

Stock Assessment Frequency

Joint Plan Team Discussion

November 13, 2017

new assessment frequency-presented in October to Council

Assessment	Author	Tiers 1-3	Frequency	
			Old	New
AI pollock	Barbeaux	yes	1	2
BSAI Greenland turbot	Bryan	yes	1	2
BSAI northern rock sole	Wilderbuer	yes	1	2
BSAI other flatfish	Wilderbuer	no	2	4
BSAI sculpins	Spies	no	2	4
GOA N/S rock sole	Bryan	yes	2	4
GOA other shallow-water flatfish	Turnock	no	2	4
GOA Dover sole	McGilliard	yes	2	4
GOA other deep-water flatfish	McGilliard	no	2	4
GOA rex sole	McGilliard	no	2	4
GOA flathead sole	Turnock	no	2	4
GOA sculpins	Spies	no	2	4
BSAI/GOA grenadier	Rodgveller	no	2	4

New assessment frequency requests-presented in October to Council

SSC requested (2/17) that the following analyses prior to the new assessment schedule:

1. An evaluation of how projected OFL-to-ABC buffers should increase in the intervening years between full assessments
2. Development of a framework for evaluating the costs and benefits of changing the target frequency for the affected stocks and complexes
3. A more quantitative evaluation of the potential risks of changing the target frequency of the GOA flatfish stocks to a four-year cycle

ew assessment frequency

- Team discussion:
 - None of the requested analyses have been undertaken
 - AFSC has already proceeded with the new schedule
 - Therefore, it is impossible to fulfill the SSC's request to have the three analyses completed prior to implementation of the new assessment schedule

ew assessment frequency

The minutes of the Joint Teams' January meeting show that stocks or complexes were not recommended for moving to a lower assessment frequency unless the following three criteria were met:

- The average annual change in biomass was low
- The average ratio of catch to ABC was low
- The importance to the fishery was low

ew assessment frequency

- With all due respect, the Teams recommend that the Council reconsider the need for the two analyses that were requested to be completed prior to proceeding with the second year of the new assessment schedule
- The SSC also developed a list of research areas which it said could be addressed as a result of decreasing the assessment workload of the affected authors
- The Council then asked that the Teams refine that list during their 2017 meetings
- The Teams reviewed the list and had no recommendations for changes

Results of Council discussion in October 2017

Does the table of assessment frequency accurately represent what was recommended to the Council when it “conditionally approved” the new assessment schedule?

- Yes. It differs from the Joint Teams recommendations on assessment frequency coming from their January special Plan Team meeting, but it is consistent with the SSC’s recommendation to the Council in February 2017.

Council's expressed concern

How can the Council continue to endorse their 'conditional acceptance' of the new schedule absent the requested analyses

How best to ensure that the efficiencies gained in this new process will not allow for straying from sound science to inform management.

Joint Teams to discuss how best to plan for and accomplish the following:

- Cost/benefit analysis
- Buffer analysis
- Risk analysis for GOA flatfish

Joint Team discussion

Who should take the lead on each of the three analysis?

Plan Team subgroup for each? Single or multiple agency discussion paper? Refer to Council for staff tasking?

We need to provide feedback to the Council in our report for December as to our recommendations on how to move forward, by whom and on what timeline