SEDAR

SEDAR Steering Committee

Meeting Report

DRAFT

May 20-21, 2020

Meeting via Webinar

Version: Draft 4

7/20/2020

Table of Contents

1 INTRODUCTION 7
2 SEDAR PROJECTS REPORT 7
3 SEDAR PROCESS REVIEW AND DISCUSSION 8
4 ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE REVIEW 12
5 OTHER BUSINESS 13
6 NEXT MEETING 16

DOCUMENTS

Attachment 1: September 2019 Draft Meeting Summary
Attachment 2: SEDAR Projects Update April 2020
Attachment 3: Summary of current Research Track and Operational Assessment procedures
Attachment 4: SEDAR Assessment Project Priorities and Timing
Attachment 5: Cooperator SoW
Attachment 6: SEDAR Projects List
Attachment 7: Modifications to the Project Planning Grid from the September 2019 Steering Committee report
Attachment 8: Procedural Workshop Pre-proposal – Best Practices for Combining Index of Abundance Surveys

Attendance

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Clay Porch, Chair, SEFSC
John Carmichael, SAFMC
Jessica McCawley, SAFMC
Carrie Simmons, GMFMC
Tom Frazer, GMFMC
Miguel Rolon, CFMC
Roy Crabtree, SERO
Dave Donaldson, GSMFC
Pat Campfield, ASMFC
Karyl Brewster-Geisz, HMS
Luiz Barberi, FWRI
Marcos Hanke, CFMC

SEDAR STAFF

Julie A. Neer
Kathleen Howington

WEBINAR OBSERVERS

Dustin Addis, FWRI
Shanae Allen, FWRI
Mel Bell, SAFMC
Myra Brouwer, SAFMC Staff
Walter Bubley, SCDNR
Julia Byrd, SAFMC Staff
Nancie Cummings, SEFSC
Shannon Cass-Calay, SEFSC
Rob Cheshire, SEFSC
Chip Collier, SAFMC Staff
Dale Diaz, GMFMC
Michael Drexler, Ocean Conservancy
Joseph Evans, SCDNR
Margaret Finch, SCDNR
Eric Fitzpatrick, SEFSC
John Froeschke, GMFMC Staff
Bob Gill
Dawn Glasgow, SCDNR
Rusty Hudson, DSF
Kevin Kolmos, SCDNR
Stephen Long, SCDNR
Vivian Matter, SEFSC
Shannon Nee, FWC
Matthew Nuttall, SEFSC
Jeff Pulver, SERO
Marcel Reichert, SCDNR
Ryan Rindone, GMFMC Staff
Skyler Sagarese, SEFSC
Amy Schueller, SEFSC
Katie Seigfried, SEFSC
Wiley Sinkus, SCDNR
Tracey Smart, SCDNR
Kevin Spanik, SCDNR
Molly Stevens, SESFC
Ted Switzer, FWRI
Steve Vanderkooy, GSMFC
Erik Williams, SEFSC

Meeting Outcomes Summary

SEDAR Project Priorities

- Approved project priorities for 2022 as shown in Table 1.
- Requested Cooperators provide Scopes of Work for 2023 operational assessments to the SEFSC by October 15th, 2020. The SEFSC will provide feedback to the Cooperators by February 1st, 2021. These projects will be considered for approval at the Spring 2021 meeting. (Appendix 1)
    - SAFMC: Tilefish, Snowy Grouper
    - GMFMC: No OAs not associated with a Research Track will begin in 2023; red snapper OA timing dependent on 2021 Research Track schedule

SEDAR Process Review

The Committee was updated on the SEDAR 68 Scamp Research Track process to date.

- It was noted that there has been some difficulty retaining Assessment Development Team (ADT) members but that may be due to the many changes to the schedule that this assessment has undergone. The Committee did not suggest any changes to the use of an ADT at this time.
- The Committee was also briefed on the difficulty in finding a Technical Chair for S68. Issues of workload and funding were discussed. Several suggestions were put forward but more discussions are needed to help alleviate this issue for future Research Track assessments. The Gulf Council offered to identify an SSC member to serve as the Technical Chair for the assessment portion of S68 to keep that assessment moving along and relieving that burden from the lead analysts.

Operational Assessment Discussion (Appendix 2)

Chair Porch provided the Committee a brief review of the Science Center's intentions and expectations for the Research Track (RT) and Operational Assessment (OA) approaches in the original proposal. He highlighted some potential misunderstandings that have arisen in the implementation of the recent OAs, and provided recommendations for future OAs. Key points were:

- Functionally, OAs should resemble previous Update assessments, with the primary goal of updating the approved model with current data
- OAs should no longer include "Assessment Panels" as previously defined and used. Instead, Topical Working Groups (TWG) would be convened as necessary to discuss and provide recommendations to the analytic team on specific topics regarding data or modeling approaches, that are identified for evaluation and consideration through the Terms of Reference.
- The need for TWGs and the topics to be considered will be outlined in the SoW for each assessment.
- For OAs where the SEFSC is the lead analytic agency, a SEFSC staff Project Manager will be in place to manage the data flow and products.

Other Business Topics

Indices Workshop Pre-Proposal: The Committee supported the Indices Pre-proposal and requested submission of a full proposal for review at the Fall Meeting. Guidance was provided that the full proposal address topics of broader, region-wide interest, and include participants from all areas covered by SEDAR. Expanding the scope beyond Gulf of Mexico issues is necessary to secure SEDAR support.

Gulf of Mexico Shrimp Assessment Process Review: The SEFSC proposed a process to review the current Gulf of Mexico stock assessments. Those assessments have been produced outside of the SEDAR process for several years, and recently there has been a desire to review the methods being used for those assessments. The Committee discussed the proposed plan and recommended the following process (Appendix 3):

- SEFSC convenes special working groups (WGs) to develop best practice guidance for several topics: SEAMAP trawl data, effort estimation and CPUE, catch estimation, and the use of Observer data - bycatch (and catch) estimation
- Gulf Council convenes an assessment workshop to review above WG products, establish the simplest reasonable assessment model and identify possible future directions
- SEDAR Research Track Assessment

The Gulf Cooperator requested that the SEFSC provide the Terms of Reference for the WGs so that the SSC has an opportunity to review them and the SEFSC agreed. More information about this process will be brought to the Fall meeting.

Statements of Work Template and Timing: The Committee reviewed a proposed template for preparing Statements of Work of Operational Assessments (Appendix 4). Topics for inclusion in the SoWs were accepted, while the proposed template itself will be revisited at the next Steering Committee meeting after Cooperators have an opportunity to use it for the 2023 assessment SoWs. The Committee also updated the timing for submitting SoWs (October 15th) and for the SEFSC to provide feedback to the Cooperator (February 1st).

Table 1: SEDAR Project Planning Grid – Meeting Outcome: May 2020 SEDAR Steering Committee

Table Color Legend:

Steering Committee Approved and SEFSC Scheduled Projects	FUTURE Requests
Steering Committee Approved, PENDING SEFSC SCHEDULING	2022 Proposed Projects

YEAR	SA Team				Gulf/Caribbean Team					HMS Team		FL FWCC	ASMFC GSMFC	CMP
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	1	2			
2020	Scamp RT	Snowy Grouper U	Gag Grouper OA	Tilefish OA	Scamp RT	GAJ OA	Vermilion OA	Cobia U	Gag Grouper OA	Atlantic Blacktip Benchmark	Hammerheads RT	Mutton Bench	Gulf Menhaden OA	King U
2021	Scamp OA	Red Snapper OA	Black Sea Bass OA	Spanish Mackerel OA	Scamp OA	Red Snapper RT	Gray Snapper OA	Red Snapper RT	Queen Trigger PR-STX-STT OA				ASFMC Menhaden OA	Gulf Spanish OA
2022	Gray Triggerfish RT	Red Grouper OA	Vermilion OA	Blueline Tilefish OA	Yellowedge OA	Red Snapper OA	Gray Triggerfish RT	Red Snapper OA	Queen snap@PR, redtail parrot@STX			Hogfish Bench		
2023		Snowy Grouper/ Tilefish	White Grunt RT		Lane Snapper OA?	Tilefish Complex OA?		Vermilion OA	Lane@PR,, YTS			Black Grouper Bench?	ASFMC Red Drum (RW)/ Gulf Menhaden OA	
2024														
2025														
2026														

Timing of projects shown in this table is approximate and is intended for SEDAR Steering Committee workload planning purposes only. Please consult individual project schedules for specific start and end dates.

1 Introduction

1.1 Documents

- Agenda
- Attachment 1. September 2019 Draft Meeting Summary

1.2 Action

- Introduction
- Review and Approve Agenda
- Approve Meeting Summary

MEETING OUTCOME

The Committee added the following topic to Other Business during its discussions of other topics on the agenda: discussion on formatting and timing of the Statements of Work for Operational Assessments.

2 SEDAR Projects Report

2.1 Documents

Attachment 2. SEDAR Projects Update April 2020

2.2 Summary

The projects report (Attachment 2) provides a summary of current and recently completed SEDAR assessment projects.

Highlighted project developments:

- COVID-19 Impacts to ongoing projects:
    - Fortunately, only SEDAR 68 – Scamp assessment has been impacted by delays due to COVID-19. The Data Workshop was scheduled for March 16-20, 2020 but was cancelled due to the restrictions on large gatherings and the concern of many participants with regards to travel. The modified data review process for S68 is discussed in more detail below.
    - Several SEDAR projects will be getting underway in the next few months, and it remains to be seen if modifications to those schedules will need to be made as a result of the disruption.
- SEDAR 68 Scamp Data Review and Recommendation Process: After the cancellation of the in-person DW, and the mounting evidence that it would be some time before any sort of large gathering would be possible, SEDAR and SEFSC Staff held discussions to determine a path forward, followed by additional discussions with the previously-appointed working group leads. The following process is currently underway:

- Working Groups (Life History, Commercial Statistics, Recreational Statistics, and Indices of Abundance) worked amongst themselves to schedule and held various meetings to review the available data and make pre-decisional recommendations.
- Several publicly-noticed Data Plenary webinars will be held, during which the Working Groups will present the results of the discussions to the entire Data Panel for review and comment.
- If concerns are raised that require additional analysis, the Working Group will be tasked to complete that request and report back at the next Plenary webinar.
- Once the Panel is satisfied with the analyses, then the Assessment Development Team (ADT) will make the final decision regarding recommending using the data in the assessment. These recommendations will happen during the Plenary webinars.
- A Data Process Report will be produced, to document the discussions and decisions of the Panel and the ADT.

MEETING OUTCOME

It was requested that the following text be added to the report for the SEDAR Project Report section:

The SEFSC informed the Gulf Council at its January 2020 Council meeting that they were unable to complete the SEDAR 62 standard assessment of Gulf gray triggerfish. The SEFSC recommended a Research Track assessment approach and thought that an interim analysis may be possible in the near term.

2.3 Action

- Informational; none required

3 SEDAR Process Review and Discussion

3.1 Documents

Attachment 3. Summary of current Research Track and Operational Assessment procedures

Attachment 4. SEDAR Assessment Project Priorities and Timing

3.2 Summary

Update on SEDAR 68 – Scamp Research Track (RT) Pilot Process

- Stock ID Process: The Stock ID process, conducted via webinars, was successful. Three Working Groups (Life History, Genetics, and Landings and Spatial Movements) worked to review material pertinent to their working group and provided pre-decisional recommendations for the entire Stock ID Panel to consider during publicly–noticed webinars. The Panel completed a report of their findings which can be found on the

SEDAR website.
(http://sedarweb.org/docs/wpapers/S68_SID_05_Stock_ID_Final_Report.pdf)

- Assessment Development Team issues: The ADT component of the Research Track process was implemented to ensure there was a core group of individuals who were involved and responsible for the decision-making in all stages of the assessment process, in the hopes of having some consistency between stages. While identifying individuals willing to serve on the ADT was initially not a challenge, having the appointees actually be available to participate for the whole process has become difficult. The RT process is very long, and other responsibilities are making it difficult for ADT members to fulfill their roles.
- Technical Chair Issues: From the May 2019 Steering Committee Final Report:

  The Committee supported assigning a scientist to chair the research track process. One individual will chair the DW through AW stages of the research track. The Chair will be recommended by the research track planning team and appointed by the lead analytical agency (e.g., SEFSC or FL FWCC). Peer Reviews will be chaired by an SSC representative, per current practices.

  There was some difficulty finding a Technical Chair for SEDAR 68. Participants were reluctant to agree to serve as Chair through multiple stages of the process. A member of the ADT ultimately agreed to Chair the Data portion of the process, and the lead analysts agreed to serve as Chairs for their respective assessments but all have expressed the concern of how difficult it is to be fully engaged in the discussions while running the meeting. The scope of the duties of the Technical Chair, or perhaps how the Technical Chair is selected, may need to be reconsidered.

<u>Discussion on the nature and direction of Operational Assessments</u>

A summary of the current process for Operational Assessments (OA) not associated with a Research Track can be found in Attachment 3. This process is fairly flexible, allowing OAs to range in scope from the simple addition of more years of data where the assessment is conducted basically "in-house" by the Center (most similar to the previous Updates) to a much more involved process which allows for the inclusion of new data, new methods, assessment panels and in-person meetings and webinars, all open to the public.

The SEFSC provides the following clarification regarding OAs:

- The SEFSC is responsible for preparing Operational Assessments and managing the technical aspects of them, including data acquisition and model development.
- Unless there is a justified reason for a more complex approach and changes in the model, Operational Assessments should primarily include updating the existing assessment framework with the most recent data and only minor modifications in the framework and supporting information.
- The scope of OAs may be expanded to include additional datasets, changes in model structure, and incorporation of new information on the species or fishery *as requested by*

the SSC if the SEFSC agrees they are necessary to ensure the assessment is best available science and can be reasonable accommodated with available resources.

- Operational Assessments will not include 'Assessment Panels' as previously defined through SEDAR. Instead, "Topical Working Groups" will be appointed by the Cooperators as needed to address specific items identified in the SoWs of a given OA and provide guidance to the lead analysts. As noted in the first bullet, the SEFSC is responsible for making technical decisions regarding the assessment.
- SEFSC will provide a Project Manager for each OA that it conducts. The Project Manager will be responsible for coordinating SEFSC tasks and all data management for that assessment.
- At the completion of each assessment (OA or RT), a summary page listing all data sets included in the assessment, along with the contact information for who provided the analysis, will be compiled. This will be the source of data information for the next assessment.
- SEDAR will continue to serve a liaison between the Cooperators and the lead assessment agencies. It will manage administrative items such as Statements of Work, Terms of Reference, Topical Working Group appointments, and website postings. In the rare event that an OA requires public webinars or in-person meetings, SEDAR Coordinators will handle those arrangements.

Table. Comparison of key components of OA Process currently in place and modifications proposed by the SEFSC

Component	Current Process	Modifications
Project Management	SEDAR	SEFSC
Assessment Panel	Yes	Topical Working Groups
Webinars/meetings	Yes/Occasionally	Few/Topical

3.3 Action

Discuss clarifications to the nature, timing, or approach to Operational Assessments not associated with Research Track assessments.

MEETING OUTCOME

Update on Scamp Pilot Research Track Process

The Committee did not have any advice regarding the difficulty of retaining ADT members for the scamp assessment. It was noted that the Scamp assessment schedule has been impacted by both the 2019 Federal shutdown and COVID-19 impacts, so this issue may not be a problem for future Research Tracks.

The issue of finding a Technical Chair received much discussion. Committee agreed that it is difficult to both run the meeting (Chair) and be fully engaged in the discussions (ADT), so it would be best to have separate individuals serve those roles.

- It was suggested that it might be possible to have an SSC member serve as the Chair, but that person would be in addition to the SSC/ADT members on the Panel. Concern was

raised that the SSC is already pretty heavily involved and trying to identify an additional SSC member to serve as Chair would be difficult.

- The SEFSC indicated it may be difficult to have an assessment lead handle chairing all the SEDAR workshops and webinars due to workload issues but it might be feasible to reach out to other Centers or organizations to identify a Chair (SERO, Council Staff, academic).
- The question was raised whether funds would be available to pay someone to serve as the Technical Chair. If the Technical Chair was an SSC member eligible for a stipend, then the Cooperator to which they are associated would be responsible for covering that cost. SEDAR has not had any funds to cover stipends in the past, and does not believe it will have additional funds to do so in the future.
- Chair Porch offered that it might be possible for the new Deputy for Science and Council Services to serve as a Technical Chair for an occasional Research Track.
- It was noted that a Technical Chair would not be responsible for all the SEDAR workshops and webinar, but just those associated with a specific Research Track. The scope of responsibility of the Technical Chair needs to be more clearly defined going forward.
- More discussion regarding the Technical Chair position may be needed, as we continue forward with Research Track assessments.
- As a way forward, the Gulf Council offered to try and find an additional SSC to serve as the Technical Chair for the assessment portion of S68 Scamp.

Operational Assessment Process Clarification (Appendix 2)

Chair Porch provided the Committee a brief overview regarding the Science Center's original intent in proposing the Research Track (RT) and Operational Assessment (OA) approaches.

- Research Track assessments were most similar to previous benchmark assessments, but with a more flexible timeline and no requirement to produce management advice.
- Operational assessments are based on previous benchmark or research-track assessments that have already undergone independent peer review. Therefore, unless there is a justified reason for making changes to the model or data, Operational Assessments should normally be limited to updating the existing assessment framework with the most recent data and only minor modifications in the framework and supporting information.

The SEFSC did not anticipate having Assessment Panels for every OA. However, increasingly panels and in-person meetings are requested by the Cooperators. The SEFSC notes that the panels and workshops result in OA assessments taking much more time than originally anticipated.

The SEFSC recommended eliminating "Assessment Panels' for all future Operational Assessments. Instead, OAs may have Topical Working Groups (TWG), which are working groups assembled to discuss specific topics identified in the SoW.

As noted above, the SEFSC is responsible for making technical decisions regarding the assessment in consultation with members of the TWG. The SSC, during their usual process of developing scientific advice for the Council. will consider whether any changes made to the

assessment, in accordance with the statement of work, constitute an improvement over a strict update of the previously approved assessment framework.

The SEFSC believes that this change back to its original intent will reinforce the intent to focus on new issues within OA assessments, rather than a broad review of all aspects of the assessment, and that the name change will help achieve the role change.

Topical Working Groups (TWGs):

- Tasked to review and make recommendations on specific topics identified in the SoWs.
- Comprised of members of the SSC, stakeholders, and other technical experts
- May meet via webinars or in-person workshops; process recommendation should be included in the SoW
- May utilize an IPT-style approach to facilitate some of their discussion
- Will produce a written report (SEDAR Working Paper) documenting their discussions and recommendations
- Timing of the TWG needs to be such that the report documenting the discussions and recommendations is available in time for the analytic teams to incorporate the information into the assessment.
- Most TWGs should be organized within the SEDAR Process, as that process it is already set up to handle Cooperator appointments, notices, meeting and webinar logistics, etc.

The Committee supported the implementation by the SEFSC of Project Managers for all the assessments lead by the SESFC. The inclusion of a summary page in the report documenting the data sources and technical decisions was also supported.

It was noted that the SoW request comes from the Cooperator and not from the SSC, as originally stated in the third bullet of this section in the Overview document.

4 Assessment Schedule Review

4.1 Documents

Attachment 5. Cooperator SoWs

Attachment 6. SEDAR Projects List

Attachment 7. Modifications to the Project Planning Grid from the September 2019 Steering Committee report.

4.2 Summary

The SEFSC requested that each cooperator provide a SoW for the 2021 operational assessments (Attachment 5). SEFSC will report on the SOWs and workload outlook, and the Committee is asked to finalize priorities for 2022 and recommend priorities for 2023.

ASFMC Schedule Request Modifications: ASFMC has requested to push the Atlantic red drum assessment review back until 2024 and conduct an update of Atlantic menhaden in 2022.

SAFMC Schedule Modification: The SEFSC informed the South Atlantic Council at its March 2020 meeting that they would be able to complete the SA red snapper operational assessment by the April 2021 SSC meeting, earlier that originally predicted. This shift in completion date was in response to the redefining of the items contained in the SoW.

Priorities for 2020 – 2023 are shown in Table 2. Due to potential COVID-19 disruptions to assessment schedules for the 2020 projects, it was agreed to postpone the SEDAR-SEFSC Scheduling Call for the 2021 projects (originally scheduled for April) until June.

4.3 Action

- Finalize 2022 Projects
- Recommend 2023 Priorities
- Consider long-term priorities
- Verify date for submitting 2023 Scopes of Work to SEFSC: March 1, 2021

MEETING OUTCOME

The Committee reviewed future assessment project priorities and finalized assessment projects for 2022. Recommendations are shown in Table 1, found at the front of this report with the summarized findings and recommendations.

GSFMC Schedule Request Modifications: GSFMC requested to hold a Gulf menhaden OA in 2021 and push the Gulf menhaden OA slated for 2023 back to 2024. Chair Porch indicated that the 2021 request could be accommodated.

2022 Workplan

Chair Porch indicated that analytical resources are adequate for the requested projects, but he acknowledged that projects or timing may need to be modified given the unknowns regarding the potential future impacts COVID -19. However, at this time the plan appears feasible and was approved for further development of project milestones and schedules.

2023 Workplan

The Committee identified preliminary projects for 2023. These will be finalized at the Spring 2021 meeting. Cooperators were requested to provide statements of work for all potential 2023 operational assessments to the SEFSC by October 15, 2020.

Future Priorities and Workload Planning

Cooperators are requested to identify their assessment priorities for 2024-2026 for further consideration and discussion at the Fall 2020 Steering Committee meeting. Although interim analyses are not a SEDAR project, they will need to be considered in SEFSC workload planning.

5 Other Business

- Procedural Workshop Pre-proposal – Best Practices for Combining Index of Abundance Surveys

Objective: To streamline future reef-fish assessments by defining best practices for generating indices of relative abundance and size composition that incorporate data from multiple surveys and account for survey changes through time.

Attachment 8: Pre-proposal summary

- SEDAR Methods Working Group/Workshop – Shrimp Assessment Process Review

  The SEFSC is conducting an in-depth review of several components of the Gulf of Mexico shrimp assessments. The Center believes a SEDAR Methods Working Group could be beneficial for summarizing the individual review components. A CIE desk review may be requested.

MEETING OUTCOME

Procedural Workshop Pre-proposal – Best Practices for Combining Index of Abundance Surveys

The Committee supported the pre-proposal and would welcome a full proposal be prepared for the Fall Meeting. They suggested that more thought be given to being more inclusion for participants and topics outside of the Gulf of Mexico to justify SEDAR support.

SEDAR Methods Working Group/Workshop – Shrimp Assessment Process Review

Chair Porch provided the Committee a brief summary regarding the shrimp assessments in the Gulf of Mexico. Those assessments have been produced outside of the SEDAR process for several years, and recently there has been a desire to review the methods being used for those assessments.

The SEFSC proposed a three-stage plan:

- Stage 1 (2020) – convene a series of special working groups, organized by the SEFSC, to review previously used methods
- Stage 2 (2021) – hold a SEDAR Methods workshop, where the Special working groups reports are reviewed, and the previous shrimp assessments are updated with the approved methods to provide management advice
- Stage 3 (2022/23?) – SEDAR Assessment and Peer Review of Next Generation Model workshop held

The Committee expressed concerns about the proposed plan, particularly having SEDAR conduct a workshop where assessment advice would be produced for models not previously reviewed through the SEDAR Process. It was suggested that the second stage be conducted as a joint venture between the Gulf Council and the SEFSC. The Gulf Cooperator requested that the SEFSC provide the Terms of Reference for the working groups so that the SSC has an opportunity to review them and the SEFSC agreed. The Committee also noted that the Working Groups should consider the inclusion of non-Center participants.

The Committee requested more information at the next meeting and recommended the following process moving forward (Appendix 3):

A. Stage 1 - SEFSC convenes special working groups to develop best practice guidance for

1. SEAMAP trawl data: mostly Center staff as they run the survey
2. Effort estimation (and CPUE): External partners should be invited.
3. Catch estimation (stop the incomplete port-agent semi-canvas and work with states to develop more timely reporting (perhaps monthly) of trip-ticket data): State partners will be important
4. Observer data - bycatch (and catch) estimation-- there is already a group formed to do this. External partners should be invited.

Timing: Initial Working Groups have been formed. Brief SoWs will be distributed to Gulf of Mexico Council in June. Gulf Council SSC will suggest potential participants and items of interest for SoW.

B. Stage 2 - Gulf Council convenes an assessment workshop to review above WG products, establish the simplest reasonable assessment model (might be close to the 'continuity' model, but with refined inputs), and identify possible future directions (environmental covariate, spatial structure). Goal of this stage is to give more timely management advice than afforded by a long research track, and with a better model than currently used, while laying the foundation for building a more comprehensive model in the future.

Timing: 2021. Date TBD

C. Stage 3 - SEDAR Research Track Assessment to explore outstanding issues (spatial structure, incorporation of environmental covariates etc.)

Timing: 2022/23. Dates TBD

Format and Timing of Statements for Work (SoW) for Operational Assessments (Appendix 1 and 4)

The Committee discussed a proposed template for standardizing the Statements of Work (Appendix 4). While the Committee decided to postpone a decision on the template itself, there was agreement regarding the content that needed to be included in the SoWs. Cooperators agreed to user the proposed template for the 2023 OA SoWs. The key elements were:

- Model type and additional years of data
- Requested Data Updates
- Requested Model Modifications to Previously-approved Assessment
- Topical Working Group Information

The Committee also refined the timing of the submission of the SoW and feedback from the SEFSC. The updated timing was approved by the Committee:

- Assessment Species are tentatively approved at Spring SEDAR Steering Committee Meeting (two years ahead of earliest possible assessment date)
- Cooperators use their process to develop SoWs
- Initial Cooperator-approved SoWs submitted to SEFSC by October 15th
- SEFSC provides feedback to Cooperators via memo no later than February 1st
- Cooperators/Technical review bodies review feedback and negotiate final SoWs with SEFSC

- Final SoWs provided to SEDAR Program Manager by May 1st. (>1 year ahead of intended assessment date)

6 Next Meeting

The Committee is asked to make a scheduling recommendation and suggest topics for the next meeting. Based on past practices, this meeting would be a webinar-based meeting in September 2020. Given the need to conduct the current (May 2020) meeting via webinar, the Committee could consider an in-person meeting in Charleston, SC for the September 2020 meeting.

MEETING OUTCOME

The Committee was in favor of the next SEDAR Steering Committee meeting be held via webinar. Due to a variety of meetings already scheduled for that month, the Committee is looking at the week of August 31st and September 28th. A doodle poll will be sent to the Committee to determine the exact dates.

Appendix 1. **SEDAR ASSESSMENT PROJECT PRIORITES & TIMING**

(Approved: May 2019 Steering Committee Meeting; Updated May 2020 Steering Committee Meeting)

1. Cooperators develop their project priorities.
   Timing: ongoing, 2-5 years in advance of Steering Committee discussions

2. SEDAR Steering Committee reviews preliminary Cooperator requests.
   Timing: 2.5 to 3 years in advance
   Outcome: Preliminary projects list, ready for further consideration through the next steps

3. Cooperators develop **Scope of Work** for each of their assessments on the preliminary list.
   Timing: approximately 2 years before assessment
   Submission and Review Process:
   - Initial Cooperator-approved SoWs submitted to SEFSC by October 15th
   - SEFSC provides feedback to Cooperators via memo no later than February 1st
   - Cooperators/Technical review bodies review feedback and negotiate final SoWs with SEFSC
   - Final SoWs provided to SEDAR Program Manager by May 1st.

   NOTE: Scope of Work is required for OPERATIONAL assessments only. Research Track process uses a planning team to develop a schedule and TORs to meet project needs

   Contents: The following topics should be considered in SOW development
   - Years of data to be updated (may provide a specific terminal year) and model information
   - Requested datasets or research findings to be included and evaluated
   - Requested model modifications to previously-approved assessment
   - Topical Working Group Identification (need, topics)
   - Topical Working Group Process recommendations (i.e., webinar or in-person meeting needs)

4. SEDAR Steering Committee finalizes assessment priorities at the Spring meeting.
   Timing: Priorities are finalized 2 years in advance (2022 projects finalized in 2020)
   Considerations: Analytical and data workload and resources
   Outcome: Final assessment project list for the year

5. SEDAR/SEFSC planning meeting to address the approved project list.
   Timing: 2-3 months following the Steering Committee meeting (typically by August 1)
   Outcome: Project milestones and suggested workshop dates

6. SEDAR drafts initial TORs and schedules for Cooperator review and consideration
   Timing: 1-3 months following the planning meeting
   Considerations: based on the milestones developed through the planning meeting
   SEFSC (lead analysts) consulted on initial draft.

7. SEDAR Steering Committee issues resolution.
   Timing: Fall Steering Committee meeting
   Outcome: Address any issues with fulfilling the project list that arose during the initial planning process.

Appendix 2. Summary of Research Track and Operational Assessment Process
May 2020

Research Track Assessments:

- Purpose: Build a robust assessment tool – will not provide management advice.
- Process: can vary. Typically – 2-3 workshops – Data, Assessment, Review
- Peer Review: Independent panel utilizing CIE reviewers; usually an in-person workshop
- Participants: Suggested participants list produced by Planning Team; participants appointed by Cooperator
- Public Participation: SEDAR provides open, public workshops and webinars with opportunity to comment throughout. Additional opportunities are available once the product is disseminated to the Cooperator.
- Assessment Development Team: standing panel of participants who participate in both the data and assessment stages of the process to provide consistency in decision making process. May also support the Review Workshop stage.
- TORs: Draft ToRs produced by Planning Team; approval of ToRs follows Cooperator approval process
- Product: A thoroughly documented, independently peer reviewed assessment report.
- Data Timeliness: Terminal year for RT will be set by Planning Team; the most recent data reasonably available for the DW should be utilized. Data will not be updated as the process proceeds, and the schedule will not be delayed to update a data timeseries.
- Expected Timeline: 12-18 months; this timeline does not include the Operational assessment to provide management advice.
- Frequency: SEDAR-wide: 1-2 Research Tracks underway at any particular time
    - Per individual stocks: variable, based on need. There are no "expiration dates" on the assessment tool built through a RT (or the benchmark)

Specific Research Track Components:

Planning Team (Organized for each assessment project)

Consists of the SEDAR Coordinator, Lead Analyst, Cooperator staff lead, SSC chair or representative

Charge

Appendix 2. Summary of Research Track and Operational Assessment Process
May 2020

1. Develop a draft project schedule: identify and provide a timeline for the workshops/webinars, critical deadlines and milestones necessary for the project

- Data delivery deadlines established during SEDAR/SEFSC Master Schedule Planning calls
- Final delivery deadlines may be established by the Cooperator/Steering Committee. The planning team is responsible for setting up a schedule that gets the project completed by that time.
- Approval of Milestone Project Schedule follows current practice (lead analytic team and Cooperator)

2. Develop initial TORs: What unique issues does this assessment need to address?

- May begin with default TORs for all assessments, as done in the previous process. This step is for modifying and adding to the defaults to address the specific challenges of each assessment.
- The role of Cooperator staff, analytical lead, and SSC participant is to ensure that issues of concern for their group are considered. For example, the SSC may be concerned about environmental impacts on a stock and add a TOR to have them considered.

3. Identify participants necessary to meet the TORs

- The assigned lead analyst may not be able to address certain specific TORs (e.g. an environmental or survey examination). There may also be a need to bring in specific data providers.

Assessment Development Team (ADT)

- This group is similar to the existing assessment panel
- This is a subset within the DW process
- High level of commitment, strive for balance of opinions and expertise

Goals

- Improve consistency in decision making across workshops, particularly DW to AW
- Reduce the expectation that AW is obligated to follow all DW recommendations
- Improve consistency in decision making across regions, eg, addressing uncertainty ranges

Charge: The ADT is collectively responsible for preparing the stock assessment.

- Attend Data and assessment workshops
- Participate in consensus decision making
- Contribute analyses as needed (based on expertise, esp if added to the working group to help with a specific analytical area)
- Contribute to report preparation
- Present to RW as needed

ADT Suggested Make-up:

- SEFSC: assessment leads; other analysts as needed – who will contribute to the report and analyses
- Cooperator: 1 SSC, 1 other analytical (or SSC)
- Other analytical: 1-2 others, based on plan team recommendations and additional expertise needed
- Technical Chair: Scientist appointed by lead analytic agency; ideally serve as Chair for both Data and Assessment stages

ADT Involvement in Process:

DW Stage:

- DW work groups make recommendations, prepare report sections and documentation
- Decisions made during full plenary, with the ADT members responsible for developing consensus recommendations as needed
- ADT will draft consensus recommendations for inclusion in appropriate DW report sections.

AW Stage:

- AW may also include other participants beyond the ADT who contribute, but are not part of the panel: this may include other analysts/data providers and fisherman observers

Technical and Administrative Chairs

- Divide Chair duties into Technical and Administrative
- Technical tasks to be handled by lead analyst (or other designee of the lead assessment agency)
- Administrative tasks to be handled by SEDAR Coordinator

Research Track (RT) FAQs

Is an RT required for existing, peer reviewed benchmark assessments?

No. A RT would only be required for an existing assessment if there is a need for major changes, such as those that would trigger a new benchmark in the current process.

Is an RT required for first time assessments?

Yes. The RT will be used to build the model tool, similar to the current benchmark. This does not mean RTs will always be limited to single stocks. Multiple data limited stocks could be addressed, as has been done under the current process.

Will RTs only be applied to single assessments, similar to current benchmarks?

No. RT may be applied to a group of stocks to address a methods or data input change shared by all. For example, a RT could be used to develop indices for multiple species from a new survey dataset. A RT could also be used to develop and evaluate a change in model structure or assumptions that could be applied to multiple existing assessments.

Will RTs provide transparency and include opportunities for public involvement?

Yes. RT workshops and webinars will be functionally similar to previous SEDAR workshops.

What role will SSCs play in RTs?

SSCs will play a role in all phases, just as they did for benchmarks.

How will Stock ID be addressed?

Stock ID will be determined at the start of the RT process, similar to how it was addressed prior to benchmark DWs. Usually done through webinars. The Steering Committee will provide guidance on the stock ID determination process when there is a stock ID question to resolve.

Will data providers be expected to recompile or reanalyze data after submitted through DW/Pre-AW phase?

No. The intent is for data to be provided in such a way that the analytical team can compile it as necessary for the assessment.

Operational Assessment (not associated with a Research Track)

- Purpose: Provide analyses to support management advice with up-to-date data.
- Process:
  - Statements of Work (SoW) for a particular Operational Assessment are Cooperator's request to the SEFSC with regards to data inputs, potential assessment modifications, and topics and process (webinars, workshops) for Topical Working Groups, if desired
  - Cooperators produce detailed SoWs that are submitted to the SEFSC for their review.
    - SEFSC provides feedback to Cooperators via memo
    - Cooperators/Technical review bodies review feedback and negotiate final SoWs with SEFSC
    - Final SoWs provided to SEDAR Program Manager
  - SEFSC informs Cooperators what can be accommodated during the SEDAR Steering Committee discussions regarding Project Scheduling
- TORs: Draft ToRs produced by Cooperator and lead analytic agency; approval of ToRs follows existing Cooperator approval process.

- Peer Review: Provided by SSC
- Cooperator Representative Participation will be thorough Topical Working Groups: The need for these groups will vary by project; topics and process (webinars, in-person meetings) should be identified in the SoW
- Public Participation: Open, public SEDAR TWG webinars or workshops will provide opportunity to comment. Additional opportunities once the product is disseminated to the Cooperator.
- Product: A brief report similar to previous update and standard assessment reports, that provides management quantities and addresses the TORs
- Data Timeliness: The intent is to use the most recent data so the advice is timely
- Expected Timeline: 6 months.
- Frequency: Variable:
    - Key Stocks - every 2-5 years
    - After RT: immediate, once updated data are available
    - Other Stocks – as requested

Specific Operational Assessment Components:

Topical Working Groups (TWG):

- Tasked to review and make recommendations on specific topics identified in the SoWs.
- Comprised of members of the SSC, stakeholders, and other technical experts
- May meet via webinars or in-person workshops; process recommendation should be included in the SoW
- May also utilize an IPT-style approach to facilitate some of their discussion
- Will produce a written report (SEDAR Working Paper) documenting their discussions and recommendations
- Timing of the TWG needs to be such that the report documenting the discussions and recommendations is available in time for the analytic teams to incorporate the information into the assessment.
- Most TWGs should be organized within the SEDAR Process, as that process it is already set up to handle Cooperator appointments, notices, meeting and webinar logistics, etc.

Operational Assessment (OA) FAQs

If an Operational Assessment may be an update of the previous assessment, or may allow for slight modifications, who will decide what can be included?

The SEFSC will decide what is necessary and can be accommodated in the overall schedule. The Statement of Work for a given assessment will outline the process, based on recommendations and requests from the Cooperator, including SSC and APs. The SEFSC will review the SoWs, along with research needs identified in the RT (or prior assessments) and consider if any are addressed and can be included. The SEFSC may also review any new research and data sources that may be relevant. All of these factors will need to be considered when outlining the process and how extensive it needs to be. The SEFSC will inform the Cooperator of its determination via a memo in early Spring, to allow for time to negotiate prior to the Spring SEDAR Steering Committee meeting.

How will the interval between OAs be determined?

Intervals will vary between stocks, and should be determined through a collaborative effort of the SSC/APs/SEFSC (or other appropriate groups depending on the cooperator). Ideally, future timing will be addressed during the RT, and may be addressed during an OA. Future timing may change as a fishery or stock changes.

Shrimp Research/Assessment Plan

2020: SEFSC Special Working Groups

1. SEAMAP
2. EFFORT
3. CATCH
4. OBSERVER

2021: GMFMC Assessment Workshop

Assessment workshop to
5. Review 1-4
6. Refine existing model
7. Recommend future directions

2022/23 SEDAR Research Track

Assessment Workshop & Review Workshop to develop *Next Generation* Stock Assessment Models

Appendix 4. Draft Statement of Work Template and Updated Timing

Species:
Shadow Shark

Model and Additional Data Years:

- Prior Assessment: SE Shadow Shark SEDAR 99
- Prior Terminal Year: 2026
- OA Terminal Year: 2030/2031, adding 4-5 years of new data, depending on the chosen terminal year.)
- Apply the current SUPRA configuration.

Requested Data Updates (Please be as specific as possible):

- Include any new and updated information on life history, discard mortality, and steepness.
- Explore using appropriate CVs for the landings data to capture the uncertainty in the model results.
- Evaluate sensitivity runs with differing amounts of recruitment coming from outside the system to account for the possibility of transport of larvae and adults from the Caribbean.

Requested Model Modification to previously approved assessment (Please be as specific as possible):

- Modification Request 1:
- Modification request 2:

Is a Topical Working Group Needed?: Yes or No

If Yes, Topical Working Group Topics:

- Topic 1:
- Topic 2:

Suggested Topical Working Group Process:
Webinars/workshops?

APPROVED TIMING:

- Assessment Species are approved at Spring SEDAR Steering Committee Meeting (ex. May 2020)
- Cooperators use their process to develop SoWs
- Initial Cooperator-approved SoWs submitted to SEFSC by October 15th (15 Oct 2020 in this example)
- SEFSC provides feedback to Cooperators via memo no later than February 1st (1 February 2021 in this example)
- Cooperators/Technical review bodies review feedback and negotiate final SoWs with SEFSC
- Final SoWs provided to SEDAR Program Manager by May 1st. (1 May 2021)