

Report on the yelloweye and greenstriped rockfishes
Stock Assessment Review (STAR) Panel
August 3 – 7, 2009
Seattle, WA

Jean-Jacques Maguire
CIE Reviewer
Halieutikos inc
1450 Godefroy, Québec, Qc
Canada, G1T 2E4
jjmaguire@sympatico.ca

Prepared for the Center for Independent Experts
September 2009

Executive Summary

The assessment documents for the two reviewed species were made available sufficiently early before the meeting to allow for an in-depth review. The documents for the two species were well prepared and contained the required information.

The assessments for both species do represent the best available scientific information and each assessment provides a reliable basis for setting OFLs and ABCs as mandated by the Magnuson-Stevens Act. The greenstriped rockfish assessment is subject to considerable uncertainties however because of the lack of reliable catch estimates.

The two assessments use Stock Synthesis as their main analytical tool as is the case for many USA West Coast stock assessments. Stock Synthesis is a highly flexible assessment tool in which it is possible to use several sources of information (growth information, catch, length and age frequencies, indices of stock sizes, etc.) to evaluate stock status. Stock Synthesis is highly structured with many options and built-in assumptions; it can be configured to mimic several other types of assessment approaches. Because of its structure and underlying assumptions, Stock Synthesis can provide stock estimates and fisheries management benchmarks even when very little data, including reliable catch statistics as is the case for greenstriped rockfish. In Stock Synthesis, it difficult to ascertain the most important influence on the assessment results: the data or the assumptions in the assessment model. Using assessment software other than Stock Synthesis, including simpler statistical catch at age models, would be helpful to validate Stock Synthesis results and to determine the relative influence of data versus assumptions.

In other stock assessment and peer review systems, considerable time is spent examining input data prior to modeling. Analysts who use Stock Synthesis seem to spend less time on that stage: all available data is included in the assessment software and the analysts look at what comes out. Input data could be more carefully examined prior to being included in the Stock Synthesis framework.

Estimates of catches have been extended backwards considerably, sometimes to the end of the 19th century. One of the main reasons for extending estimates of catches as far back as possible is to avoid the “shifting baseline” syndrome that could result in lost fishing opportunities. The danger, however, is that because of limited data other than catches and because catch estimates are themselves highly uncertain, unrealistic virgin biomasses may be estimated, which, when compared with reasonably well informed and well estimated recent biomass estimates, imply that the stocks remain below the rebuilding target and should continue to be severely constrained. The catch statistics for greenstriped rockfish are not considered very reliable as the species has never been targeted, has been retained inconsistently and discard information is available only for recent years.

Background

The STock Assessment Review (STAR) panel is part of the Pacific Fishery Management Council's (PFMC) process to provide peer review as referenced in the 2006 Reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, which states that "the Secretary and each Regional Fishery Management Council may establish a peer review process for that Regional Fishery Management Council for scientific information used to advise the Regional Fishery Management Council about the conservation and management of the fishery (see Magnuson-Stevens Act section 302(g)(1)(E)). If a peer review process is established, it should investigate the technical merits of stock assessments and other scientific information used by the Council's Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC). The peer review process is not a substitute for the SSC and should work in conjunction with the SSC." The Pacific Fishery Management Council's Terms of Reference for the West Coast Groundfish Stock Assessments and STAR Process for 2009-2010 require that reviewers be appointed from the Center for Independent Experts (CIE). Two reviewers from the Center for Independent Experts (CIE) took part in the 2009 STAR panel on cabezon and lingcod.

Yelloweye rockfish has been declared overfished, it is subject to a rebuilding plan, and management measures for yelloweye rockfish are tightly constraining several west coast fisheries. The last benchmark assessment for yelloweye rockfish was completed in 2006. However, the 2007 update identified numerous data issues which could only be partially addressed under update protocols. Greenstriped rockfish has never been assessed and is viewed as a potentially indicator species for other unassessed shelf rockfish species. These two benchmark stock assessments are expected to provide the basis for the management of the groundfish fisheries off the West Coast of the U.S. including providing scientific basis for setting OFLs and ABCs as mandated by the Magnuson-Stevens Act. The technical review took place during August 3 – 7, 2009 in a formal, public meeting of fishery stock assessment experts.

Major changes made in the 2009 yelloweye rockfish assessment, compared with the previous assessment include using Stock Synthesis version 3.03b modeling framework instead of SS2; incorporation of reconstructed landings that extended the modeled period to 1916 instead of 1925; treatment of the population dynamics in an area-based model with recruitment apportioned to areas based on internal parameter estimation; removal of stochasticity in recruitment; addition of NWFSC shelf-slope trawl survey (referred to as NWFSC combined survey in the assessment report) and the triennial trawl survey; incorporation of weight-specific fecundity based on a meta-analysis of rockfish reproduction; revision of aging error estimates; inclusion of age data as conditional age-at-length compositions; estimation of gender-specific natural mortality and spawner-recruit steepness in the model using newly developed priors.

This first greenstriped rockfish assessment utilized the Stock Synthesis modeling platform and included a wide variety of data sets. Five fisheries were modeled, including: (1) Washington-Oregon (WA/OR) trawl, (2) California (CA) trawl, (3)

foreign catches from 1966-1976, (4) “other” commercial gears, and (5) recreational harvests. Three fishery-independent time series of abundance were developed using Delta-GLMM analyses, i.e., early (1980-1992) and late (1995-2004) triennial trawl survey and the NWFSC combined trawl survey (2003-2008). Length compositional data were available to inform estimation of fishery and survey selectivities and conditional age-at-length data were obtained from the combined trawl survey.

A number of structural assumptions were evaluated in this first greenstriped rockfish assessment and incorporated into the final model, including: use of SS3 version 3.03a modeling framework; inclusion of reconstructed landings with the modeled period beginning in 1916; full bias-corrected stochastic recruitment from 1987-2005 with ramped bias corrections before (1970-1986) and after (2006-2020); estimation of retention curves and discards for trawl and “other” commercial gears; incorporation of weight-specific fecundity; unbiased aging error estimates based on the method of Punt et al. (2008); fixed M (0.08 yr⁻¹) based on longevity and Hoenig (1983); fixed steepness ($h = 0.69$) based on Dorn’s prior for an unobserved rockfish.

Review Activities

Prior to the August 3 – 7, 2009 STAR panel meeting, I downloaded and reviewed the main assessment papers. I attended the STAR Panel and was rapporteur for yelloweye. I took active part on the discussions for the two species being reviewed.

Summary of Findings for each ToR

1. Become familiar with the draft yelloweye rockfish and greenstriped rockfish stock assessments and background materials. Along with other members of the Panel, determine if the stock assessment document is sufficiently complete according to the Pacific Fishery Management Council’s Terms of Reference for West Coast Groundfish Stock Assessment and STAR Panels

Both the yelloweye rockfish and greenstriped rockfish assessment documents were complete, very well researched, very well documented and very clearly presented. The yelloweye rockfish assessment documented the effects of moving from the previous assessment platform to the current one, both incorporated the results of recent research, and they included several sensitivity runs covering a range of plausible cases. Both included a retrospective analysis where the results did not extend past the last year used in the retrospective assessment which facilitated interpretation of the results.

2. Evaluate data collection operations and survey design and make recommendations for improvement

The data collection operations were not discussed in detail, but do seem to be appropriate and follow standard procedures.

The yelloweye rockfish assessment uses 9 indices of stock size (IPHC longline survey – WA (1999-2008), IPHC longline survey – OR (1999-2008), Triennial trawl survey –

WA (1980-2004); break in catchability in 1995, NWFSC shelf-slope trawl survey – OR (2003-2008), Recreational (CPFV) CPUE – CA (1988-1998), Recreational CPUE - CA (1980-1986, 1993-1999), Recreational (CPFV) CPUE – OR (2004-2008), Recreational CPUE - OR (1979-1999), Recreational CPUE - WA (1990-1999), Abundance indices) but only four cover the most recent year of the assessment period.

The greenstriped rockfish assessment uses 3 fishery independent indices of stock size: Early Triennial trawl survey (1980-1992), Late Triennial trawl survey (1995-2004), NWFSC shelf-slope trawl survey (2003-2008) and no fishery dependent index as the species has never been targeted and has been inconsistently retained.

3. Comment on quality of data used in the assessment.

Data from the early 1980s to the present are considered to be more reliable than for years before 1980. For yelloweye rockfish, as a result of fisheries management measures implemented in the late 1990s – early 2000s fishery dependent indices of stock sizes used in previous assessment could no longer be used because of change in fishing behavior, timing and / areas. The best available data have been used, but stock size indices are uncertain for yelloweye rockfish. Greenstriped rockfish appears to be adequately sampled by research surveys, but catch is highly uncertain.

4. Evaluate and comment on analytic methodologies.

Both assessments used the most recent version Stock Synthesis as their main analytical tool. Stock Synthesis is a standard assessment tool for many USA West Coast stock assessments. It is a highly flexible assessment tool in which it is possible to use several sources of information (growth information, catch, length and age frequencies, indices of stock sizes, etc.) to evaluate stock status. Stock Synthesis is highly structured with many options and built-in assumptions; it can be configured to mimic several other types of assessment approaches. Because of its structure and underlying assumptions, Stock Synthesis can provide stock estimates and fisheries management benchmarks even when very little data are available. In Stock synthesis, it is sometimes difficult to ascertain the most important influence on the assessment results: the data or the assumptions in the assessment model.

5. Evaluate model assumptions, estimates, and major sources of uncertainty. Specifically, recommend improvements including alternative model configurations or formulations as appropriate during the panel meeting and comment on the primary sources of uncertainty in the assessment model.

Recommendations for improvements made during the meeting are documented in the panel report in the additional runs requested and in the research recommendations. Using assessment software other than Stock Synthesis, including simpler statistical catch at age models, would be helpful to validate Stock Synthesis results and to determine the relative influence of data versus assumptions.

6. Insert an explicit statement as to whether this stock assessment represents the best available science.

Both the yelloweye rockfish assessment and the greenstriped rockfish assessment do represent the best available scientific information and provides a reliable basis for setting OFLs and ABCs as mandated by the Magnuson-Stevens Act. The greenstriped rockfish assessment is subject to considerable uncertainties however due to highly uncertain historical catches as the species has never been targeted and has been inconsistently retained.

7. Recommendations for any further improvements.

Use other models, including simpler statistical catch at age models, to determine the relative influence of data versus assumptions in Stock Synthesis.

Prior to running any assessment model, investigate what the data are saying. This would allow the identification of stock size indices that are may or may not be consistent. If stock size indices are consistent, the analyses can proceed, but if they are not, a scientific judgment has to be made on how to use conflicting indices. Similarly, age and length compositions should be examined for signals on recruitment and abundance of various age/size classes.

8. Brief description on panel review proceedings, highlighting pertinent discussions, issues, effectiveness, and recommendations.

The meeting proceeded smoothly along the agreed schedule. The STATs diligently conducted additional analyses and presented them. There was a real good spirit of cooperation between the STAT and the STAR panel to improve the quality and usefulness of the assessment. All participants had internet access in the meeting room which greatly facilitated review activities and exchange of material.

Conclusions and Recommendations

In other stock assessment and peer review systems, considerable time is spent examining input data prior to modeling. Analysts who use Stock Synthesis seem to spend less time on that stage: all available data is included in the assessment software and the analysts look at what comes out. Input data could be more carefully examined prior to being included in the Stock Synthesis framework. Prior to running any assessment model, analysts should investigate what the data are saying. This would allow the identification of stock size indices that are may or may not be consistent. If stock size indices are consistent, the analyses can proceed, but if they are not, a scientific judgment has to be made on how to use conflicting indices. Similarly, age and length compositions should be examined for signals on recruitment and abundance of various age/size classes.

It is sometimes difficult to ascertain the most important influence on the assessment results: the data or the assumptions in the assessment model. Using assessment software other than Stock Synthesis, including simpler statistical catch at age models, would be helpful to validate Stock Synthesis results and to determine the relative influence of data versus assumptions.

In addition to retrospective analyses, the assessment document should include a comparison of assessment results with those of previous assessments.

The sensitivity of results to using only recent reliable data should be investigated.

Appendix 1: Bibliography of materials provided for review

Hicks, A.C., Haltuch, M.A. and Wetzel, C. 2009. DRAFT Status of greenstriped rockfish (*Sebastes elongatus*) along the outer coast of California, Oregon, and Washington.

Methot, R.D. 2000. Technical description of the stock synthesis assessment program. U.S. Dept. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NWFSC-43, 46 p.

Methot, R.D. 2009. User Manual for Stock Synthesis Model Version 3.02C. Updated January 29, 2009. NOAA Fisheries Seattle, WA

STAR Panel 2006. Yelloweye rockfish.

Stewart, I.J., Wallace, J.R. and McGilliard, C. 2009. Status of the U.S. yelloweye rockfish resource in 2009.

Wallace, J.R. 2007. Update to the status of yelloweye rockfish (*Sebastes ruberrimus*) off the U.S. West Coast in 2007.

Appendix 2: A copy of the CIE Statement of Work

Statement of Work for Jean-Jacques Maguire

External Independent Peer Review by the Center for Independent Experts

Stock Assessment Review Panel for Yelloweye Rockfish and Greenstriped Rockfish

Scope of Work and CIE Process: The National Marine Fisheries Service's (NMFS) Office of Science and Technology coordinates and manages a contract to provide external expertise through the Center for Independent Experts (CIE) to conduct impartial and independent peer reviews of NMFS scientific projects. This Statement of Work (SoW) described herein was established by the NMFS Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR) and CIE based on the peer review requirements submitted by NMFS Project Contact. CIE reviewers are selected by the CIE Coordination Team and Steering Committee to conduct the peer review of NMFS science with project specific Terms of Reference (ToRs). Each CIE reviewer shall produce a CIE independent peer review report with specific format and content requirements (**Annex 1**). This SoW describes the work tasks and deliverables of the CIE reviewers for conducting an independent peer review of the following NMFS project.

Project Description: Yelloweye rockfish has been declared overfish, is subject to a rebuilding plan, and is highly constraining on several west coast fisheries. The last benchmark assessment for yelloweye rockfish was completed in 2006. However, the 2007 update identified numerous data issues which could only be partially addressed under update protocols. Greenstriped rockfish has never been assessed and is viewed as a potentially indicator species for other unassessed shelf rockfish species. These two benchmark stock assessments will provide the basis for the management of the groundfish fisheries off the West Coast of the U.S. including providing scientific basis for setting OFLs and ABCs as mandated by the Magnuson-Stevens Act. The technical review will take place during a formal, public, multiple-day meeting of fishery stock assessment experts. Participation of external, independent reviewer is an essential part of the review process. Participation of external, independent reviewer is an essential part of the review process.

The STAR panel is part of the Pacific Fishery Management Council's process to provide peer review as referenced in the 2006 Reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, which states that " the Secretary and each Regional Fishery Management Council may establish a peer review process for that Regional Fishery Management Council for scientific information used to advise the Regional Fishery Management Council about the conservation and management of the fishery (see Magnuson-Stevens Act section 302(g)(1)(E)). If a peer review process is established, it should investigate the technical merits of stock assessments and other scientific

information used by the Council's Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC). The peer review process is not a substitute for the SSC and should work in conjunction with the SSC."

The Pacific Fishery Management Council's Terms of Reference for the West Coast Groundfish Stock Assessments and STAR Process for 2009-2010 requires that some reviewers be appointed from the Center for Independent Experts (CIE). The Council's terms of reference document will be included as background material. The Terms of Reference (ToRs) specific to the CIE are attached in **Annex 2**. The tentative agenda of the panel review meeting is attached in **Annex 3**.

Requirements for CIE Reviewers: Two CIE reviewers are required with one of the reviewers participating in all 2009 STAR panels (other than hake) to provide a level of consistency between the panels. The CIE reviewers shall conduct an impartial and independent peer review in accordance with the SoW and ToRs herein. Each CIE reviewer's duties shall not exceed a maximum of 14 days to complete all work tasks of the peer review described herein. CIE reviewers shall have the expertise, background, and experience to complete an independent peer review in accordance with the SoW and ToRs herein. CIE reviewers shall have expertise and work experience in fish population dynamics, with experience in the integrated analysis modeling approach, using age-and size-structured models, use of MCMC to develop confidence intervals, and use of Generalized Linear Models in stock assessment models.

Location of Peer Review: Each CIE reviewer shall conduct an independent peer review during the panel review meeting scheduled in Seattle, Washington on August 3-7, 2009.

Statement of Tasks: Each CIE reviewers shall complete the following tasks in accordance with the SoW and Schedule of Milestones and Deliverables herein.

Prior to the Peer Review: Upon completion of the CIE reviewer selection by the CIE Steering committee, the CIE shall provide the CIE reviewer information (name, affiliation, and contact details) to the COTR, who forwards this information to the NMFS Project Contact no later the date specified in the Schedule of Milestones and Deliverables. The CIE is responsible for providing the SoW and ToRs to the CIE reviewers. The NMFS Project Contact is responsible for providing the CIE reviewers with the background documents, reports, foreign national security clearance, and information concerning other pertinent meeting arrangements. The NMFS Project Contact is also responsible for providing the Chair a copy of the SoW in advance of the panel review meeting. Any changes to the SoW or ToRs must be made through the COTR prior to the commencement of the peer review.

Foreign National Security Clearance: When CIE reviewers participate during a panel review meeting at a government facility, the NMFS Project Contact is responsible for

obtaining the Foreign National Security Clearance approval for CIE reviewers who are non-US citizens. For this reason, the CIE reviewers shall provide requested information (e.g., name, contact information, birth date, passport number, travel dates, and country of origin) to the NMFS Project Clearance for the purpose of their security clearance, and this information shall be submitted at least 30 days before the peer review in accordance with the NOAA Deemed Export Technology Control Program NAO 207-12 regulations (available at the Deemed Exports NAO website: <http://deemedexports.noaa.gov/sponsor.html>).

Pre-review Background Documents: Two weeks before the peer review, the NMFS Project Contact will send by electronic mail or make available at an FTP site the CIE reviewers all necessary background information and reports for the peer review. In the case where the documents need to be mailed, the NMFS Project Contact will consult with the CIE on where to send documents. The CIE reviewers shall read all documents in preparation for the peer review.

Documents to be provided to the CIE reviewers prior to the STAR Panel meeting include:

- The current draft stock assessment reports;
- The most recent previous yelloweye rockfish stock assessments and STAR Panel reports;
- The Pacific Fishery Management Council's Scientific and Statistical Committee's Terms of Reference for Stock Assessments and STAR Panel Reviews;
- Stock Synthesis (SS) Documentation
- Additional supporting documents as available.
- An electronic copy of the data, the parameters, and the model used for the assessments (if requested by reviewer).

This list of pre-review documents may be updated up to two weeks before the peer review. Any delays in submission of pre-review documents for the CIE peer review will result in delays with the CIE peer review process, including a SoW modification to the schedule of milestones and deliverables. Furthermore, the CIE reviewers are responsible only for the pre-review documents that are delivered to the reviewer in accordance to the SoW scheduled deadlines specified herein.

Panel Review Meeting: Each CIE reviewers shall conduct the independent peer review in accordance with the SoW and ToRs. **Modifications to the SoW and ToRs can not be made during the peer review, and any SoW or ToRs modifications prior to the peer review shall be approved by the COTR and CIE Lead Coordinator.** Each CIE reviewer shall actively participate in a professional and respectful manner as a member of the meeting review panel, and their peer review tasks shall be focused on the ToRs as specified in the contract SoW. The NMFS Project Contact is responsible for any facility arrangements (e.g., conference room for panel review meetings or teleconference arrangements). The CIE Lead Coordinator can contact the Project Contact to confirm any peer review arrangements, including the meeting facility arrangements.

In most circumstances a STAR Panel will include a chair appointed from the SSC's Groundfish Subcommittee and three other experienced stock assessment analysts. The STAR panel chair is responsible for: 1) developing an agenda for the STAR panel meeting, 2) ensuring that STAR panel members and STAT teams follow the Terms of Reference, 3) participating in the review of the assessment, 4) guiding the STAR panel and STAT team to mutually agreeable solutions, and 5) coordinating review of final assessment documents.

The CIE reviewer's role includes being an active panel participant and participants are strongly encouraged to voice all comments regarding the assessment data, model configurations, and uncertainty during the STAR Panel so the assessment teams can address the comments during the Panel meeting and incorporate changes when appropriate. The assessments are finalized by the end of the Panel meeting and comments made after the fact will not be able to be included in the final assessment document. The CIE reviewer should also contribute to the final STAR Panel Review Report. Additional details regarding the STAR Panel reviewer's responsibilities will be included in the Pacific Fishery Management Council's final Terms of Reference for Groundfish Stock Assessments and STAR Panel meetings.

Contract Deliverables - Independent CIE Peer Review Reports: Each CIE reviewer shall complete an independent peer review report in accordance with the SoW. Each CIE reviewer shall complete the independent peer review according to required format and content as described in Annex 1. Each CIE reviewer shall complete the independent peer review addressing each ToR as described in Annex 2.

Other Tasks – Contribution to Summary Report: Each CIE reviewer will assist the Chair of the panel review meeting with contributions to the Summary Report. CIE reviewers are not required to reach a consensus, and should instead provide a brief summary of their views on the summary of findings and conclusions reached by the review panel in accordance with the ToRs.

Specific Tasks for CIE Reviewers: The following chronological list of tasks shall be completed by each CIE reviewer in a timely manner as specified in the **Schedule of Milestones and Deliverables**.

- 1) Conduct necessary pre-review preparations, including the review of background material and reports provided by the NMFS Project Contact in advance of the peer review;
- 2) Participate during the panel review meeting in Seattle, Washington during August 3-7, 2009, as called for in the SoW, and conduct an independent peer review in accordance with the ToRs (Annex 2);
- 3) No later than August 21, 2009, each CIE reviewer shall submit an independent peer review report addressed to the "Center for Independent Experts," and sent to Mr. Manoj Shrivani, CIE Lead Coordinator, via email to shivlanim@bellsouth.net, and CIE Regional Coordinator, via email to David Die

- at ddie@rsmas.miami.edu. Each CIE report shall be written using the format and content requirements specified in Annex 1, and address each ToR in Annex 2;
- 4) CIE reviewers shall address changes as required by the CIE review in accordance with the schedule of milestones and deliverables.

Schedule of Milestones and Deliverables: CIE shall complete the tasks and deliverables described in this SoW in accordance with the following schedule.

6 July 2009	CIE sends reviewer contact information to the COTR, who then sends this to the NMFS Project Contact
20 July 2009	NMFS Project Contact sends the CIE Reviewers the pre-review documents
3-7 August 2009	Each reviewer participates and conducts an independent peer review during the panel review meeting in Seattle, Washington.
21 August 2009	CIE reviewers submit draft CIE independent peer review reports to the CIE Lead Coordinator and CIE Regional Coordinator
4 September 2009	CIE submits CIE independent peer review reports to the COTR
11 September 2009	The COTR distributes the final CIE reports to the NMFS Project Contact and regional Center Director

Modifications to the Statement of Work: Requests to modify this SoW must be made through the Contracting Officer’s Technical Representative (COTR) who submits the modification for approval to the Contracting Officer at least 15 working days prior to making any permanent substitutions. The Contracting Officer will notify the CIE within 10 working days after receipt of all required information of the decision on substitutions. The COTR can approve changes to the milestone dates, list of pre-review documents, and Terms of Reference (ToR) of the SoW as long as the role and ability of the CIE reviewers to complete the SoW deliverable in accordance with the ToRs and deliverable schedule are not adversely impacted. The SoW and ToRs cannot be changed once the peer review has begun.

Acceptance of Deliverables: Upon review and acceptance of the CIE independent peer review reports by the CIE Lead Coordinator, Regional Coordinator, and Steering Committee, these reports shall be sent to the COTR for final approval as contract deliverables based on compliance with the SoW. As specified in the Schedule of Milestones and Deliverables, the CIE shall send via e-mail the contract deliverables (the CIE independent peer review reports) to the COTR (William Michaels, via William.Michaels@noaa.gov).

Applicable Performance Standards: The contract is successfully completed when the COTR provides final approval of the contract deliverables. The acceptance of the contract deliverables shall be based on three performance standards: (1) each CIE report shall have the format and content in accordance with Annex 1, (2) each CIE report shall address each ToR as specified in Annex 2, (3) the CIE reports shall be delivered in a timely manner as specified in the schedule of milestones and deliverables.

Distribution of Approved Deliverables: Upon notification of acceptance by the COTR, the CIE Lead Coordinator shall send via e-mail the final CIE reports in *.PDF format to the COTR. The COTR will distribute the approved CIE reports to the NMFS Project Contact and regional Center Director.

Key Personnel:

William Michaels, Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR)
NMFS Office of Science and Technology
1315 East West Hwy, SSMC3, F/ST4, Silver Spring, MD 20910
William.Michaels@noaa.gov Phone: 301-713-2363 ext 136

Manoj Shivlani, CIE Lead Coordinator
Northern Taiga Ventures, Inc.
10600 SW 131st Court, Miami, FL 33186
shivlanim@bellsouth.net Phone: 305-383-4229

NMFS Project Contact:

Stacey Miller
NWFSC/FRAM Division
2032 SE OSU Drive, Newport OR 97365
Stacey.Miller@noaa.gov Phone: 206-437-5670

Elizabeth Clarke
NWFSC/FRAM Division
2725 Montlake Blvd. E, Seattle WA 98112
Elizabeth.Clarke@noaa.gov Phone: 206-860-5616

Annex 1: Format and Contents of CIE Independent Peer Review Report

1. The CIE independent report shall be prefaced with an Executive Summary providing a concise summary of the findings and recommendations.
2. The main body of the reviewer report shall consist of a Background, Description of the Individual Reviewer's Role in the Review Activities, Summary of Findings for each ToR, and Conclusions and Recommendations in accordance with the ToRs.
 - a. Reviewers should describe in their own words the review activities completed during the panel review meeting, including providing a detailed summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations.
 - b. Reviewers should discuss their independent views on each ToR even if these were consistent with those of other panelists, and especially where there were divergent views.
 - c. Reviewers should elaborate on any points raised in the Summary Report that they feel might require further clarification.
 - d. Reviewers shall provide a critique of the NMFS review process, including suggestions for improvements of both process and products.
 - e. The CIE independent report shall be a stand-alone document for others to understand the proceedings and findings of the meeting, regardless of whether or not they read the summary report. The CIE independent report shall be an independent peer review of each ToRs, and shall not simply repeat the contents of the summary report.
3. The reviewer report shall include as separate appendices as follows:
 - Appendix 1: Bibliography of materials provided for review
 - Appendix 2: A copy of the CIE Statement of Work
 - Appendix 3: Panel Membership or other pertinent information from the panel review meeting.

Annex 2: Terms of Reference for the Peer Review

Stock Assessment Review Panel for Yelloweye and Greenstriped Rockfish

1. *Become familiar with the draft yelloweye rockfish and greenstriped rockfish stock assessments and background materials. Along with other members of the Panel, determine if the stock assessment document is sufficiently complete according to the Pacific Fishery Management Council's Terms of Reference for West Coast Groundfish Stock Assessment and STAR Panels (to be included once finalized).*
2. *Evaluate, data collection operations and survey design and make recommendations for improvement*
3. *Comment on quality of data used in the assessment.*
4. *Evaluate and comment on analytic methodologies*
5. *Evaluate model assumptions, estimates, and major sources of uncertainty. Specifically, recommend improvements including alternative model configurations or formulations as appropriate during the panel meeting and comment on the primary sources of uncertainty in the assessment model.*
6. *Insert an explicit statement as to whether this stock assessment represents the best available science.*
7. *Recommendations for any further improvements*
8. *Brief description on panel review proceedings highlighting pertinent discussions, issues, effectiveness, and recommendations*

Note – CIE reviewers typically address scientific subjects, hence ToRs usually do not involve CIE reviewers with regulatory and management issues unless this expertise is specifically requested in the SoW.

Annex 3: Tentative Agenda

YELLOWEYE ROCKFISH AND GREENSTRIPED ROCKFISH STOCK ASSESSMENT REVIEW (STAR) PANEL

August 3-7, 2009,
Hotel Deca
4507 Brooklyn Avenue NE,
Seattle, Washington 98105

Monday, August 3, 2009

- 8:30 a.m. Welcome and Introductions (Jim Hastie, NMFS).
- 8:45 a.m. Review the Draft Agenda and Discussion of Meeting Format (Steve Ralston: Panel Chair – SSC representative).
- Review Terms of Reference for Assessment and Review Panel
 - Assignment of reporting duties
- 9:00 a.m. Yelloweye Rockfish Stock Assessment Team (STAT: Stewart, Wallace, and McGilliard) – Overview of Data and Stock Synthesis Modeling
- 10:15 a.m. Coffee Break
- 10:30 a.m. Yelloweye Rockfish STAT Presentation Continued
- 12:00 p.m. Lunch (On Your Own)
- 1:30 p.m. Q&A session with the Yelloweye Rockfish STAT & Panel discussion
- 3:30 p.m. Coffee Break
- 3:45 p.m. Panel develops prioritized requests for additional model runs / analyses for the Yelloweye Rockfish STAT
- 4:30 p.m. Panel provides written requests for additional model runs / analyses to the Yelloweye Rockfish STAT
- 5:30 p.m. Adjourn for day.

Tuesday, August 4, 2009

- 8:30 a.m. Greenstriped Rockfish Stock Assessment Team (STAT: Hicks, Haltuch, and Wetzel) – Overview of Data and Stock Synthesis Modeling
- 10:15 a.m. Coffee Break
- 10:30 a.m. Greenstriped Rockfish STAT Presentation Continued
- 12:00 p.m. Lunch (On Your Own)
- 1:30 p.m. Q&A session with the Greenstriped Rockfish STAT & Panel discussion
- 3:00 p.m. Coffee Break
- 3:15 p.m. Panel develops and prioritizes requests for additional analysis by the Greenstriped Rockfish STAT and provides written requests

- 4:00 p.m. Panel check-in with Yelloweye Rockfish STAT (if needed)
5:30 p.m. Adjourn for day.

Wednesday, August 5, 2009

- 8:30 a.m. Yelloweye Rockfish STAT Presentation of first set of model runs
Q&A session with the Yelloweye Rockfish STAT & Panel discussion
- Panel develops written request for second round of model runs / analyses for the Yelloweye Rockfish STAT
- 10:15 a.m. Coffee Break
- 10:30 a.m. Yelloweye Rockfish STAT Presentation Continued
- 12:00 p.m. Lunch (On Your Own)
- 1:30 p.m. Greenstriped Rockfish STAT Presentation of first set of model runs
Q&A session with the Greenstriped Rockfish STAT & Panel discussion
- Panel develops written request for second round of model runs / analyses for the Greenstriped Rockfish STAT
- 3:30 p.m. Coffee Break
- 3:45 p.m. Continue Panel discussion with Greenstriped Rockfish STAT
- 5:30 p.m. Adjourn for day.

Thursday, August 6, 2009

- 8:30 a.m. Yelloweye Rockfish STAT presentation of second set of model runs
Q&A session with the Yelloweye Rockfish STAT & Panel discussion
- Identification of preferred model and elements of a decision table.
- Panel develops third list of model runs for decision table and begins drafting STAR report.
- 10:15 a.m. Coffee Break
- 10:30 a.m. Yelloweye Rockfish STAT Presentation Continued
- 12:00 p.m. Lunch (On Your Own)
- 1:30 p.m. Greenstriped Rockfish STAT presentation of second set of model runs
Q&A session with the Greenstriped Rockfish STAT & Panel discussion
- Identification of preferred model and elements of a decision table.
- Panel develops third list of model runs for decision table and begins drafting STAR report.
- 3:30 p.m. Coffee Break
- 3:45 p.m. Panel discussion or report drafting continues
- 5:30 p.m. Adjourn for day.

Friday, August 7, 2009

- 8:30 a.m. Consideration of remaining issues

Review decision tables for Yelloweye and Greenstriped Rockfish

11:00 a.m. Panel agrees to a process for completing final STAR report and review of revised assessment documents by Council Briefing Book deadline (08/26 for Council's September Briefing Book).

Review Panel Adjourns When Business Is Completed.

Appendix 3: Panel Membership or other pertinent information from the panel review meeting.

Panel Reviewers

Stephen Ralston	Panel Chair, SSC Representative
Richard Methot	NMFS, Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC)
Vivian Haist	Center for Independent Experts (CIE)
J.-J. Maguire	Center for Independent Experts (CIE)

Panel Advisors

John DeVore	Pacific Fishery Management Council
Robert Alverson	Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) Representative
Rob Jones	Groundfish Management Team (GMT) Representative

Yelloweye rockfish STAT

Ian Stewart	NMFS, Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC)
John Wallace	NMFS, Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC)
Carey McGilliard	University of Washington, School of Aquatic & Fishery Resources

Greenstriped rockfish STAT

Allan C. Hicks	NMFS, Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC)
Melissa A. Haltuch	NMFS, Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC)
Chantel Wetzel	University of Washington, School of Aquatic & Fishery Resources

Others present:

Jim Hastie, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center
Ian Taylor, University of Washington
Tom Jagielo
Pete Leipzig, Fishermens Marketing Association
Troy Buell, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Theresa Tsou, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Corey Niles, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Farron Wallace, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Henry Cheng, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Colby Brady, Makah Tribe
Brad Pettinger, Oregon Trawl Commission
Elizabeth Clarke, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center