



---

## OUTCOMES OF THE 11TH SESSION OF THE IPHC SCIENTIFIC REVIEW BOARD (SRB011)

PREPARED BY: IPHC SECRETARIAT (05 APRIL 2018)

---

### PURPOSE

To provide the MSAB with the outcomes of the 11<sup>th</sup> Session of the IPHC Scientific Review Board (SRB) relevant to the mandate of the MSAB.

### BACKGROUND

The agenda of the 11<sup>th</sup> Session of the IPHC Scientific Review Board (SRB) included an agenda item dedicated to Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE).

### DISCUSSION

During the course of the 11<sup>th</sup> Session of the IPHC Scientific Review Board (SRB011), a number of specific requests and recommendations regarding the IPHC MSE process were proposed by the SRB. Relevant sections from the report of the meeting are provided in [Appendix A](#) for the MSAB's consideration.

### RECOMMENDATION

That the MSAB:

- 1) **NOTE** paper IPHC-2018-MSAB011-05 which details the outcomes of the 11<sup>th</sup> Session of the IPHC Scientific Review Board (SRB) relevant to the mandate of the MSAB.

### APPENDICES

[Appendix A](#): Excerpt from the 11<sup>th</sup> Session of the IPHC Scientific Review Board (SRB) Report ([IPHC-2017-SRB011-R](#)).

**APPENDIX A**  
**Excerpt from the 11<sup>th</sup> Session of the IPHC Scientific Review Board (SRB) Report**  
**(IPHC-2017-SRB011-R)**

**7. MANAGEMENT STRATEGY EVALUATION: UPDATE**

22. The SRB **NOTED** paper IPHC-2017-SRB11-08 that provided an update on the progress of the IPHC Management Strategy Evaluation process and seek recommendations from the SRB related to the Management Strategy Evaluation.

*7.1 A description of the closed-loop simulations*

23. The SRB **NOTED** the substantial progress in developing a very powerful simulation tool for evaluating robustness of alternative harvest policies. For example, the current simulation modeling framework could examine the expected long-term consequences of the current harvest policy.

24. The SRB **NOTED** that the current simulation framework is not yet adequate for evaluating short-term and medium-term outcomes because it assumes perfect knowledge about stock size and parameters in all future years. The SRB looks forward to SRB12 where we *expect* to see the implications of uncertainty in annual assessments and parameters.

25. The SRB **RECOMMENDED** that the IPHC Secretariat and Management Strategy Advisory Board collaborate to:

- 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.

26. The SRB **NOTED** that the simulation model for projecting future changes in weight-at-age and regime shifts was presented in the type of detail that had previously been requested by the SRB; that is, with some specific equations and distributional assumptions so that the SRB could evaluate the model input, output, and parameterization, as well as alternative formulations.

27. The SRB **REQUESTED** that a quasi-extinction threshold be established so that:

- 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.

28. 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.

29. 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.

*7.2 Simulation results and presenting results to the IPHC Management Strategy Advisory Board (MSAB)*

See [paragraphs 23 and 24](#).