Risk Table Report

SSC sub-group: Anne Hollowed, Sherri Dressel, Curry Cunningham, Mike Downs, Brad Harris, Ian Stewart and Alison Whitman

Contributors: Martin Dorn, Bridget Ferriss, Daniel Gothel, Alan Haynie, James Ianelli, Stephen Kasperski, Kalei Shotwell, Elizabeth Siddon, Paul Spencer, Grant Thompson, and Stephani Zador

Synthesis of information from February Workshop

SSC Task

Develop preliminary advice to authors for September

Overview of report

- Discussion 1: Introduction to Risk Tables: historical background, conceptual framework, synthesis of applications
- Discussion 2: Frameworks for addressing uncertainty
- Discussion 3: Quantifying the importance of assessment risk
- Discussion 4: Population dynamics risk
- Discussion 5: risk of external changes in ecosystem conditions
- Discussion 6: risk of changes in fishery performance
- Discussion 7:Comparing P* and decision theoretic approaches
- Discussion 8: joint probability for linking risk table to ABC reduction

Objectives

- Assess the progress and value of species-specific risk tables for all stocks
- Evaluate risk table consistency among species and highlight challenges
- Define "risk" and "uncertainty"
- Compare ABC and OFL buffers for scientific uncertainty with ABC reductions due to the risk table
- Discuss future options

Time line

Date/Meeting	Action	Who
June 2021	Assemble full workshop report	SSC/Workshop Session lead
June 2021	Preliminary recommendations	SSC/NPFMC
September 2021	Comment and recommendations	CPT/GPT
October 2021	Finalize 2021 recommendations	SSC/NPFMC

 Reductions in ABC below the maximum permissible are intended to be infrequent and only occur under exceptional circumstances. If they begin to become commonplace, that should warrant further review of the assessment and/or the Tier system.

- The SSC recognizes that within the context of the risk tables, "risk" is the risk of the ABC exceeding the true (but unknown) OFL. The risk tables are intended to inform the process of adjusting the ABC from the maximum when needed. The risk tables provide an avenue for articulating the justification for a reduction.
- The SSC recommends that risk tables are produced each year for all groundfish (and perhaps crab) stocks and stock complexes in the fishery.

- The framework is intended to provide a clear and transparent basis for communicating assessment-related and stock condition concerns that are not directly captured in model-based uncertainty, the tier system, or harvest control rules.
- The risk table framework is working well.
- The tables have expanded communication among assessment authors and between assessment authors and ecosystem/process researchers.

- Risk scores should be specific to a given species or species complex.
- The SSC recommends that authors of stock complexes consider the dominant and weakest members of the complex when formulating advice.
- Stocks for which the expected catch is much lower than the ABC still need a risk table. This should avoid a situation where the SSC assumes, incorrectly, that there is little risk for a given stock, but the Council then sets the TAC higher than expected.

- The SSC recommends that considerations of reductions in ABCs below the maximum permissible be made on a case-by-case basis with justification based on risk scoring.
- The SSC does not support trying to prescribe a common reduction from maxABC for a given risk score across species because the processes underlying the score may differ among stocks.
- Avoid blanket comparisons across species.

- The SSC recommends that the fishery/community performance column should focus on information that would inform the biological status of the resource and not the effects of proposed ABCs on the fishery or communities or bycatch-related considerations.
- The SSC recognizes that the community impact information is critical for informed decision making for TAC setting and recommends this information be included in other Council documents such as the ACEPO and/or the Economic SAFE.
- The SSC encourages the inclusion of LK/TK/S as a source of knowledge about the condition of the stock.

- The SSC agrees that authors should avoid inclusion of stock trends/processes that are incorporated in the assessment or reflected in the Tier ranking in risk tables. For cases where a process external to the assessment is relevant to two or more risk categories, the SSC recommends that the narrative reflect the interconnected relationships that exist between rankings among risk categories.
- The SSC suggests a potential revision to the category levels: from the existing four to three categories (normal, increased, extreme).