



Suggestions for minutes and SAFE Intro summaries

**NOAA
FISHERIES**

**Alaska Fisheries
Science Center**

Grant Thompson

November 17, 2014

Suggestions for writing minutes

- If a rapporteur is unsure what the Team's recommendation was, including uncertainty as to whether any recommendation was made in the first place:
 - Please *do*: Include a comment to this effect
 - Please *do not*: Hide a pseudo-recommendation somewhere in the main text by using language such as “the Team suggests” or “the Team agreed that authors should” (as opposed to the established format for Team recommendations)
- Please *do not* make substantive “stealth edits” of recommendations
 - If someone wants to suggest a substantive change in the draft text of a recommendation, that is fine, but:
 - Please *do* include a comment noting what was changed, accompanied by an e-mail to all Team members if the edit is being suggested after the meeting has adjourned

Suggestions for SAFE Intro summaries (1 of 4)

- Change the *Spawning biomass and stock status trends* subheading by deleting the word “status,” so as not to confuse this with the “Status determination” subheading
- Use the standard (as amended) subheadings, which are:
 - *Changes from previous assessment*
 - *Spawning biomass and stock trends*
 - *Tier determination/Plan Team discussion and resulting ABCs and OFLs*
 - *Status determination*
 - *Ecosystem considerations* (this one is optional)
- Do not change the order of the subheadings

Suggestions for SAFE Intro summaries (2 of 4)

- Make sure that items of information are addressed under the appropriate subheading
- For new data listed under *Changes from previous assessment*, distinguish between those items that have an impact on reference points or specifications from those that are presented for information only (alternatively, the latter items may be omitted entirely)
- Under *Spawning biomass and stock trends*, be sure to mention something about spawning biomass if the stock is managed under Tiers 1-3
 - Discussion of recruitment strengths under this subheading is also useful for stocks managed under Tiers 1-3, as it helps to explain the described trends

Suggestions for SAFE Intro summaries (3 of 4)

- If assessment authors change their estimates of reference points or specifications so that they differ from the values in the chapter that the Team was provided, summary writers should include a comment to that effect in the initial draft of the Intro
- In general, but especially for “off-year” assessments, the amount of text should be roughly proportional to the amount of new information or degree of controversy in the assessment
 - As opposed to, e.g., making the amount of text proportional to the summary writer’s personal interest in that particular stock
- The fact that a sentence may have been important in some previous year’s summary does not mean that it must be retained for all time
 - E.g., if a stock was split from a complex, this fact probably does not need to be mentioned once the first year of split management scrolls off the top of the summary table

Suggestions for SAFE Intro summaries (4 of 4)

- For off-year assessments of stocks managed under Tier 3, make sure to distinguish between the *assessment* model and the *projection* model
 - E.g., do not say, “The *model* was re-run...”
- Given that, with the exception of EBS pollock, it is rare for an author or the Team to recommend an ABC other than the maximum permissible level:
 - Add a piece of generic text to the start of the “Summaries of Stock Status” section stating that recommended ABCs correspond to the maximum permissible levels unless otherwise specified
 - Omit references to the maximum permissible level in the species summaries, except for those rare cases where the author or Team recommends something different