AFSC Groundfish Stock Assessment Guidelines

Alaska Fisheries Science Center Melissa Haltuch and Chris Lunsford



Disclaimer

Internal to AFSC document

Informational share with the NPFMC advisory bodies

Living document that will be updated as needed



2023

Updated to reflect assessment prioritization schedule and products definitions

2024

Provide guidance for September - November products Clarify what goes into operational full and operational update stock assessments Revise model results section with emphasis on model diagnostics and convergence criteria Revise and clarify projections and harvest recommendations section Revise risk table section to reflect SSC requests Revise ecosystem sections



AFSC Groundfish Stock Assessment Guidelines

	Assessment Type			
Section	Operational Full	Operational Update	Harvest Projection	Catch Report
Title Page/Authorship	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Executive Summary				
Summary of Changes to Assessment Inputs	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Summary of Results	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Responses to SSC/Plan Team Comments in general	Yes	Abbreviated	No	No
Responses to SSC/Plan Team Specific to assessment	Yes	Abbreviated	No	No
Introduction	Yes	Abbreviated	No	No
Fishery and Management History	Yes	Abbreviated	No	No
Data	Yes	Yes	No	No
Fishery	Yes	Abbreviated	No	No
Survey	Yes	Abbreviated	No	No
Other	As Needed	As Needed	No	No
Analytic Approach				
Description of alternative models	Yes	No	No	No



AFSC Groundfish Stock Assessment Guidelines

	Assessment Type			
Section	Operational Full	Operational Update	Harvest Projection	Catch Report
Results				
Tables	Yes	Yes	No	No
Figures	Yes	Yes	No	No
Evaluation of Model(s) and Associated Uncertainty	Yes (Tier 1-3)	Yes (Tier 1-3)	No	No
Sensitivity to Model Specification	Yes (Tier 1-3)	Yes (Tier 1-3)	No	No
Convergence Status and Criteria	Yes (Tier 1-3)	Yes (Tier 1-3)	No	No
Likelihood Profiles on Key Parameters	Yes (Tier 1-3)	Yes (Tier 1-3)	No	No
Retrospective Analysis	Yes (Tier 1-3)	Yes (Tier 1-3)	No	No
Historic Retrospectives	Yes (Tier 1-3)	Yes (Tier 1-3)	No	No
Projections and Harvest Recommendations				
Amendment 56 reference points	Yes	Yes	No	No
Specification of OFL and ABC	Yes (Tiers 1-5)	Yes (Tiers 1-5)	Yes	No
Standard Harvest Scenarios	Yes (Tiers 1-3)	Yes (Tier 1-3)	No	No



AFSC Groundfish Stock Assessment Guidelines RESULTS

Tier 1-3 Models Onl	y	Full	Update (Nov. PT only)
	Time series of derived quantities, with uncertainty intervals, for recommended and base models	Sept & Nov	√
Model Results	Fits to all data sources	Sept & Nov	√
	Parameter estimates, with uncertainty	Sept & Nov	√
Model Evaluation	Sensitivity to model specification (e.g., dropping datasets, LOO, Steepness, M). Can be hosted as an external file.	Sept	
	Convergence status and criteria, including jitter analysis or evidence that posterior sampling is adequate if Bayesian methods are used.	Sept & Nov	√
	Likelihood profile(s) on key parameters	Sept	
	10-year retrospective analysis (biomass), with uncertainty intervals if feasible	Sept & Nov	
	Comparison of past assessment estimates	Sept & Nov	



AFSC Groundfish Stock Assessment Guidelines Standard Harvest Scenarios and Projection Methodology: Tiers 1-3

Standard set of projections

7 Scenarios

Standardized software and settings for projections

spmR

Stock Synthesis 3



	Assessment Type				
Section	Operational Full	Operational Update	Harvest Projection	Catch Report	
Risk table and ABC recommendation	Yes	Yes	No	No	
Area allocation of ABC	Yes	Yes	Abbreviated	No	
Status determination	Yes	Yes	No	No	
F limit	Yes (Tiers 1-3)	Yes (Tiers 1-3)	No	No	
Ecosystem Considerations					
Ecosystem effects on the stock	Yes	Abbreviated	No	No	
Fishery effects on the stock	Yes	Abbreviated	No	No	
Data Gaps and research priorities	Yes	Yes	No	No	



Risk Table Levels of Concern

Team Effort Sandra Lowe, Cole Monnahan, Maia Kapur, Kalei Shotwell, Stephani Zador, Ebett Siddon, Bridget Ferriss, Ivonne Ortiz, and others



Background

- In the report of the 2021 Risk Table Workshop (pages 33-34 of <u>June 2021 SSC report</u>), SSC recommended risk table category levels be revised from the existing 4 categories to 3 categories (normal, increased, extreme)
- The 2023 stock assessment risk tables used 3 categories dropping level 2 (substantially increased concerns), but did not change the category descriptions
- The SSC requested the risk tables use 3 categories of concern (normal, increased, extreme), and revise the category descriptions to cover the range in the original table



The SSC requests that the general risk table *with definitions* be placed in the introductory SAFE material, and that authors include the species specific implementation of the risk table in the stock assessment for operational full and operational update assessments.



Risk Table Levels of Concern (2018-2022 definitions)				
	Assessment-related considerations	Population dynamics considerations	Environmental/ecosystem considerations	Fishery Performance*
Level 1: Normal	Typical to moderately increased uncertainty/minor unresolved issues in assessment.	Stock trends are typical for the stock; recent recruitment is within normal range.	No apparent environmental/ecosystem concerns	No apparent fishery/resource-use performance and/or behavior concerns
Level 2: Substantially increased concerns	Substantially increased assessment uncertainty/ unresolved issues.	Stock trends are unusual; abundance increasing or decreasing faster than has been seen recently, or recruitment pattern is atypical.	Some indicators showing adverse signals relevant to the stock but the pattern is not consistent across all indicators.	Some indicators showing adverse signals but the pattern is not consistent across all indicators
Level 3: Major Concern	Major problems with the stock assessment; very poor fits to data; high level of uncertainty; strong retrospective bias.	Stock trends are highly unusual; very rapid changes in stock abundance, or highly atypical recruitment patterns.	Multiple indicators showing consistent adverse signals a) across the same trophic level as the stock, and/or b) up or down trophic levels (i.e., predators and prey of the stock)	Multiple indicators showing consistent adverse signals a) across different sectors, and/or b) different gear types
Level 4: Extreme concern	Severe problems with the stock assessment; severe retrospective bias. Assessment considered unreliable.	Stock trends are unprecedented; More rapid changes in stock abundance than have ever been seen previously, or a very long stretch of poor recruitment compared to previous patterns.	Extreme anomalies in multiple ecosystem indicators that are highly likely to impact the stock; Potential for cascading effects on other ecosystem components	Extreme anomalies in multiple performance indicators that are highly likely to impact the stock

*Fishery Performance was added in 2019

Risk Table Levels of Concern (2023 definition)				
	Assessment-related considerations	Population dynamics considerations	Environmental/ecosystem considerations	Fishery Performance
Level 1: Normal	Typical to moderately increased uncertainty/minor unresolved issues in assessment.	Stock trends are typical for the stock; recent recruitment is within normal range.	No apparent environmental/ecosystem concerns	No apparent fishery/resource-use performance and/or behavior concerns
Level 2: Substantially increased concerns	Substantially increased assessment uncertainty/ unresolved issues.	Stock trends are unusual; abundance increasing or decreasing faster than has been seen recently, or recruitment pattern is atypical.	Some indicators showing adverse signals relevant to the stock but the pattern is not consistent across all indicators.	Some indicators showing adverse signals but the pattern is not consistent across all indicators
Level 2: Major Concern	Major problems with the stock assessment; very poor fits to data; high level of uncertainty; strong retrospective bias.	Stock trends are highly unusual; very rapid changes in stock abundance, or highly atypical recruitment patterns.	Multiple indicators showing consistent adverse signals a) across the same trophic level as the stock, and/or b) up or down trophic levels (i.e., predators and prey of the stock)	Multiple indicators showing consistent adverse signals a) across different sectors, and/or b) different gear types
Level 3: Extreme concern	Severe problems with the stock assessment; severe retrospective bias. Assessment considered unreliable.	Stock trends are unprecedented; More rapid changes in stock abundance than have ever been seen previously, or a very long stretch of poor recruitment compared to previous patterns.	Extreme anomalies in multiple ecosystem indicators that are highly likely to impact the stock; Potential for cascading effects on other ecosystem components	Extreme anomalies in multiple performance indicators that are highly likely to impact the stock

Proposed Risk Table Levels of Concern for 2024				
	Assessment-related considerations	Population dynamics considerations	Environmental/Ecosystem considerations	Fishery Performance
Level 1: Normal	Typical to moderately increased uncertainty/minor unresolved issues in assessment.	Stock population dynamics (e.g., recruitment, growth, natural mortality) are typical for the stock and recent trends are within normal range.	No apparent ecosystem concerns related to biological status (e.g., environment, prey, competition, predation), or minor concerns with uncertain impacts on the stock.	No apparent concerns related to biological status (e.g., stock abundance, distribution, fish condition), or few minor concerns with uncertain impacts on the stock.
Level 2: Major Increased concern	Substantially increased assessment uncertainty/ unresolved issues, such as residual patterns and substantial retrospective patterns, especially positive ones.	Stock population dynamics (e.g., recruitment, growth, natural mortality) are unusual; trends increasing or decreasing faster than has been seen recently, or patterns are atypical.	Indicator(s) with adverse signals related to biological status (e.g., environment, prey, competition, predation).	Several indicators with adverse signals related to biological status (e.g., stock abundance, distribution, fish condition).
Level 3: Extreme concern	Severe assessment problems; very poor fits to important data; high level of uncertainty; very strong retrospective patterns, especially positive ones.	Stock population dynamics (e.g., recruitment, growth, natural mortality) are extremely unusual; very rapid changes in trends, or highly atypical patterns compared to previous patterns.	Indicator(s) showing a combined frequency (low/high) and magnitude(low/high) to cause severe adverse signals a) across the same trophic level as the stock, and/or b) up or down trophic levels (i.e., predators and prey of the stock) that are likely to impact the stock.	Multiple indicators with strong adverse signals related to biological status (e.g., stock abundance, distribution, fish condition), a) across different sectors, and/or b) different gear types.



Future Topics

AFSC Guidelines is a living internal document FIMS is coming...

