

Report on the cabezon and lingcod  
Stock Assessment Review (STAR) Panel  
July 27 - 31, 2009  
Seattle, WA

Jean-Jacques Maguire  
CIE Reviewer  
Halieutikos inc  
1450 Godefroy, Québec, Qc  
Canada, G1T 2E4  
[jjmaguire@sympatico.ca](mailto:jjmaguire@sympatico.ca)

Prepared for the Center for Independent Experts  
September 2009

## Executive Summary

The assessment documents for the two reviewed species were made available sufficiently early before the meeting to allow for an in-depth review. The documents for the two species were well prepared and contained the required information.

The assessments for both species do represent the best available scientific information and each assessment provides a reliable basis for setting OFLs and ABCs as mandated by the Magnuson-Stevens Act. Both assessments are subject to considerable uncertainties however because of the lack of reliable fishery independent indices of stock size and because management measures since the early 2000s have decreased considerably the usefulness of fishery dependent indices of stock size.

The two assessments use Stock Synthesis as their main analytical tool, as is the case for many USA West Coast stock assessments. Stock Synthesis is a highly flexible assessment tool in which it is possible to use several sources of information (growth information, catch, length and age frequencies, indices of stock sizes, etc.) to evaluate stock status. Stock Synthesis is highly structured with many options and built-in assumptions; it can be configured to mimic several other types of assessment approaches. Because of its structure and underlying assumptions, Stock Synthesis can provide stock estimates and fisheries management benchmarks even when very little data, including reliable stock size indices are available as is the case for the cabezon and lingcod assessments. In Stock Synthesis, it difficult to ascertain the most important influence on the assessment results: The data or the assumptions in the assessment model. Using assessment software other than Stock Synthesis, including simpler statistical catch at age models, would be helpful to validate Stock Synthesis results and to determine the relative influence of data versus assumptions.

In other stock assessment and peer review systems, considerable time is spent examining input data prior to modeling. Analysts who use Stock Synthesis seem to spend less time on that stage: All available data are included in the assessment software and the analysts look at what comes out. Input data could be more carefully examined prior to being included in the Stock Synthesis framework.

Estimates of catches have been extended backwards considerably, sometimes to the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. One of the main reasons for extending estimates of catches as far back as possible is to avoid the “shifting baseline” syndrome that could result in lost fishing opportunities. The danger, however, is that because of limited data other than catches and because catch estimates are themselves highly uncertain, unrealistic virgin biomasses may be estimated, which, when compared with reasonably well informed and well estimated recent biomass estimates, imply that the stocks remain below the rebuilding target and should continue to be severely constrained.

## **Background**

The STock Assessment Review (STAR) panel is part of the Pacific Fishery Management Council's (PFMC) process to provide peer review as referenced in the 2006 Reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, which states that:

the Secretary and each Regional Fishery Management Council may establish a peer review process for that Regional Fishery Management Council for scientific information used to advise the Regional Fishery Management Council about the conservation and management of the fishery (see Magnuson-Stevens Act section 302(g)(1)(E)). If a peer review process is established, it should investigate the technical merits of stock assessments and other scientific information used by the Council's Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC). The peer review process is not a substitute for the SSC and should work in conjunction with the SSC.

The Pacific Fishery Management Council's Terms of Reference for the West Coast Groundfish Stock Assessments and STAR Process for 2009-2010 require that reviewers be appointed from the Center for Independent Experts (CIE). Two reviewers (S.J. Smith and J.-J. Maguire) from the Center for Independent Experts (CIE) took part in the 2009 STAR panel on cabezon and lingcod.

Cabezon and lingcod were previously assessed in 2005 with the cabezon stock assessment being limited to waters off California. The 2009 assessment retains the two California sub-stocks, evaluates a coast-wide California stock, and extends the assessment to a third sub-stock for cabezon in the waters off Oregon. The 2005 lingcod assessment used two separate models for northern and southern areas and was the basis for declaring the coast-wide stock rebuilt, however, the rate of recovery in the southern area was much lower. The 2009 assessment covered the distribution from the U.S.-Mexico border to the U.S. Canadian border as two separate assessments of (1) Lingcod off of Washington and Oregon (the North stock), and lingcod off of California (the South stock). The technical review took place at the hotel DECA in Seattle during July 27 – 31 in a formal, public meeting of fishery stock assessment experts.

## **Review Activities**

Prior to the July 27- 31, 2009 STAR panel meeting, I downloaded and reviewed the main assessment papers. I attended the STAR Panel and was rapporteur for cabezon. I took active part on the discussions for the two species being reviewed.

## Summary of Findings for each ToR

- 1. Become familiar with the draft Cabezon and Lingcod stock assessments and background materials. Along with other members of the Panel, determine if the stock assessment document is sufficiently complete according to the Pacific Fishery Management Council's Terms of Reference for West Coast Groundfish Stock Assessment and STAR Panels (to be included once finalized).**

Both the cabezon and lingcod assessment document were complete, very well researched, very well documented and very clearly presented. Both incorporated the results of recent research, documented the effects of moving from the previous assessment platform to SS3, and included several sensitivity runs covering a range of plausible cases. Both included a retrospective analysis where the results extended to the last year of the assessment, that is, past the last year used in the retrospective assessment. This does not facilitate interpretation of the results and it is preferable to end the series at the last year used in the retrospective assessment.

- 2. Evaluate, data collection operations and survey design and make recommendations for improvement**

The data collection operations were not discussed in detail, but do seem to be appropriate and follow standard procedures.

Several potential indices of abundance were included in the cabezon assessment: Fishery-dependent CPFV logbook CPUE, a CDFG hook-and-line survey, and PSMFC dockside and onboard surveys, fishery-independent adult surveys (TENERA and PISCO), recruitment surveys (CalCOFI, Southern California Edison Impingement, PISCO SMURFS, SLO SMURFS), and Oregon Ocean Recreational Boat Survey (ORBS) sampling program.

Changes in bag and size limits in California also necessitated the separation of the CPFV data into two series: 1) 1960-1999 and 2000-2008. This approach differs from the previous assessment, which used a continuous index from 1960-2004.

The lingcod assessment uses Triennial survey indices for the years 1980-2004; NWFSC survey indices for the years 2003-2008; commercial logbook CPUE indices for the years 1976-1997 (North) or 1978-1997 (South); and PSMFC Dockside (recreational) boat survey index 1980-1989, 1993-1997 (South).

- 3. Comment on quality of data used in the assessment**

Data from the early 1980s to the present are considered to be more reliable than for years before 1980. As a result of fisheries management measures implemented in the late 1990s – early 2000s fishery dependent indices of stock sizes used in previous assessment could no longer be used because of change in fishing behavior, timing and / or areas. The best available data have been used, but stock size indices are unlikely to provide reliable estimates of stock size and sampling for size and age is difficult because of the small catches and high price (e.g. cabezon for live fish trade) and is consequently limited.

Both assessments used newly reconstructed catches for California. While all relevant sources of information available appear to have been used, and all assumptions seem reasonable, there is no doubt that actual catches by species remain highly uncertain. One of the main reasons for extending estimates of catches as far back as possible is to avoid the “shifting baseline” syndrome where the objective to rebuild to recent high biomasses, which may be considerably smaller than historical highs, could result in lost fishing opportunities. The danger, however, is that because of limited data other than catches and because catch estimates are themselves highly uncertain, unrealistic virgin biomasses may be estimated, which, when compared with reasonably well informed and well estimated recent biomass estimates, imply that the stocks remain below the rebuilding target and should continue to be severely constrained.

If quantitative stock assessments are to continue to be done for these species, it would be useful to have more reliable indices of stock size because trawl surveys may not provide reliable indices. Longline or pot surveys could be more appropriate and a combined survey could possibly be designed for both species.

#### **4. Evaluate and comment on analytic methodologies.**

Both assessments used the most recent version Stock Synthesis as their main analytical tool. Stock Synthesis is a standard assessment tool for many USA West Coast stock assessments. It is a highly flexible assessment tool in which it is possible to use several sources of information (growth information, catch, length and age frequencies, indices of stock sizes, etc. ) to evaluate stock status. Stock Synthesis is highly structured with many options and built-in assumptions; it can be configured to mimic several other types of assessment approaches. Because of its structure and underlying assumptions, Stock Synthesis can provide stock estimates and fisheries management benchmarks even when very little data are available. In Stock synthesis, it is sometimes difficult to ascertain the most important influence on the assessment results: the data or the assumptions in the assessment model.

#### **5. Evaluate model assumptions, estimates, and major sources of uncertainty. Specifically, recommend improvements including alternative model configurations or formulations as appropriate during the panel meeting and comment on the primary sources of uncertainty in the assessment model.**

Recommendations for improvements made during the meeting are documented in the panel report in the additional runs requested and in the research recommendations. Using assessment software other than Stock Synthesis, including simpler statistical catch at age models, would be helpful to validate Stock Synthesis results and to determine the relative influence of data versus assumptions. While the STAT has done an admirable job at using the available information, it is not obvious that most progress will be achieved by more modeling: Either collecting reliable stock size information, or using management approaches that do not require stock assessments might prove more useful.

**6. Insert an explicit statement as to whether this stock assessment represents the best available science.**

Both the cabezon assessment and the lingcod assessment do represent the best available scientific information and provides a reliable basis for setting OFLs and ABCs as mandated by the Magnuson-Stevens Act. Both assessments are subject to considerable uncertainties however because of the lack of reliable fishery independent indices of stock size and because management measures since the early 2000s have decreased considerably the usefulness of fishery dependent indices of stock size.

**7. Recommendations for any further improvements.**

Use other models, including simpler statistical catch at age models, to determine the relative influence of data versus assumptions in Stock Synthesis.

Prior to running any assessment model, investigate what the data are saying. This would allow the identification of stock size indices that are or may not be consistent. If stock size indices are consistent, the analyses can proceed, but if they are not, a scientific judgment has to be made on how to use conflicting indices. Similarly, age and length compositions should be examined for signals on recruitment and abundance of various age/size classes.

**8. Brief description on panel review proceedings, highlighting pertinent discussions, issues, effectiveness, and recommendations.**

The meeting proceeded smoothly along the agreed schedule. The STATs diligently conducted additional analyses and presented them. There was a real good spirit of cooperation between the STAT and the STAR panel to improve the quality and usefulness of the assessment. All participants had internet access in the meeting room which greatly facilitated review activities and exchange of material.

## **Conclusions and Recommendations**

In other stock assessment and peer review systems, considerable time is spent examining input data prior to modeling. Analysts who use Stock Synthesis seem to spend less time on that stage: all available data is included in the assessment software and the analysts look at what comes out. Input data could be more carefully examined prior to being included in the Stock Synthesis framework. Prior to running any assessment model, analysts should investigate what the data are saying. This would allow the identification of stock size indices that are may or may not be consistent. If stock size indices are consistent, the analyses can proceed, but if they are not, a scientific judgment has to be made on how to use conflicting indices. Similarly, age and length compositions should be examined for signals on recruitment and abundance of various age/size classes.

It is sometimes difficult to ascertain the most important influence on the assessment results: the data or the assumptions in the assessment model. Using assessment software other than Stock Synthesis, including simpler statistical catch at age models, would be helpful to validate Stock Synthesis results and to determine the relative influence of data versus assumptions.

If fisheries management require that quantitative stock assessments are to continue to be done for these species, it would be useful to have reliable indices of stock size. Given the characteristics of both species, it seems that a joint survey could be designed and could be used to sample in all areas, including those currently closed to fishing.

In addition to retrospective analyses, the assessment document should include a comparison of assessment results with those of previous assessments.

The sensitivity of results to using only recent reliable data should be investigated, particularly with respect to depletion estimates.

## **Appendix 1: Bibliography of materials provided for review**

Cope, J.M. and Punt, A.E. 2005. Status of Cabezon (*Scorpaenichthys marmoratus*) in California Waters as Assessed in 2005.

Cope, J.M. and Key, M. 2009. DRAFT!!! Status of Cabezon (*Scorpaenichthys marmoratus*) in California and Oregon Waters as Assessed in 2009.

Hamel, O.S, Sethi, S.A. and Wadsworth, T.F. 2009. Status and Future Prospects for Lingcod in Waters off Washington, Oregon, and California as Assessed in 2009.

Jagiello, T.H. and Wallace, F.R. 2005. Assessment of Lingcod (*Ophiodon elongatus*) for the Pacific Fishery Management Council in 2005.

Jagiello, T.H., Wallace, F.R. , and Cheng, Y.W. 2003. Assessment of Lingcod (*Ophiodon elongatus*) for the Pacific Fishery Management Council in 2003

Methot, R.D. 2000. Technical description of the stock synthesis assessment program. U.S. Dept. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NWFSC-43, 46 p.

Methot, R.D. 2009. User Manual for Stock Synthesis Model Version 3.02C. Updated January 29, 2009. NOAA Fisheries Seattle, WA

STAR Panel Report. 2005. Cabezon.

STAR Panel Report. 2003. Cabezon

STAR Panel Report 2005. Lingcod.

## **Appendix 2: A copy of the CIE Statement of Work**

### **Statement of Work for Jean-Jacques Maguire**

#### **External Independent Peer Review by the Center for Independent Experts**

#### **Stock Assessment Review Panel for Cabezon and Lingcod**

**Scope of Work and CIE Process:** The National Marine Fisheries Service's (NMFS) Office of Science and Technology coordinates and manages a contract to provide external expertise through the Center for Independent Experts (CIE) to conduct impartial and independent peer reviews of NMFS scientific projects. This Statement of Work (SoW) described herein was established by the NMFS Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR) and CIE based on the peer review requirements submitted by NMFS Project Contact. CIE reviewers are selected by the CIE Coordination Team and Steering Committee to conduct the peer review of NMFS science with project specific Terms of Reference (ToRs). Each CIE reviewer shall produce a CIE independent peer review report with specific format and content requirements (**Annex 1**). This SoW describes the work tasks and deliverables of the CIE reviewers for conducting an independent peer review of the following NMFS project.

**Project Description:** Cabezon and lingcod were last assessed in 2005. The cabezon stock assessment, however, was limited to waters off California. A new integrated assessment for the entire west coast will be undertaken in 2009. Lingcod was last assessed during 2005, using two separate models for northern and southern areas. That assessment was the basis for declaring the coast-wide stock rebuilt, however, the rate of recovery in the southern area was much lower. This assessment will focus on developing an integrated assessment for the entire west coast. These two benchmark stock assessments will provide the basis for the management of the groundfish fisheries off the West Coast of the U.S. including providing scientific basis for setting OFLs and ABCs as mandated by the Magnuson-Stevens Act. The technical review will take place during a formal, public, multiple-day meeting of fishery stock assessment experts. Participation of external, independent reviewer is an essential part of the review process.

The STAR panel is part of the Pacific Fishery Management Council's process to provide peer review as referenced in the 2006 Reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, which states that " the Secretary and each Regional Fishery Management Council may establish a peer review process for that Regional Fishery Management Council for scientific information used to advise the Regional Fishery Management Council about the conservation and management of the fishery (see Magnuson-Stevens Act section 302(g)(1)(E)). If a peer review process is established, it should investigate the technical merits of stock assessments and other scientific information used by the Council's Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC). The peer

review process is not a substitute for the SSC and should work in conjunction with the SSC.”

The Pacific Fishery Management Council’s Terms of Reference for the West Coast Groundfish Stock Assessments and STAR Process for 2009-2010 requires that some reviewers be appointed from the Center for Independent Experts (CIE). The Council’s terms of reference document will be included as background material.

The Terms of Reference (ToRs) specific to the CIE are attached in **Annex 2**. The tentative agenda of the panel review meeting is attached in **Annex 3**.

**Requirements for CIE Reviewers:** Two CIE reviewers are required with one of the reviewers participating in all 2009 STAR panels (other than hake) to provide a level of consistency between the panels. The CIE reviewers shall conduct an impartial and independent peer review in accordance with the SoW and ToRs herein. Each CIE reviewer’s duties shall not exceed a maximum of 14 days to complete all work tasks of the peer review described herein. CIE reviewers shall have the expertise, background, and experience to complete an independent peer review in accordance with the SoW and ToRs herein. CIE reviewers shall have expertise and work experience in fish population dynamics, with experience in the integrated analysis modeling approach, using age-and size-structured models, use of MCMC to develop confidence intervals, and use of Generalized Linear Models in stock assessment models.

**Location of Peer Review:** Each CIE reviewer shall conduct an independent peer review during the panel review meeting scheduled in Seattle, Washington on July 27-31, 2009.

**Statement of Tasks:** Each CIE reviewers shall complete the following tasks in accordance with the SoW and Schedule of Milestones and Deliverables herein.

Prior to the Peer Review: Upon completion of the CIE reviewer selection by the CIE Steering committee, the CIE shall provide the CIE reviewer information (name, affiliation, and contact details) to the COTR, who forwards this information to the NMFS Project Contact no later the date specified in the Schedule of Milestones and Deliverables. The CIE is responsible for providing the SoW and ToRs to the CIE reviewers. The NMFS Project Contact is responsible for providing the CIE reviewers with the background documents, reports, foreign national security clearance, and information concerning other pertinent meeting arrangements. The NMFS Project Contact is also responsible for providing the Chair a copy of the SoW in advance of the panel review meeting. Any changes to the SoW or ToRs must be made through the COTR prior to the commencement of the peer review.

Foreign National Security Clearance: When CIE reviewers participate during a panel review meeting at a government facility, the NMFS Project Contact is responsible for obtaining the Foreign National Security Clearance approval for CIE reviewers who are

non-US citizens. For this reason, the CIE reviewers shall provide requested information (e.g., name, contact information, birth date, passport number, travel dates, and country of origin) to the NMFS Project Clearance for the purpose of their security clearance, and this information shall be submitted at least 30 days before the peer review in accordance with the NOAA Deemed Export Technology Control Program NAO 207-12 regulations (available at the Deemed Exports NAO website: <http://deemedexports.noaa.gov/sponsor.html>).

Pre-review Background Documents: Two weeks before the peer review, the NMFS Project Contact will send by electronic mail or make available at an FTP site the CIE reviewers all necessary background information and reports for the peer review. In the case where the documents need to be mailed, the NMFS Project Contact will consult with the CIE on where to send documents. The CIE reviewers shall read all documents in preparation for the peer review.

Documents to be provided to the CIE reviewers prior to the STAR Panel meeting include:

- The current draft stock assessment reports;
- The most recent previous Cabezon and Lingcod stock assessments and STAR Panel reports;
- The Pacific Fishery Management Council's Scientific and Statistical Committee's Terms of Reference for Stock Assessments and STAR Panel Reviews;
- Stock Synthesis (SS) Documentation
- Additional supporting documents as available.
- An electronic copy of the data, the parameters, and the model used for the assessments (if requested by reviewer).

This list of pre-review documents may be updated up to two weeks before the peer review. Any delays in submission of pre-review documents for the CIE peer review will result in delays with the CIE peer review process, including a SoW modification to the schedule of milestones and deliverables. Furthermore, the CIE reviewers are responsible only for the pre-review documents that are delivered to the reviewer in accordance to the SoW scheduled deadlines specified herein.

Panel Review Meeting: Each CIE reviewers shall conduct the independent peer review in accordance with the SoW and ToRs. **Modifications to the SoW and ToRs can not be made during the peer review, and any SoW or ToRs modifications prior to the peer review shall be approved by the COTR and CIE Lead Coordinator.** Each CIE reviewer shall actively participate in a professional and respectful manner as a member of the meeting review panel, and their peer review tasks shall be focused on the ToRs as specified in the contract SoW. The NMFS Project Contact is responsible for any facility arrangements (e.g., conference room for panel review meetings or teleconference arrangements). The CIE Lead Coordinator can contact the Project Contact to confirm any peer review arrangements, including the meeting facility arrangements.

In most circumstances a STAR Panel will include a chair appointed from the SSC's Groundfish Subcommittee and three other experienced stock assessment analysts. The STAR panel chair is responsible for: 1) developing an agenda for the STAR panel meeting, 2) ensuring that STAR panel members and STAT teams follow the Terms of Reference, 3) participating in the review of the assessment, 4) guiding the STAR panel and STAT team to mutually agreeable solutions, and 5) coordinating review of final assessment documents.

The CIE reviewer's role includes being an active panel participant and participants are strongly encouraged to voice all comments regarding the assessment data, model configurations, and uncertainty during the STAR Panel so the assessment teams can address the comments during the Panel meeting and incorporate changes when appropriate. The assessments are finalized by the end of the Panel meeting and comments made after the fact will not be able to be included in the final assessment document. The CIE reviewer should also contribute to the final STAR Panel Review Report. Additional details regarding the STAR Panel reviewer's responsibilities will be included in the Pacific Fishery Management Council's final Terms of Reference for Groundfish Stock Assessments and STAR Panel meetings.

Contract Deliverables - Independent CIE Peer Review Reports: Each CIE reviewer shall complete an independent peer review report in accordance with the SoW. Each CIE reviewer shall complete the independent peer review according to required format and content as described in Annex 1. Each CIE reviewer shall complete the independent peer review addressing each ToR as described in Annex 2.

Other Tasks – Contribution to Summary Report: Each CIE reviewer will assist the Chair of the panel review meeting with contributions to the Summary Report. CIE reviewers are not required to reach a consensus, and should instead provide a brief summary of their views on the summary of findings and conclusions reached by the review panel in accordance with the ToRs.

**Specific Tasks for CIE Reviewers:** The following chronological list of tasks shall be completed by each CIE reviewer in a timely manner as specified in the **Schedule of Milestones and Deliverables**.

- 1) Conduct necessary pre-review preparations, including the review of background material and reports provided by the NMFS Project Contact in advance of the peer review;
- 2) Participate during the panel review meeting in Seattle, Washington during July 27-31, 2009, as called for in the SoW, and conduct an independent peer review in accordance with the ToRs (Annex 2);
- 3) No later than August 14, 2009, each CIE reviewer shall submit an independent peer review report addressed to the "Center for Independent Experts," and sent to Mr. Manoj Shrivani, CIE Lead Coordinator, via email to [shivlanim@bellsouth.net](mailto:shivlanim@bellsouth.net), and CIE Regional Coordinator, via email to David Die

- at [ddie@rsmas.miami.edu](mailto:ddie@rsmas.miami.edu). Each CIE report shall be written using the format and content requirements specified in Annex 1, and address each ToR in Annex 2;
- 4) CIE reviewers shall address changes as required by the CIE review in accordance with the schedule of milestones and deliverables.

**Schedule of Milestones and Deliverables:** CIE shall complete the tasks and deliverables described in this SoW in accordance with the following schedule.

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| 29 June 2009     | CIE sends reviewer contact information to the COTR, who then sends this to the NMFS Project Contact                        |
| 13 July 2009     | NMFS Project Contact sends the CIE Reviewers the pre-review documents  |
| 27-31 July 2009  | Each reviewer participates and conducts an independent peer review during the panel review meeting in Seattle, Washington. |
| 14 August 2009   | CIE reviewers submit draft CIE independent peer review reports to the CIE Lead Coordinator and CIE Regional Coordinator    |
| 28 August 2009   | CIE submits CIE independent peer review reports to the COTR  |
| 4 September 2009 | The COTR distributes the final CIE reports to the NMFS Project Contact and regional Center Director                        |

**Modifications to the Statement of Work:** Requests to modify this SoW must be made through the Contracting Officer’s Technical Representative (COTR) who submits the modification for approval to the Contracting Officer at least 15 working days prior to making any permanent substitutions. The Contracting Officer will notify the CIE within 10 working days after receipt of all required information of the decision on substitutions. The COTR can approve changes to the milestone dates, list of pre-review documents, and Terms of Reference (ToR) of the SoW as long as the role and ability of the CIE reviewers to complete the SoW deliverable in accordance with the ToRs and deliverable schedule are not adversely impacted. The SoW and ToRs cannot be changed once the peer review has begun.

**Acceptance of Deliverables:** Upon review and acceptance of the CIE independent peer review reports by the CIE Lead Coordinator, Regional Coordinator, and Steering Committee, these reports shall be sent to the COTR for final approval as contract deliverables based on compliance with the SoW. As specified in the Schedule of Milestones and Deliverables, the CIE shall send via e-mail the contract deliverables (the CIE independent peer review reports) to the COTR (William Michaels, via [William.Michaels@noaa.gov](mailto:William.Michaels@noaa.gov)).

**Applicable Performance Standards:** The contract is successfully completed when the COTR provides final approval of the contract deliverables. The acceptance of the contract deliverables shall be based on three performance standards: (1) each CIE report shall have the format and content in accordance with Annex 1, (2) each CIE report shall

address each ToR as specified in Annex 2, (3) the CIE reports shall be delivered in a timely manner as specified in the schedule of milestones and deliverables.

**Distribution of Approved Deliverables:** Upon notification of acceptance by the COTR, the CIE Lead Coordinator shall send via e-mail the final CIE reports in \*.PDF format to the COTR. The COTR will distribute the approved CIE reports to the NMFS Project Contact and regional Center Director.

**Key Personnel:**

William Michaels, Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR)  
NMFS Office of Science and Technology  
1315 East West Hwy, SSMC3, F/ST4, Silver Spring, MD 20910  
[William.Michaels@noaa.gov](mailto:William.Michaels@noaa.gov) Phone: 301-713-2363 ext 136

Manoj Shivlani, CIE Lead Coordinator  
Northern Taiga Ventures, Inc.  
10600 SW 131<sup>st</sup> Court, Miami, FL 33186  
[shivlanim@bellsouth.net](mailto:shivlanim@bellsouth.net) Phone: 305-383-4229

NMFS Project Contact:

Stacey Miller  
NWFSC/FRAM Division  
2032 SE OSU Drive, Newport OR 97365  
[Stacey.Miller@noaa.gov](mailto:Stacey.Miller@noaa.gov) Phone: 206-437-5670

Elizabeth Clarke  
NWFSC/FRAM Division  
2725 Montlake Blvd. E, Seattle WA 98112  
[Elizabeth.Clarke@noaa.gov](mailto:Elizabeth.Clarke@noaa.gov) Phone: 206-860-5616

## **Annex 1: Format and Contents of CIE Independent Peer Review Report**

1. The CIE independent report shall be prefaced with an Executive Summary providing a concise summary of the findings and recommendations.
2. The main body of the reviewer report shall consist of a Background, Description of the Individual Reviewer's Role in the Review Activities, Summary of Findings for each ToR, and Conclusions and Recommendations in accordance with the ToRs.
  - a. Reviewers should describe in their own words the review activities completed during the panel review meeting, including providing a detailed summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations.
  - b. Reviewers should discuss their independent views on each ToR even if these were consistent with those of other panelists, and especially where there were divergent views.
  - c. Reviewers should elaborate on any points raised in the Summary Report that they feel might require further clarification.
  - d. Reviewers shall provide a critique of the NMFS review process, including suggestions for improvements of both process and products.
  - e. The CIE independent report shall be a stand-alone document for others to understand the proceedings and findings of the meeting, regardless of whether or not they read the summary report. The CIE independent report shall be an independent peer review of each ToRs, and shall not simply repeat the contents of the summary report.
3. The reviewer report shall include as separate appendices as follows:
  - Appendix 1: Bibliography of materials provided for review
  - Appendix 2: A copy of the CIE Statement of Work
  - Appendix 3: Panel Membership or other pertinent information from the panel review meeting.

## **Annex 2: Terms of Reference for the Peer Review**

### **Stock Assessment Review Panel for Cabezon and Lingcod**

1. *Become familiar with the draft Cabezon and Lingcod stock assessments and background materials. Along with other members of the Panel, determine if the stock assessment document is sufficiently complete according to the Pacific Fishery Management Council's Terms of Reference for West Coast Groundfish Stock Assessment and STAR Panels (to be included once finalized).*
2. *Evaluate, data collection operations and survey design and make recommendations for improvement*
3. *Comment on quality of data used in the assessment.*
4. *Evaluate and comment on analytic methodologies*
5. *Evaluate model assumptions, estimates, and major sources of uncertainty. Specifically, recommend improvements including alternative model configurations or formulations as appropriate during the panel meeting and comment on the primary sources of uncertainty in the assessment model.*
6. *Insert an explicit statement as to whether this stock assessment represents the best available science.*
7. *Recommendations for any further improvements*
8. *Brief description on panel review proceedings highlighting pertinent discussions, issues, effectiveness, and recommendations*

*Note – CIE reviewers typically address scientific subjects, hence ToRs usually do not involve CIE reviewers with regulatory and management issues unless this expertise is specifically requested in the SoW.*

**Annex 3: Tentative Agenda**  
**LINGCOD AND CABEZON**  
**STOCK ASSESSMENT REVIEW (STAR) PANEL**

July 27-31, 2009,  
Hotel Deca  
4507 Brooklyn Avenue NE,  
Seattle, Washington 98105

---

**Monday, July 27, 2009**

- 8:30 a.m. Welcome and Introductions (Jim Hastie, NMFS)
- 8:45 a.m. Review the Draft Agenda and Discussion of Meeting Format  
(Vidar Wespestad, Panel Chair)
- Review Terms of Reference for Assessment and Review Panel
  - Assignment of reporting duties
- 9:00 a.m. Stock Assessment Team (STAT-1) Presentation of the Cabezon  
assessment (Jason Cope and Meisha Key)
- Overview of Data and Stock Synthesis Modeling
- 10:15 a.m. Coffee Break
- 10:30 a.m. STAT Presentation Continued
- 12:00 p.m. Lunch (On Your Own)
- 1:30 p.m. Q&A session with the STAT-1 & Panel discussion
- 3:30 p.m. Coffee Break
- 3:45 p.m. Panel develops request for additional model runs / analyses for STAT 1
- 4:30 p.m. Panel provides written requests for additional model runs / analyses to  
STAT 1
- 5:30 p.m. Adjourn for day

**Tuesday, July 28, 2009**

- 8:30 a.m. Stock Assessment Team (STAT-2) Presentation of the Lingcod  
assessment (Owen Hamel)
- Overview of Data and Stock Synthesis Modeling
- 10:15 a.m. Coffee Break
- 10:30 a.m. STAT Presentation Continued
- 12:00 p.m. Lunch (On Your Own)
- 1:30 p.m. Q&A session with the STAT-2 & Panel discussion
- 3:00 p.m. Coffee Break
- 3:15 p.m. Panel develops written requests for additional model runs / analyses for  
STAT 2
- 4:00 p.m. Panel check in with STAT-1 if needed

5:30 p.m. Adjourn for day

**Wednesday, July 29, 2009**

- 8:30 a.m. STAT-1 presentation of first set of model runs for Cabezon
- Q&A session with the STAT-1 & Panel discussion
  - Panel develops written request for second round of model runs / analyses for STAT-1
- 10:15 a.m. Coffee Break
- 10:30 a.m. STAT Presentation Continued
- 12:00 p.m. Lunch (On Your Own)
- 1:30 p.m. STAT-2 Presentation of first set of model runs for Lingcod
- Q&A session with the STAT-2 & Panel discussion
  - Panel develops written request for second round of model runs / analyses for STAT-2
- 3:30 p.m. Coffee Break
- 3:45 p.m. Continue Panel discussion with STAT-2
- 5:30 p.m. Adjourn for day

**Thursday, July 30, 2009**

- 8:30 a.m. STAT-1 Presentation of Second Set of Model Runs for Cabezon
- Q&A session with the STAT-1 & Panel discussion
  - Identification of preferred model and elements for the decision table
  - Panel develops third list of model runs for decision table and begins drafting STAR report
- 10:15 a.m. Coffee Break
- 10:30 a.m. STAT Presentation Continued
- 12:00 p.m. Lunch (On Your Own)
- 1:30 p.m. STAT-2 Presentation of Second Set of Model Runs for Lingcod
- Q&A session with the STAT-2 & Panel discussion
  - Identification of preferred model and elements for the decision table
  - Panel develops third list of model runs for decision table and begins drafting STAR report
- 3:30 p.m. Coffee Break
- 3:45 p.m. Panel discussion or report drafting continues
- 5:30 p.m. Adjourn for day

**Friday, July 31, 2009**

- 8:30 a.m. Consideration of remaining issues
- Review decision tables for Cabezon and Lingcod

11:00 a.m. Panel agrees to process for completing final STAR report by Council Briefing Book deadline (08/26 for Council's September Briefing Book).  
Review Panel Adjourns When Business is Completed

## **Appendix 3: Panel Membership or other pertinent information from the panel review meeting.**

### **Panel Reviewers**

Vidar Wespestad, STAR Chair and SSC representative

J.J. Maguire, Center for Independent Experts

Stephen Smith, Center for Independent Experts

Jim Ianelli, National Marine Fisheries Service Alaska Fisheries Science Center

### **Panel Advisors**

Joanna Grebel, California Department of Fish and Game, GMT Representative

Dan Platt, GAP Representative

John DeVore, PFMC Representative

### **Cabezon STAT**

Jason Cope, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center

Meisha Key, California Department of Fish and Game

### **Lingcod STAT**

Owen Hamel, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center

Suresh Sethi, School of Aquatic and Fisheries Sciences, University of Washington

Thomas Wadsworth, Moss Landing Marine Laboratories, Moss Landing, California

Dr. Hamel was present and presented for the STAT

### **Others present:**

Jim Hastie, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center

Lynn Mattes, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

Tom Jagielo

Jim Likes

Pete Leipzig, Fisherman's Marketing Association