## Five Overarching Objectives

- Biological sustainability - identify stock conservation objectives
- Fishery (all directed fisheries) sustainability and stability - identify harvest minimum and acceptable variability
- Assurance of access - minimize probability of fishery closures
- Minimize bycatch mortality
- Serve consumer needs


## Five Management Procedures

- Total mortality: Direct accounting by area for all sources of mortality in that area, including sublegals.
- Size limits: No size limit, current minimum size limit, 26 inches instead of 32, slot limits.
- Harvest strategies: 30:20 control rule, reference removal rate $21.5 \% / 16.125 \%$, coastwide and by area.
- National shares: catch limits by areas would be allocated rather than based on apportionment.
- Bycatch mitigation: Compensation among areas for bycatch in a particular area.

Table 1. Candidate goals and objectives for MSE process - May 2014

| Goal | Objective | Performance <br> Metric | Probability | Time frame | IPHC Staff Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Biological <br> sustainability | Limit <br> - the level of <br> biomass below <br> which no fishing <br> can occur | 1) Maintain a <br> minimum of <br> number of mature <br> female halibut <br> coast-wide (e.g., <br> one million) | 0.99 | Each year | Number of females and <br> spawning biomass can be <br> equivalent, however this <br> objective could also be <br> evaluated with respect to <br> average female size |


| Goal | Objective | Performance Metric | Probability | Time frame | IPHC Staff Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | catch at $>70 \%$ of historical 19932012 average |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 5) Maximize yield in each regulatory area | 0.5 | Each year | * See above. This performance metric is actually an objective and requires a specific value for calculating a probability. |
|  |  |  | ? | Within 5 years of implementation | * See above. |
|  |  |  | 0.9 | Each year | * The absolute quantities for catch will be difficult to achieve. For example you may never be able to achieve $70 \%$ of the average catch in 90 out of 100 cases. In terms of assurance of access in 90 out of 100 cases, adjusting the \% of the average catch may be necessary. |
| Fishery sustainability and stability | Harvest efficiency | Wastage in the longline fishery <10\% of annual catch limit | 0.75 | Over a 5 year period | * The performance metric might be best expressed as the ratio of discards to retained, or sublegal:legal. Wastage is difficult to quantify due to assumptions about discard mortality rate and biases in the observer programs with partial coverage. |


| Goal | Objective | Performance Metric | Probability | Time frame | IPHC Staff Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fishery sustainability and stability <br> Assurance of access <br> Serve consumer needs | Limit catch variability | 6) Limit annual changes in TAC, coastwide and/or by Regulatory Area, to less than $15 \%$ | 1 | Each year | * This might be better described as a harvest control rule or procedure (akin to slow up fast down). The performance metric would be the average annual variability in catch. In this case the AAV <= 0.15 with a probability of 1 each year. |
| Biological sustainability | Risk tolerance and assessment uncertainty | When Limit < estimated biomass < Threshold, limit the probability of declines | 0.05-0.5, depending on estimated stock status | 10 years | * The performance metric here might better be expressed as the frequency that Blimit < estimated biomass <= threshold, and the desired probability of being in this window is on the order of 0.05-0.5 over a 10 year window. |

* Many of the performance metrics are likely to interact with both conservation targets and harvest rate objectives, and their probabilities will be dependent on recruitment variation and desirable/acceptable economic standards of participants. Finding the balance of these competing objectives is the primary purpose of the MSE process.

