred model.
6.7. Basis for the OFL: Table listing estimates of M ~~(default value 0.18 for king crabs and 0.3?? for Tanner and snow crabs)~~, Tier level, current mature male biomass (MMB, at the time of mating), B_{MSY} (or the proxy thereof) and the basis for the calculation of B_{MSY}, current mature male biomass relative to B_{MSY} (or its proxy), ~~?,~~ and the basis for calculating average catch; show for five years prior to and including the current year (Table 3 of this document lists examples of how these tables should be constructed for stocks in each Tier).
7.8. Provide the p~~P~~robability d~~D~~ensity f~~F~~unction of the OFL (if applicable) and what additional uncertainty is included in this estimate.
8.9. Provide the basis for the ABC recommendation (if the recommendation is below maxABC, report both the recommended and maxABC).
9.10. A summary of the results of any rebuilding analyses: table showing the year by which rebuilding is expected to occur, the rebuilding time period, the catch for the next fishing year and probability of recovery to the proxy for B_{MSY} for a range of harvest strategies (including one for which the probability of recovery within the rebuilding period is 0.5).

A. Summary of Major Changes

Formatted: Heading 2

1. Changes (if any) to the management of the fishery.
2. Changes to the input data (e.g. specify any new data sources and which data sources have been updated).
3. Changes (if any) to the assessment methodology.
4. ~~Changes to the assessment results, including projected biomass, TAC/GHL, total catch (including discard mortality in all fisheries and retained catch), and OFL.~~

B. Responses to SSC and CPT Comments

Formatted: Heading 2

1. Responses to the most recent two sets of SSC and CPT[1] comments on assessments in general (for each comment that is addressed in the main text, list the comment and give name of the section where it is discussed; if the SSC or CPT did not make any comments on assessments in general, say so).
2. Responses to the most recent two sets of SSC and CPT[1] comments specific to the assessment (for each comment that is addressed in the main text, list the comment and give the name of section where it is discussed; if the SSC or CPT did not make any comments specific to the assessment, say so).

[1] For an assessment in May, these comments will be from the SSC and CPT meetings in May and September of the previous year. For an assessment in September, these comments will be from the SSC and CPT meetings in May of the current year and September of the previous year.

All comments relevant to the assessment and crab assessments in general must be listed. If a comment has not been addressed in the assessment, the comment should be listed and the reasons for not addressing it must be provided.

Formatted: Normal

C. Introduction

1. Scientific name.
2. Description of general distribution (including a map, showing the stock boundary and, if possible, the actual distribution).
3. Evidence of stock structure, if any.
4. Description of life history characteristics relevant to stock assessments (e.g., special features of reproductive biology).
5. Brief summary of management history. A complete summary of the management history will be provided in the ADF&G Area Management Report appended to the annual SAFE.
6. Brief description of the annual ADF&G harvest strategy. All parameters for stocks with an approved harvest strategy should be provided in tables in both t and million lb.
7. Summary of the history of the basis and estimates B_{MSY} or $B_{MSYPROXY}$
8. Brief history of the target fishery for the stock, including a) periods of opening/closure of the fishery, b) revisions in harvest policy, and c) changes in access to the fishery.

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

D. Data (Items in this section should be presented primarily in tabular form.)

Formatted: Heading 2, Space After: 0 pt

1. Summary of new information (the section should essentially repeat the information provided under Section A.2).
2. Data which should be presented as time series, separately by sex and, depending on the assessment, also by maturity state and shell condition (table headers should indicate when the data were extracted, and the source for the data; years should be reported as fishing year 2xxx/yy or calendar year, depending on the fishery concerned):
   a. Total catch, partitioned by strata used in the assessment model, if any.
   b. Information on bycatch and discards. Non-retained catches and discards should ideally be reported using the categories in Table 4 to this document (the table header should specify the mortality rates applied to discards and bycatch, and whether the values in the table have had these mortality rates applied or not).
   c. Catch-at-length (with sample sizes) for fisheries, bycatch, discards, and surveys. For surveys include all known surveys that catch crab.
   d. Survey biomass estimates (with measures of uncertainty).
   e. Survey catch-at-length (with sample sizes), as appropriate.
   f. Catch-per-unit effort time-series (if used in the assessment) and how the data were standardized with diagnostics tables/plots.
   g. Other time series data (e.g., predator abundance, fishing effort, tagging data).
3. Data which may be aggregated over time:
   a. Growth-per-molt; frequency of molting, etc. (by sex and perhaps maturity state).
   b. Weight-at length or weight-at-age (by sex).
4. Information on any data sources that were available, but were excluded from the assessment.

Notes:

Formatted: Font: Bold
Formatted: Normal

- Information on length-composition may be more appropriately presented in the form of plots, especially for assessments for which there are a substantial amount of such data.
- The reported samples sizes should reflect the actual number of samples; information on the sample sizes assumed when fitting any population models should also be reported.

E. Analytic Approach

1. History of modeling approaches for this stock

a. Summarize CIE review comments from past reviews and sequentially address how those comments have been taken into account.
b. Provide a brief summary (table or bulleted list) describing model changes over time since the model was first accepted for use in the assessment.

2. Model Description

a. Description of overall modeling approach (e.g., age-/size-structured versus biomass dynamic, maximum likelihood versus Bayesian). If the model has not been published in its current form, its equations should be listed in full in an appendix. If there is a technical appendix, items b-f below should be included in the appendix, and only a short description of the model and its estimation scheme needs to be included in this section. Specify when the fishery is assumed to occur and, if necessary, provide a table which lists the assumed time of the fishery for each year of the assessment periods.
b. Reference software used (e.g., Synthesis, AD Model Builder).
c. Description of all likelihood components.
d. Description of how the state of the population at the start of the first year of the assessment period is determined and the size-range that the model covers.
e. Parameter estimation framework:
    i. List all of the parameters which are estimated outside of the assessment (e.g., the natural mortality rate, parameters governing the maturity schedule), along with how the values for these parameters were estimated (methods do not necessarily have to be statistical, e.g., *M* could be estimated by referencing a previously published value).
    ii. List all of the parameters that are estimated conditionally on those described above (e.g., full-selection fishing mortality rates, parameters governing the survey and fishery selectivity schedules, recruitments) and indicate any bounds and/or priors placed on these parameters and whether the parameter estimate is within x% of the bound.
    iii. List any constraints imposed on the estimated parameters (including penalties on recruitment and selectivity).
    iv. The default for average recruitment should include the entire time series. Justifications for including fewer years should be provided along with model runs of both the full and truncated time series.
f. Definition of model outputs

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1"
Formatted: Font color: Auto
Formatted: Font color: Black
Formatted: Heading 3, Indent: First line: 0.25", Space After: 0 pt
Formatted: Font: 11 pt, Italic, Font color: Black
Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.25"

i. Biomass measures (e.g., biomass of animals 50 mm and larger). Indicate the assumed time of mating and that of the fishery.
ii. Recruitment (e.g., number of males and females in the 50-55 mm size-class).
iii. Fishing mortality (e.g., full-selection F multiplied by selectivity for lengths 80 mm and above). Whether fishing mortality is an exploitation rate or an instantaneous rate should be reported in table headers and the text. The ideal is to report "fishing mortality" as the fully-selected instantaneous fishing mortality rate at the time of the fishery to enhance comparability amongst stock assessments.

g. Critical assumptions and consequences of assumption failures (for example, highlight assumptions regarding *M*, *q,* and selectivity, to which assessments are often very sensitive).
h. Changes to any of the above since the previous assessment.
~~i.~~ Outline of methods used to validate the code to implement the model and whether the code is available.
i.

3. Model Selection and Evaluation

Formatted: Heading 3, Indent: First line: 0.25"

a. Describe alternative model configurations[2], if any (e.g., alternative *M* values or likelihood weights; use a hierarchical approach where possible (e.g., asymptotic vs. domed selectivities, constant vs. time-varying selectivities)). The model configuration on which the previous assessment was based (both without and with new data) must be included in the set of proposed models considered in order to retain comparability with previous assessments[3].
b. Show a progression of results from the previous assessment model to the new base model with all data updated and then to the author's preferred ~~base~~ model by adding each new data source and each model modification in turn to enable the impacts of these changes to be assessed. Clearly identify the model used as the basis for each model run. If changes in model results occur, sufficient information should be provided for the CPT / SSC to understand the cause for the changes.
c. ~~Label the approved model from the previous year as model 0.~~Use the following convention for numbering models: When a model constituting a "major change" from the original version of the base model is introduced, it is given a label of the form "Model *yy.j*," where *yy* is the year (designated by the last two digits) that the model was introduced, and *j* is an integer distinguishing this particular "major change" model from other "major change" models introduced in the same year. When a model constituting only a "minor change" from the original version of the base model is introduced, it is given a label of the form "Model *yy.jx*," where "*x*" is a letter distinguishing this particular "minor change" model from other "minor change" models derived from the original version of the same base model. The distinction between

Formatted: Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border)

[2] For Tier 5 assessments "model configuration" refers to the time period over which the mean catch is computed while for Tier 3 and 4 assessments it includes the time period used to define B_{MSY}/B_{REF}.

[3] This information should be included in the May and September versions of the assessment report. However, for ease of reading, information on model configurations and results of model runs considered, but not adopted, should be included in an appendix to the assessment report or in an online location readily accessible during the CPT meetings.

"major" and "minor" model changes is determined by the author on the basis of qualitative differences in model structure.

d. Provide evidence of search for balance between realistic (but possibly over-parameterized) and simpler (but not realistic) models.
e. Provide convergence status and convergence criteria for the ~~base case~~preferred model ~~(or proposed base case model)~~ such as randomization run results or other evidence of a search for the global best estimates.
f. Provide a table (or plot) of the sample sizes assumed for the compositional data. There are several ways for specify input sample size, including:
    i. the number of animals actually measured;
    ii. a fixed constant (e.g., 500);
    iii. the application of bootstrapping approaches (e.g., Folmer and Pennington, 2000); and
    iv. as for i and iii, with a maximum imposed on the input sample size.

    The first, third, and last of these approaches allows the input sample sizes (and hence the weight assigned to the compositional data) to reflect uneven sampling over time. The basis for specifying the input sample sizes should be justified, and analyses should be conducted (see Section 4.4 below) to justify the final effective sample sizes.

g. Provide the basis for data weighting, including whether the input effective sample sizes are tuned and the survey CV adjusted.
h. Do parameter estimates for all models make sense and are they credible?
i. Describe criteria used to evaluate the model or to choose among alternative models, including the role (if any) of uncertainty.
j. Show residual analysis (e.g., residual plots, time series plots of observed and predicted values, or other approaches). Note that residual analysis is expected for the ~~base case~~ preferred model below.
k. Show evaluation of the model, if only one model is presented, or evaluation of alternative models and selection of a final model, if more than one model is presented.

4. Results (best model(s))[4]

Although the author may focus on the author's recommended model run, results should be provided for all model runs that the assessment author considers or the CPT may consider sufficiently plausible that they could form the basis for management advice. Assessment authors should come to the plan team meeting prior to the final reference point setting meeting prepared to present detailed results for all analyses conducted, even if detailed results are not included in the assessment.

~~1.~~a. ~~A~~All tables and figures should be labeled in numerical order (i.e., 1, 2, 3, etc.) and included in the document in sequentially numbered pages.
~~2.~~b. List effective sample sizes, the weighting factors applied when fitting the indices, and the weighting factors applied to any penalties.
~~3.~~c. Include a table showing differences in likelihood.

[4] There may be several "best" models in the Initial assessment draft, but there should be one "best" model in the Final assessment draft as identified by the CPT at the previous meeting.

Formatted: Heading 3, Indent: First line: 0.25"
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"
Formatted: List Paragraph, Indent: Left: 0.5", Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", Tab stops: Not at 0.25" + 0.5"
Formatted: Font color: Auto
Formatted: List Paragraph, Indent: Left: 0.5", Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

4.d. Include tables of estimates (all quantities should be accompanied by confidence intervals or other statistical measures of uncertainty, unless infeasible; include estimates from previous SAFEs for retrospective comparisons), including:

a.i. All parameters (include recruitments, selectivity parameters, any estimated growth parameters, catchability, etc.).

b.ii. Abundance and biomass time series, including spawning biomass and MMB, including the estimates used for PSC (prohibited species catch) bycatch calculations.

c.iii. Recruitment time series (including average recruitment).

d.iv. Time series of catch divided by spawning biomass (e.g., MMB).

5.e. Include graphs of estimates (all quantities should be accompanied by confidence intervals or other statistical measures of uncertainty, unless infeasible), including:

a.i. Fishery and survey selectivities, molting probabilities, and other schedules depending on parameter estimates.

b.ii. Estimated male, female, mature male, total and effective mature biomass time series (indicate the proxy for B_{MSY} on the relevant plots).

c.iii. Estimated full-selection F over time.

d.iv. Estimated fishing mortality versus estimated spawning stock biomass, including applicable OFL and maximum F_{target} definitions for the stock (see, for example, Fig. 54 of Turnock and Rugolo, 2008). Graphs of this type are useful to evaluate management performance.

e.v. Fit of a stock-recruitment relationship, if feasible.

6.f. Show evaluation of the fit to the data. Model fits should be represented by a solid line while population estimates should be represented by a dotted line. Estimated confidence intervals should be provided on the fit (results for the models [1-3] included in the document should be plotted together to assist with comparisons between estimates).

a.i. Graphs of the fits to observed and model-predicted catches (retained catch and discards), including model-predicted catches and discards for all years to allow discards to be inferred for years for which data are not available.

b.ii. Graphs of model fits to survey numbers (include confidence intervals for the data and model predictions).

c.iii. Graphs of model fits to catch proportions by length (e.g., using bubble and/or line plots).

d.iv. Graphs of model fits to survey proportions by length (e.g., using bubble and/or line plots).

e.v. Marginal distributions for the fits to the compositional and tagging data.

f.vi. Plots of implied versus input effective sample sizes and time-series of implied effective sample sizes.

i. Tables of the root-mean-square errors (RMSEs) for the indices and a comparison with the assumed values for the coefficients of variation assumed for the indices.

vii.

g.viii. Quantile-quantile (q-q) plots and histograms of residuals (to the indices and compositional data) to justify the choices of sampling distributions for the data.

7.g. Include retrospective and historical analyses (provide BOTH).

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: List Paragraph, Indent: Left: 1", Numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1"

Formatted: List Paragraph, Indent: Left: 0.5", Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1", Numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1", Numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1", Numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

~~a.~~i. Retrospective analysis of the key management parameter (e.g., MMB; retrospective bias in preferred ~~base~~ model or models by taking the "best" model and truncating the time-series of data on which the assessment is based).

~~b.~~ii. Historical analysis (plot of actual estimates from current and previous assessments).

~~8.~~h. Include uncertainty and sensitivity analyses. Highlight unresolved problems and major uncertainties, along with any special issues that complicate scientific assessment, including questions about the best model, etc.

~~a.~~i. The best approach for describing uncertainty depends on the situation. Possible approaches (not mutually exclusive) include:

- Sensitivity analyses (tables or figures) that show ending biomass levels, OFLs, and/or likelihood component values obtained while systematically varying (e.g., halving and doubling) the emphasis factors for each type of data (and penalty) in the model.
- Likelihood profiles for parameters or biomass levels.
- CVs for biomass or OFL estimated by bootstrap, the delta method, or Bayesian methods.
- Subjective appraisal of the magnitude and sources of uncertainty.
- Retrospective and historical analyses (see above).
- ~~i.~~ Comparison of alternate models and or assumptions (i.e., model structure uncertainty, as evaluated in Section E.3 of this document).

~~b.~~ii. It is important that some qualitative or quantitative information about relative probability be stated if a range of model runs (e.g., based on CV's or alternative assumptions about model structure or recruitment) is used to depict uncertainty. It is important to state that all scenarios (or all scenarios between the bounds depicted by the runs) are equally likely if no statements about relative probability can be made.

~~c.~~iii. Simulation results.

~~9.~~i. Examine retrospective patterns in estimation of recruitment deviations using squid plots. Do not include the last year in average recruitment calculations.

j. Conduct 'jitter analysis' that involves randomly adjusting all of the initial values (by ~10%), re-running the model fitting process, and recording the resulting likelihood and OFLs or terminal MMB.

5. Stock projections

Include a table of 5-year projections of stock abundance and fishery yields for the author's recommended model run with the following setup:

a. Projections should be based on an average fishing mortality from the last five years, with the exception of a linear extrapolation from previous five years of fishing mortality for stocks with a declining trend.

- **Formatted:** Indent: Left: 1", Numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1"
- **Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.5", Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"
- **Formatted:** Indent: Left: 1", Numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1"
- **Formatted:** Font color: Auto
- **Formatted:** Indent: Left: 1.25"
- **Formatted:** Font color: Auto
- **Formatted:** List Paragraph, Indent: Left: 1.25", Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1"
- **Formatted:** Indent: Left: 1.25"
- **Formatted:** Font color: Auto
- **Formatted:** List Paragraph, Indent: Left: 1.25", Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1"
- **Formatted:** Indent: Left: 1.25"
- **Formatted:** Font color: Auto
- **Formatted:** List Paragraph, Indent: Left: 1.25", Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1"
- **Formatted:** Indent: Left: 1.25"
- **Formatted:** Font color: Auto
- **Formatted:** List Paragraph, Indent: Left: 1.25", Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1"
- **Formatted:** Indent: Left: 1.25"
- **Formatted:** Font color: Auto
- **Formatted:** List Paragraph, Indent: Left: 1.25", Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1"
- **Formatted:** Indent: Left: 1", Numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1"
- **Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.5", Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"
- **Formatted:** Heading 3, Add space between paragraphs of the same style, Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 0.5", Tab stops: Not at 0.5"
- **Formatted:** Font: 12 pt
- **Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.5", No bullets or numbering
- **Formatted:** Font: 12 pt
- **Formatted:** Font: 12 pt, Font color: Auto
- **Formatted:** Font: 12 pt
- **Formatted:** Justified, Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.25", Space After: 0 pt, Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 0.5"
- **Formatted:** Font: 12 pt

b. Recruitment should be bootstrapped from historical recruitments from the period used for status determination of that stock, or for stocks with years of recent low recruitment, a shorter time period reflecting that lower recruitment level.

c. Initiate projections using either the maximum likelihood estimates (MLEs) from the recommended model or from MCMC draws from that model.

~~10.~~d. Assessment authors should modify the standard approach to deal with specific situations, such as periods of low recruitment, or novel management situations. Multiple projections may be required to adequately characterize assessment uncertainties, such as, for example, generating projections using both the full set of recruitment estimates and recruitment estimates from a more recent time period. It may be appropriate to provide a series of projections at various percentiles of recent average fishing mortality (e.g. 0%, 25%, 50%, 75%, 100%, 125%) when the State of Alaska is considering a range of options in implementing the TAC. However, the number of projection scenarios should be limited to the extent possible to avoid possible confusion.

F. Calculation of the OFL

1. Include specification of the Tier level and stock status level for computing the OFL, along with the basis for the selection. For Tier 4 and 5 stocks, the rationale for the time period used to define proxy B_{MSY}, B_{REF} (Tier 4) and the average retained catch used to compute the O FL (Tier 5) needs to be specified. Note that the default time period to define B_{REF} is the entire time series (including the current year). Justification and comparative results should be provided for both alternatives.
2. List parameter and stock size estimates (or best available proxies thereof) required by limit and target control rules specified in the fishery management plan.
3. Include specification of the total catch OFL:
    a. Provide the equations (from Amendment 24) on which the OFL is to be based, including the equations used to project discard and bycatch by sex (the mathematical specifications for this need to be documented in a peer-reviewed publication or in a technical appendix). Include documentation on how fishery selectivity is determined for the OFL projection.
    b. Provide the basis for projecting MMB to the time of mating (the mathematical specifications for this need to be documented in a peer-reviewed publication or in a technical appendix).
    c. Include specification of F_{OFL}, OFL, and other applicable measures (if any) relevant to determining whether the stock is overfished or if overfishing is occurring (e.g., B_{REF}, $B_{35\%}$). Include estimates from the present assessment and the assessments since 2006/07. Table 2 of this Appendix lists examples of tables for Tiers 3, 4 and 5.
4. Include specification of the retained catch portion of the total catch OFL:
    a. Provide the equations on which the recommendation for the retained portion of the total catch OFL is to be based.
5. Include recommendations for F_{OFL}, OFL total catch, and the retained catch portion of the OFL for the coming year. List the OFLs by sector (retained catch, discard in the directed fishery, bycatch in other crab fisheries, the groundfish fishery, etc.), where appropriate.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.25"
Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Formatted: Default, Justified, Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.25", Add space between paragraphs of the same style, Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 0.5", Tab stops: Not at 0.5"
Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Formatted: Font color: Black
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Explicitly state the metric used for the OFL, i.e., whether it is males only, all crab, or catch and discards, etc.

6. Provide a table summarizing the management quantities for each of the proposed models. Include ending year MMB, $B_{35\%}$, $F_{35\%}$, F_{OFL}, OFL, M, Average Recruitment, and stock status relative to B_{MSY}.

~~5.~~

G. Calculation of the ABC

1. Include specification of the probability distribution of the OFL used in the ABC control rule, including clear explanation and justification for use of the median or mean.
2. List variables related to scientific uncertainty considered in the OFL probability distribution.
3. List additional uncertainties relative to setting the ABC and include calculation methods for an alternative ABC.
4. Include an author recommended ABC and, if less than maxABC, provide rationale for establishing less than maximum permissible.
5. Always include the maxABC value regardless of author's recommendation, and describe how it is calculated.
6. When SSC-recommended ABCs have been lower than the maxABC, provide a short summary of the buffers applied to OFL to obtain the recommended ABC for the previous three assessments, and the factors considered by the SSC in developing those ABC recommendations.

~~5.~~

H. Rebuilding Analyses

Rebuilding analyses should be provided for stocks which are currently under a rebuilding plan.

1. Include the definition of recovery (including the definition of the proxy for B_{MSY} and the number of years that the biomass needs to exceed the proxy for B_{MSY} for the stock to be recovered).
2. State the year in which the rebuilding plan started and the year by which the stock should be recovered to the proxy for B_{MSY}.
3. Include specification of the approach used to project the model forward (e.g., assumptions about parameter uncertainty, future recruitment and selectivity, and how discards and bycatch are computed given fishing mortality on mature males).
4. Include projections under different levels of fishing mortality on mature males to evaluate the probability of recovery to the proxy for B_{MSY} over time. Results should be produced for (a) no targeted fishing, (b) bycatch only, (c) probabilities of recovery of 0.5, 0.6, 0.7 and 0.8, and (d) a harvest strategy corresponding to 75% of the F_{OFL}.

~~5.~~ Include tables of total catch, retained catch, and probability of recovery against time for the rebuilding strategies listed under (4).

5. Include a graph of the annual status of the stock relative to the B_{MSY} and MSST from the start of the rebuilding period to the present.

~~6.~~

Formatted: Indent: Hanging: 0.25"
Formatted: Font: Italic
Formatted: Font: Italic, Subscript
Formatted: Font: Italic
Formatted: Font: Italic, Subscript
Formatted: Font: Italic
Formatted: Font: Italic, Subscript
Formatted: Font: Italic
Formatted: Font: Italic, Subscript
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", No bullets or numbering
Formatted: Heading 2
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", Hanging: 0.25", Outline numbered + Level: 4 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 4.25" + Indent at: 2.25"
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", No bullets or numbering

I. Data Gaps and Research Priorities

Identify information which could feasibly be collected and analyses which should be undertaken to improve the assessment. Ideally, data collection and analysis needs should be listed in priority order.

J. Ecosystem Considerations

New products have been developed to provide indicators of environmental and ecosystem conditions for crab stocks, such as ESPs (Ecosystem Socioeconomic Profiles) and ESP report cards. These should be included as appendices to the final draft of the SAFE report chapter that is submitted to Council staff. An ecosystem consideration section is optional for those assessments that do not include an ESP or an ESP report card. If an ecosystem considerations section is included, the following format should be followed:

Ecosystem Effects on the Stock

The following factors should be discussed:

1. Prey availability/abundance trends (historically, in the present, and in the foreseeable future). These prey trends could affect growth or survival of a target stock.
2. Predator population trends (historically, in the present, and in the foreseeable future). These trends could affect stock mortality rates over time.
3. Changes in habitat quality (historically, in the present, and in the foreseeable future).
4. Changes in the physical environment such as temperature, currents, or ice distribution could affect stock migration and distribution patterns, recruitment success, or direct effects of temperature on growth.

Fishery Effects on the Ecosystem

The following factors should be discussed:

1. Fishery-specific contribution to bycatch of prohibited species, forage (including herring and juvenile pollock), HAPC biota (in particular, species common to the target fishery), marine mammals, birds, and other sensitive non-target species (including top predators such as sharks, expressed as a percentage of the total bycatch of that species.
2. Fishery-specific concentration of target catch in space and time relative to predator needs in space and time (if known) and relative to spawning components.
3. Fishery-specific effects on amount of large-size target crab.
4. Fishery-specific contribution to discards and offal production.
5. Fishery-specific effects on size at maturity and fecundity of the target species.
6. Fishery-specific effects on EFH non-living substrate (using gear specific fishing effort as a proxy for amount of possible substrate disturbance).

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25"
Formatted: Heading 2
Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt
Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt
Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Bold, Italic
Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border)
Formatted: Font: Italic
Formatted: Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border)
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", Hanging: 0.25"
Formatted: List Paragraph, Indent: Left: 1.25", Space After: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border)
Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Bold, Italic
Formatted: Font: Italic
Formatted: Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border)
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", Hanging: 0.25"
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", Hanging: 0.25", Outline numbered + Level: 4 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 4.25" + Indent at: 2.25"
Formatted: Font color: Black

K~~J~~. Literature Cited

Include citations that are relevant to understanding the stock and its status, but are not cited in the report in a special "extra references" section.

Addendum: Additional notes to authors

~~K. Presentations~~

~~1. Provide single plot of all model data sources and years applicable for each.(add this to Exec summary section too)~~

~~2. Provide code for figures to be shared in a repository.~~

SAFE chapter updates

For crab stocks that are not assessed annually, as well as crab stocks that are assessed annually but prior to fishery completion, an update to the SAFE chapter should be provided at the September CPT meeting. The only required element to this update is an estimate of the total catch for the completed fishing year, including any bycatch that might have occurred in other fisheries. This information is used to make a determination as to whether overfishing is occurring, and to update the summary tables in the SAFE introduction. Other information can be provided to the CPT if deemed relevant (such as the latest survey estimates). Only catches that were missing, incomplete, or incorrect when an assessment was accepted by the CPT, SSC, and the Council should be updated in the summary tables provided in the SAFE introduction section. In contrast, the record of specified management reference points are not updated in those tables since they were the basis for SSC and Council decision-making.

~~L.~~ Recommendations on d~~D~~ata weighting

1. Provide the weights assigned to the data in the form of CVs (for indices and catches) and effective sample sizes for compositional data.
2. Assessment authors should explore whether the assumed CV for the indices (or catches) match the variation of the residuals. Weighting of indices would involve adding an estimated "extra CV" parameter, which would be estimated.
3. The weighting of the compositional data should be based on computing effective sample sizes for each year using the McAllister-Ianelli (1997) method. If the effective sample sizes are to be tuned, the tuning process should involve multiplying the input sampling sizes by the harmonic mean of the ratio of the McAllister-Ianelli method to the input effective sample size.
4. The McAllister-Ianelli method can lead to biased estimates of effective sample sizes if the residuals are not independent. An alternative approach is that Francis (2011), which involves calculating an effective sample size based on the difference between expected and observed mean lengths by year. Authors should compute the weighting factor developed by Francis (2011), equation TA1,8, and ideally show sensitivity to using Francis weight.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Formatted: Heading 2

Formatted: Font: Italic, Font color: Black

Formatted: Heading 2, Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0", Line spacing: single, Widow/Orphan control

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Italic, Font color: Black

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, Italic

Formatted: Justified, Indent: Left: 0.25", First line: 0", Line spacing: single

Formatted: Justified, Line spacing: single

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Justified, Indent: Left: 0.25", Line spacing: single, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Justified, Line spacing: single

Table 1. Requirements for assessments by Tier level.

Report Section	Tiers 1-~~4~~3; ~~Tier 4 (with assessment)~~	Tier 5
Executive Summary	Yes	Yes
A. Summary of Major Changes	Yes	Yes
B. Responses to SSC and CPT comments	Yes	Yes
C. Introduction	Yes	Yes
D. Data	Yes	Yes[1~~2~~]
E. Analytical Approach	Yes	Yes[2~~3~~]
F. Calculation of the OFL	Yes	Yes
G. Calculation of the ABC	Yes	Yes
H. Rebuilding Analyses	Yes[3~~4~~]	Yes[3~~4~~]
I. Data Gaps and Research Priorities	Yes	Yes
J. Ecosystem Considerations	Yes	Yes
K. Literature Cited	Yes	Yes

~~1 – Items 2c, 2e need not be reported in full~~
1~~2~~ – Items 2c -2e need not be reported in full
2~~3~~ – Limited to plots of survey data and catches
3~~4~~ – Only for stocks under rebuilding

Formatted Table

Table 2. Examples of summary tables of management performance by Tier level (the table is structured for an assessment conducted in September 20~~09~~20). Biomass and MSST are from the assessment completed in that year. For stocks with multi-year assessment cycles, specification tables should provide OFLs and ABCs for each year until the next scheduled assessment for the stock.

(a) ~~(a)~~ Stocks in Tiers 1-~~3~~4.
~~and those in Tier 4 for which there is an agreed assessment model (1000 t)~~
Status and catch specifications (1000). Shaded values are new estimates or projections based on the current assessment. Other table entries are based on historical assessments and are not updated except for total and retained catch.

Year	MSST	Biomass (MMB)	TAC	Retained Catch	Total Catch	OFL	ABC
2017/18~~2005/06~~	12.74	24.86~~100~~	2.99~~60~~	3.09~~40~~	3.48~~58~~	5.60	5.04
2018/19~~2006/07~~	10.62	16.92~~120~~	1.95~~60~~	2.03~~51~~	2.65~~55~~	5.34	4.27
2019/20~~2007/08~~	12.72~~230~~	14.24~~130~~	1.72~~60~~	1.78~~55~~	2.22~~56~~	3.40	2.72
2020/21~~2008/09~~	12.12~~221~~	13.96~~219~~	1.20~~60~~	1.26~~47~~	1.57~~55~~	2.14~~91~~	1.61
2021/22		14.95				2.23	1.78
~~2009/10~~		~~280~~				~~78~~	

Status and catch specifications (million lb). Shaded values are new estimates or projections based on the current assessment. Other table entries are based on historical assessments and are not updated except for total and retained catch.

Year	MSST	Biomass (MMB)	TAC	Retained Catch	Total Catch	OFL	ABC
2017/18~~2005/06~~	28.1	54.8~~100~~[A]	6.60~~60~~	6.82~~40~~	7.93~~58~~	12.35	11.11
2018/19~~2006/07~~	23.4	37.3~~120~~[B]	4.31~~60~~	4.31~~51~~	5.85~~55~~	11.76	9.41
2019/20~~2007/08~~	28.02~~30~~	31.4~~130~~[C]	3.80~~60~~	3.91~~55~~	4.89~~56~~	7.50	6.00
2020/21~~2008/09~~	26.72~~21~~	30.8~~219~~[D]	2.77~~60~~	2.65~~47~~	3.47~~55~~	4.72~~91~~	3.54
2021/22~~2009/10~~		33.0~~280~~[D]				4.91~~78~~	3.92

The stock was above MSST in 2020/21~~08/09~~ and is hence not overfished. Overfishing did not occur during the 20~~08~~20/~~09~~21 fishing year.

~~(b) Stocks in Tier 4 for which there is not an agreed assessment model~~

~~Year~~	~~MSST~~	~~Biomass (MMB)~~	~~TAC~~	~~Retained Catch~~	~~Total Catch~~	~~OFL~~	~~ABC~~
~~2005/06~~		~~100~~	~~60~~	~~40~~	~~58~~		
~~2006/07~~		~~120~~	~~60~~	~~51~~	~~55~~		
~~2007/08~~	~~230~~	~~130~~	~~60~~	~~55~~	~~56~~		
~~2008/09~~	~~221~~	~~219~~	~~60~~	~~47~~	~~55~~	~~91~~	
~~2009/10~~		~~280~~				~~78~~	

~~The stock was above MSST in 2008/09 and is hence not overfished. Overfishing did not occur during the 2008/09 fishing year.~~

(b) ~~(c)~~ Stocks in Tier 5 ~~(1000 t)~~.

Status and catch specifications (t). Shaded values are new estimates or projections based on the current assessment. Other table entries are based on historical assessments and are not updated except for total and retained catch.

Year	MSST	Biomass (MMB)	TAC	Retained Catch	Total Catch	OFL	ABC
2017/18~~20~~ ~~05/06~~	N/A	N/A~~N/A~~	Closed~~60~~	0~~40~~	<1~~58~~	56	34
2018/19~~20~~ ~~06/07~~	N/A	N/A~~N/A~~	Closed~~60~~	0~~51~~	<1~~55~~	56	14
2019/20~~20~~ ~~07/08~~	N/A~~N/A~~	N/A~~N/A~~	Closed~~60~~	0~~55~~	<1~~56~~	56	14
2020/21~~20~~ ~~08/09~~	N/A~~N/A~~	N/A~~N/A~~	Closed~~60~~	0~~47~~	<1~~55~~	56~~91~~	14
2021/22~~20~~ ~~09/10~~	N/A	N/A~~N/A~~				56~~78~~	14

Status and catch specifications (million lb). Shaded values are new estimates or projections based on the current assessment. Other table entries are based on historical assessments and are not updated except for total and retained catch. ~~(c) Stocks in Tier 5 (million lb)~~

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted: Font color: Auto
Formatted: List Paragraph, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"
Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Formatted: List Paragraph, Indent: Left: 0.25"
Formatted: Font color: Auto
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted Table
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Year	MSST	Biomass (MMB)	TAC	Retained Catch	Total Catch	OFL	ABC
2017/182 005/06	N/A	N/AN/A	Closed60	040	0.0007558	0.12387	0.03097
2018/192 006/07	N/A	N/AN/A	Closed60	051	0.0003155	0.12387	0.03097
2019/202 007/08	N/AN/A	N/AN/A	Closed60	055	0.0016456	0.12387	0.03097
2020/212 008/09	N/AN/A	N/AN/A	Closed60	047	0.0007355	0.1238791	0.03097
2021/222 009/10	N/A	N/AN/A	Closed			0.1238778	0.03097

No overfished determination is possible for this stock given the lack of biomass information. Overfishing did not occur during the 202008/2109 fishing year.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted Table
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Table 3. Examples of tables that summarize how the OFL was calculated (the table is structured for an assessment conducted in September 20~~09~~20). The rows for 20~~21~~/22~~08/09~~ were agreed by the Crab Plan Team in September 20~~20~~80 ~~and those for 2009/10 were agreed by the Crab Plan Team in September 2010~~.

(a) ~~(a)~~ Stocks in Tiers 1-~~3~~4 ~~and those in Tier 4 for which there is an agreed assessment model~~.

Basis for the OFL: Values in 1,000 t

Year	Tier	B_{MSY}	Current MMB	B/B_{MSY} (MMB)	F_{OFL}	Years to define B_{MSY}	Natural Mortality
~~2008/09~~	~~3b~~	~~231~~	~~219.5~~	~~0.95~~	~~0.15yr^{-1}~~	~~1978/79-2008/09~~	~~0.25yr^{-1}~~
2017/18~~2009/10~~	3b~~3a~~	25.1~~234~~	21.3~~245.7~~	0.85~~1.05~~	0.24~~0.19yr^{-1}~~	1984-2017~~1978/79-2009/10~~	0.18~~0.25yr^{-1}~~
2018/19	3b	25.5	20.8	0.82	0.25	1984-2017	0.18
2019/20	3b	21.2	16.0	0.75	0.22	1984-2018	0.18
2020/21	3b	25.4	14.9	0.59	0.16	1984-2019	0.18
2021/22	3b	24.2	14.9	0.62	0.17	1984-2020	0.18

~~(b) Stocks in Tier 4 for which there is not an agreed assessment model~~

~~Year~~	~~Tier~~	~~B_{MSY}~~	~~Current MMB~~	~~B/B_{MSY} (MMB)~~	~~γ~~	~~Years to define B_{MSY}~~	~~Natural Mortality~~	~~P*~~
~~2008/09~~	~~4b~~	~~231~~	~~219.5~~	~~0.95~~	~~1.0~~	~~1978/79-2008/09~~	~~0.25yr^{-1}~~	
~~2009/10~~	~~4a~~	~~234~~	~~245.7~~	~~1.05~~	~~0.6~~	~~1978/79-2009/10~~	~~0.25yr^{-1}~~	

Basis for the OFL: Values in million lb

Year	Tier	B_{MSY}	Current MMB	B/B_{MSY} (MMB)	F_{OFL}	Years to define B_{MSY}	Natural Mortality
2017/18	3b	55.2	47.0	0.85	0.24	1984-2017	0.18
2018/19	3b	56.2	45.9	0.82	0.25	1984-2017	0.18
2019/20	3b	46.8	35.2	0.75	0.22	1984-2018	0.18
2020/21	3b	56.1	32.9	0.59	0.16	1984-2019	0.18
2021/22	3b	53.4	33.0	0.62	0.17	1984-2020	0.18

(~~e~~b) Stocks in Tier 5.

Formatted: Font color: Auto
Formatted: Font color: Auto
Formatted: List Paragraph
Formatted: Font color: Auto
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted Table
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted Table
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Year	Tier	Years to define Average catch (OFL)	Natural Mortality	Buffer
~~2008/09~~	~~5~~	~~1978/79-2008/09~~	~~0.25yr^{-1}~~	
2017/18	5	1995/96-2007/08	0.18yr^{-1}	75%
2018/19	5	1995/96-2007/08	0.18yr^{-1}	75%
2019/20	5	1995/96-2007/08	0.18yr^{-1}	75%
2020/21	5	1995/96-2007/08	0.18yr^{-1}	75%
2021/22	5	1995/96-2007/08	0.18yr^{-1}	75%
~~2009/10~~	~~5~~	~~1978/79-2009/10~~	~~0.25yr^{-1}~~	

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted Table
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Formatted Table
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Table 4. Categories for which information on catches and discards should ideally be provided.

Directed pot fishery (males)
Directed pot fishery (females)
Bycatch in other crab fisheries (by sex)
Bycatch in groundfish pot (by sex)
Bycatch in groundfish trawl (by sex)
Bycatch in the scallop fishery