



UPDATE ON ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE 11TH SESSION OF THE IPHC SCIENTIFIC REVIEW BOARD (SRB011)

PREPARED BY: IPHC SECRETARIAT (17 MAY 2018)

PURPOSE

To provide the Scientific Advisory Board (SRB) with an opportunity to consider the progress made during the intersessional period, on the recommendations/requests arising from the SRB012.

BACKGROUND

At the SRB011, the members recommended/requested a series of actions to be taken by the IPHC Secretariat staff, as detailed in the SRB011 meeting report (IPHC-2017-SRB011-R) available from the IPHC website, and as provided in [Appendix A](#).

DISCUSSION

During the 12th Session of the SRB (SRB012), efforts will be made to ensure that any recommendations/requests for action are carefully constructed so that each contains the following elements:

- 1) a specific action to be undertaken (deliverable);
- 2) clear responsibility for the action to be undertaken (such as the IPHC Staff or SRB officers);
- 3) a desired time frame for delivery of the action (such as by the next session of the SRB or by some other specified date).

RECOMMENDATION/S

That the SRB:

- 1) **NOTE** paper IPHC-2018-SRB012-03, which provided the SRB with an opportunity to consider the progress made during the inter-sessional period, in relation to the consolidated list of recommendations/requests arising from the previous SRB meeting (SRB011).
- 2) **AGREE** to consider and revise the actions as necessary, and to combine them with any new actions arising from SRB012.

APPENDICES

[Appendix A: Update on actions arising from the 11th Session of the IPHC Scientific Review Board \(SRB011\)](#)



APPENDIX A
Update on actions arising from the 11th Session of the IPHC Scientific Review Board (SRB011)

RECOMMENDATIONS

Action No.	Description	Update
SRB11– Rec.01 (para. 14)	<p>Pacific halibut stock assessment (2017): Data source development</p> <p>The SRB RECOMMENDED continuing to down-weight terminal year fishery CPUE in the annual stock assessment because terminal and post-season CPUE may be substantially different. Generating and presenting the conditional distribution for post-season CPUE given terminal CPUE, should be undertaken as a way to improve communication about most recent fishery CPUE values.</p>	<p>Completed.</p>
SRB11– Rec.02 (para. 25)	<p>Management Strategy Evaluation: A description of the closed-loop simulations</p> <p>The SRB RECOMMENDED that the IPHC Secretariat and Management Strategy Advisory Board collaborate to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) further clarify and improve the presentation of the Harvest Strategy Policy (Appendix IV). This would improve not only transparency of the existing interim harvest policy, but also of the MSE process for evaluating alternatives. b) Review harvest policies from other bodies to develop an objectives hierarchy that explicitly prioritizes long-term conservation over short-/medium-term (e.g., 3-8 years) catch performance. 	<p>Pending. The MSAB had no suggestions for improving the Harvest Strategy Policy figure, but IPHC Secretariat has been working with MSAB members to create a figure describing the TCEY distribution component. The figures will be updated as needed.</p> <p>The review of harvest policies from other bodies is currently in progress. A review of other MSE's is also in progress to determine how they report long- and short-term statistics.</p>
SRB11– Rec.03 (para. 29)	<p>The SRB RECOMMENDED that the IPHC Secretariat hire a modeler/programmer to support MSE work so that timely feedback can be given the MSAB in the MSE process.</p>	<p>Pending. The IPHC Secretariat is currently drafting a document for the Commission that will outline the deliverables expected from a MSE researcher.</p>

Action No.	Description	Update
SRB11– Rec.04 (<u>para. 36</u>)	<p>Biological and ecosystem science program: Presentation of potential future research projects</p> <p>The SRB RECOMMENDED that IPHC consider hiring a life-history modeler to provide more explicit linkage between the empirical biological program and the applied assessment and MSE modeling programs.</p>	Pending. The IPHC Secretariat is exploring possibilities for conducting the recommended modeling work.

REQUESTS

Action No.	Description	Update
SRB11– Req.01 (<u>para. 7</u>)	<p>IPHC fishery-independent setline survey: Methods for spatial survey modelling</p> <p>The SRB REQUESTED that the IPHC Secretariat present a form of <u>Table 1</u> to Commissioners, adding a column for Qualitative Cost (e.g., High, Low given sampling intensity, fishing cost, etc.).</p>	Completed. The requested column was added for the annual meeting, but Commissioners did not appear to find it helpful, preferring to see a precise estimation of costs instead.
SRB11– Req.02 (<u>para. 9</u>)	<p>The SRB REQUESTED that the following be maintained on the IPHC Program of Work: (i) examination of revenue and cost-recovery (i.e., cost benefit analyses), (ii) forecast the effect on CV of the presence or absence of expansion FISS stations, (iii) plotting relative error against number of stations, and (iv) comparison of frequency of zeros between standard and expansion FISS stations.</p>	Pending. As discussed at SRB11, this work will be undertaken as part of the full evaluation following completion of the setline survey expansion in 2019.
SRB11– Req.03 (<u>para. 12</u>)	<p>IPHC fishery-independent setline survey: Preliminary FISS results</p> <p>The SRB REQUESTED continuing research – subsequent to the 94th Annual Meeting of the IPHC (AM094) - on the effect of other covariates such as dissolved oxygen on the IPHC fishery-independent setline survey catch rates, and for any results to be presented at SRB12.</p>	Ongoing. Work on modelling covariates is underway, with a focus on dissolved oxygen in Regulatory Area 2A. Results to date to be discussed at SRB12.
SRB11– Req.04 (<u>para. 15</u>)	<p>Pacific halibut stock assessment (2017): Data source development</p> <p>The SRB REQUESTED continuing research on discrepancies between Estimated and Measured weights of Pacific halibut, be presented at SRB12.</p>	Pending. The IPHC Secretariat anticipates further data collection through 2018 is needed to fully address spatial and inter-annual patterns.

Action No.	Description	Update
SRB11– Req.05 (para. 21)	<p>Size limit analysis for 2017: Update</p> <p>NOTING the thoughtful and detailed presentation on the potential impacts of changing the minimum size limit presented in Appendix E (<i>Evaluation of adaptive management approaches</i>) of paper IPHC-2017-SRB11-07, the SRB REQUESTED that the IPHC Secretariat, between now and SRB12, seek feedback from the Commissioners, Conference Board, Processors Advisory Board, and the Management Strategy Advisory Board, on a modified version of Appendix E. In particular, a modified version would include (i) a process for starting and possibly ending an experiment, (ii) performance metrics, and (iii) criteria for making conclusions based on the experimental outcomes.</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>AM094–Rec.04 (para. 89)</p> <p>The Commission NOTED report IPHC-2018-AM094-14, which indicated that the performance of the management procedure is dominated by management decisions other than the size limit, (e.g. removal of the size limit is likely to result in minimal changes in yield) and RECOMMENDED that the size limit remain unchanged.</p>
SRB11– Req.06 (para. 27)	<p>Management Strategy Evaluation: A description of the closed-loop simulations</p> <p>The SRB REQUESTED that a quasi-extinction threshold be established so that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) simulation replicates can be flagged when projected spawning biomass drops below this threshold; b) parameter sets causing quasi-extinction in the historical period can be dropped from the operating model initialization. 	<p>Pending. IPHC Secretariat plans to work with the SRB in identifying appropriate quasi-extinction thresholds for the simulations. Currently, any parameter sets with steepness less than 0.6 are removed.</p>
SRB11– Req.07 (para. 28)	<p>The SRB REQUESTED that the MSE simulation initialize the operating model biomass in the current year from the more precise Ensemble distribution of the current state (e.g., 2017) rather than the wider distribution obtained from the Operating model.</p>	<p>Pending. The IPHC Secretariat plans to discuss an approach to reporting short- and long-term performance metrics that will address this issue.</p>

Action No.	Description	Update
SRB11– Req.08 (<u>para. 32</u>)	<p>Biological and ecosystem science program: Progress on ongoing IPHC-funded research projects</p> <p>The SRB REQUESTED that the IPHC Secretariat prepare a presentation for SRB12, on the overall research initiatives to show how stock assessment, biology, and policy are integrated. Ultimately, such an integrated presentation should be a key component of science presentations at future IPHC Annual Meetings. For example, all research presentations would have been more effective had there been:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) more precise linkages among key knowledge gaps within the biology, annual stock assessment, and MSE simulations; b) a specific suite of questions to be discussed during the SRB meeting; c) sufficient background material provided such that the SRB can provide informed comment and advice related to the specific questions in (b). 	<p>Completed. The IPHC Secretariat will present an integrated scheme of biological research with stock assessment and policy at SRB12. A draft of this integrated scheme was presented at the AM094 (IPHC-2018-AMP094-13).</p>
SRB11– Req.09 (<u>para. 33</u>)	<p>NOTING that some of the biological science work is externally funded and peer-reviewed, the SRB REQUESTED that future background papers include successfully funded proposals so that the SRB has sufficient detail to review implementation and progress of the work.</p>	<p>Completed. The IPHC Secretariat has included the funded grant proposals as information papers IPHC-2018-SRB012-INF01 and IPHC-2018-SRB012-INF02.</p>
SRB11– Req.10 (<u>para. 34</u>)	<p>The SRB REQUESTED that the IPHC Secretariat provide specific advice about the SRB’s role in reviewing the design, analytical methods, and implementation of internally-funded projects.</p>	<p>Completed. The IPHC Secretariat has provided specific advice from the SRB regarding specific research questions</p>
SRB11– Req.11 (<u>para. 35</u>)	<p>Biological and ecosystem science program: Presentation of potential future research projects</p> <p>NOTING the presentation of project timelines and milestones, the SRB REQUESTED that timelines also be included for incorporating biological research results into the stock assessment and MSE work.</p>	<p>Completed. The IPHC Secretariat will include in the presentation at SRB12 a timeline of the integrated scheme of biological research with stock assessment and policy.</p>