

Proposed Modifications to the SEDAR Process

Gulf Council SSC Meeting

August 2, 2018

Have annual call with SEFSC and decide which stocks to assess two years in advance.

- Positives:

- Better advance planning
- Better resource allocation
- Less scheduling uncertainty

- Negatives:

- Limits flexibility
- Increases time commitment
- Less reactionary capacity to issues

Determine assessment type, based on available data, two years prior to the year being discussed.

- Positives:

- Better advance planning
- Better resource allocation
- Less scheduling uncertainty

- Negatives:

- Limits flexibility
- Increases time commitment
- Less reactionary capacity to issues
- Fixes assessment type

Lock the SEDAR schedule two years in advance for both species and assessment type.

- Positives:

- Better advance planning
- Better resource allocation
- Less scheduling uncertainty
- Timely data compilation
- Logistical flexibility for meeting planning
- Eliminates time loss from last minute changes

- Negatives:

- Limits flexibility
- Less reactionary capacity to issues
- Fixes species to be assessed
- Fixes assessment type

Establish an annual data deadline for all data typically used in stock assessments.

- Positives:

- Better advance planning
- Timely data compilation
- Fewer missed deadlines

- Negatives:

- May result in some data missing deadline; being left out
- May result in unavailability of most recent year of data

RT: Make AW portion follow IPT approach.
Analysts and other experts can meet as needed.

- Positives:

- Free-flowing work environment
- Limits delays resulting from the current need to make decisions on a publicly noticed call or webinar
- Would maintain public record with rapporteurs

- Negatives:

- Loss of transparency present in the current assessment process

OA: Use IPT approach as much as is practical.
Analysts work with other experts as appropriate.

- Positives:

- Free-flowing work environment
- Limits delays resulting from the current need to make decisions on a publicly noticed call or webinar
- Would maintain public record with rapporteurs
- Fewer in-person meetings

- Negatives:

- Loss of transparency present in the current assessment process

Conduct an alternative, less data-intensive model run for every assessment.

- Positives:

- Acts as a physical check against the complexity inherent in SS3 assessments
- Likely to make fewer assumptions about data

- Negatives:

- Requires additional analytical time
- Necessary assumptions may be quite influential
- Won't be able to use all available data

Complete annual SAFE reports for species with completed stock assessments.

- Positives:

- Helps Councils respond to changes in various fisheries
- Decreases lag in rule-making from problem identification

- Negatives:

- Requires additional analytical time