

**REPORT ON THE 3RD SOUTHEAST DATA, ASSESSMENT
AND REVIEW (SEDAR III)
MEETING**

by

Andrew I.L. Payne
SEDAR III Chair (Appointed by CIE)
CEFAS
Pakefield Road
Lowestoft
Suffolk NR33 0HT
United Kingdom

Contents

Executive Summary and Recommendations	3
Background, preliminaries and documentation	3
Conduct of the meeting	4
Summary of the meeting content	6
Final comments	8
Appendix 1: Panelists and advisers	10
Appendix 2: Terms of Reference of Stock Assessment Review Workshops	11
Appendix 3: Bibliography	12
Appendix 4: Statement of Task	13

Executive Summary and Recommendations

SEDAR III met in the last week of July 2003, and addressed an assessment of yellowtail snapper, along with a cursory examination of what was known about goliath grouper. The meeting arrangements were excellent, but I have two clear recommendations: **(1) to ensure the provision of a large-scale locator map in the meeting room (for those not familiar with the geography or sampling areas); (2) to appoint before the meeting a person (or two persons) well versed in the assessment and management of the stock in question to draft the report(s) produced.**

Those charged with assisting me in my capacity as Chair (John Merriner, Gregg Waugh, and Steve Atran) did an excellent job, and the meeting would not have been near so successful without their totally committed input. The panelists were a competent and disciplined group from across the stakeholder spectrum. Supplemented by two numerically astute non-local scientists (Chris Francis, Larry Jacobson), the panel was both efficient and fair, resulting in a fruitful meeting.

The terms of reference supplied were adhered to, though there was no need for any discussion of stock rebuilding, and the meeting decided unanimously also to devote a small portion of its time debating goliath grouper, a species that had been removed from the initial plans for the meeting owing to its data-poor situation.

Discussion was intense, probing, but fruitful, and it was unanimously agreed that yellowtail snapper are currently not overfished and likely not subject to overfishing. Goliath grouper data were deemed sufficient to conduct an assessment, but first the Councils must decide on their objective for managing it – for non-consumptive use or for a sustainable fishery. For both stocks, clear advice on future research and monitoring was given.

I have no criticisms of the process followed. Indeed, I was sufficiently impressed to feel motivated to hold out the SEDAR process as an example of the way to work in my part of the world. What was particularly gratifying was that, in chairing the meeting, I felt that the spirit of compromise and the will to reach consensus was very strong.

Background, Preliminaries and Documentation

The panel met from 26 to 31 July 2003 at the Hilton Hotel, Tampa Airport, Florida, with a Chair and 15 panelists (along with several advisers and observers, who also participated in discussions), as listed in Appendix 1. The terms of reference of SEDAR Stock Assessment Review workshops are outlined in Appendix 2, the Bibliography consulted in Appendix 3, and the Statement of the Task in Appendix 4.

I was notified of the website posting of the documentation for the meeting around 10 July 2003, in good time for me to download it and to prepare myself for the meeting. All material was in readable format thus posing no problems. My primary point of contact

was John Merriner (the facilitator), but once I was in the email loop, I also received material from the two council staff representatives on the panel, Gregg Waugh and Steve Atran. All three were also responsible for the “housekeeping” arrangements at the meeting itself, namely the provision of refreshments and other hotel-provided materials, recording of the meeting proceedings, and the supply of hard copy of documentation.

Between 15 November and my departure for the USA, I studied the submitted material, familiarizing myself with its contents. John Merriner provided me with valuable background on the evolving SEDAR meeting procedures and clear direction of what was expected as output from the meeting itself. He also engaged me electronically in discussion about the meeting agenda, allowing for the presence of all the relevant staff and working group members at their times of availability.

The terms of reference were clear and, to my mind, eminently achievable in terms of yellowtail snapper. However, email discussions before the meeting revealed that there was a need for discussions also on goliath grouper (jewfish), a species originally tabled for consideration but withdrawn when the earlier data workshop concluded that data were too few to conduct an assessment at the current time. Therefore, arrangements were made for one of the researchers working on the species to present her material at the meeting, to allow the Panel to consider future research and management needs.

Overall, therefore, I was well briefed and prepared by the time the meeting convened in Tampa.

Conduct of the Meeting

The meeting convened at 13:30 on 28 July with all panelists and advisers present (other than Anne-Marie Eklund, who was to present the goliath grouper work). Dr Eklund arrived later in the week, as arranged. The facilitator opened the meeting with a welcome to all present and an introduction and warm welcome of the non-local members of the panel, myself as Chair, Chris Francis from New Zealand and also representing the CIE, and Larry Jacobson of the Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole. He then handed the meeting over to me and I explained what I wanted to achieve (as per the Terms of Reference - Appendix 2) and how I wished to get there, through debate and consensus. Specifically, the two reports required of the Panel I saw were key outputs, namely the review of the yellowtail snapper assessment, and the summary of stock status. With respect to the second of these two reports, I stressed that I saw the Panel as mandated to provide information rather than advice, *sensu stricto*, and so requested the Panel to allow me to move the drafting of that particular contribution in that form. In terms of the panel itself, I stressed that I saw my own role as primarily process-orientated in terms of the meeting discussion, and that of Mr. Francis and Dr Jacobson as to delve deeper into technical aspects of the work than I would be able to while in control of the meeting.

After the preliminaries of personal identification by panel members, the agenda was confirmed with the addition of the presentation and discussion on goliath grouper, and the order of debate throughout the week stayed the same as initially agreed in the draft agenda provided by Dr Merriner. At this juncture, I pointed out that we were privileged to be able to count among the Panel representatives of industry (fishers) and the environmental lobby. I urged those panelists to take full advantage of their opportunity by providing the extra background their unique knowledge afforded us by participating fully in the discussions. Thus, the meeting commenced with a presentation of the yellowtail snapper assessment by Rob Muller, supported by Mike Murphy and Luiz Barbieri.

For report writing, Gregg Waugh undertook the responsibility of drafting the assessment review, and Larry Jacobson offered to do the same for the stock status summary. Each fulfilled their task admirably, providing Chris Francis and me with excellent drafts to develop for submission to the meeting later in the week. The intention was to finalize the stock status report before the meeting adjourned (which we achieved), but only to undertake a first revision of the more extensive review document and to allow panelists to revert by email to me with final comments within one week.

In the event, we were ready by the Wednesday afternoon to review both first drafts in detail. That was despite several extra runs and sensitivity analyses being requested (mainly carried out overnight) and their outputs discussed rigorously. Indeed, by adjournment on the Thursday, the panel was able to take away copies of the virtually final status report (only cosmetic/format changes were made subsequently) as well as an advanced draft of the assessment review (though without the section on goliath grouper). I was very satisfied with the manner in which the latter part of the meeting was conducted. There were inevitably a few sticking points and some counter views, but the spirit of consensus-seeking prevalent throughout the meeting was followed to the end.

Two specific points deserve mention here, the first a request, the second a recommendation. First, from my UK perspective, I found it a little hard to know always the geographic (or even Council) area being referred to by the presenters and in discussion. I did try to prepare myself for this eventuality before the meeting (I also successfully learned much of the acronym jargon that I knew would be used!), but I sometimes found myself lost geographically during the meeting. It is therefore my recommendation that future SEDAR meetings provide a large-scale locator map that is available at all times for participants to refer to, particularly the Chair, who seems traditionally to be contracted from outside the USA. The second point is perhaps more important. Although Gregg Waugh and Larry Jacobson willingly filled the requirements of drafters for this meeting, it would have been better for us all, and for them in particular, had someone involved in the assessment and management process for yellowtail snapper been responsible for producing the first drafts. Such a process is invoked in the NEFSC SARC assessments, and it works well, specifically in allowing for more background information than was produced in the current (draft) reports. I certainly do not mind making my inputs and working late to ensure fairness of reporting, but it is my opinion that Mr Waugh and Dr Jacobson would have been able to use their time as panelists better had they not been responsible for the drafting. I am well aware that the

SEDAR process is still evolving and that an appointment of facilitator is imminent, but I do recommend that future meetings ensure that identification of those responsible for the drafting process be made (and agreed) before the Chair arrives and that those made so responsible have a good understanding of the assessment and management process.

Finally, I wish to pay tribute to the positive manner in which the representatives of industry (Messrs Gladding, Gales and Kelly) conducted themselves. Throughout my fisheries career, I have always stressed that fisheries scientists who conduct their work without the benefit of fisher input miss a valuable opportunity. That the current process listened to and made use of the valuable inputs of the three fishers mentioned above, as well as that of the environmental lobby panelist, lends more credibility to the outcome, and I hope the precedent will be followed in future by SEDAR.

Summary of the Meeting Content

A comprehensive report of the meeting conclusions is given in the Assessment Review Report and the Stock Status Summary, but for the purpose of completeness, a summary is here given, highlighting the aspects I personally consider to be most important.

Yellowtail snapper

The panel was satisfied with the assessment provided, noting that best use had been made of the data provided to the stock assessment workshop. The overall conclusion was unanimously that currently the stock was not overfished and that overfishing was likely not occurring. That conclusion is, however, based on certain assumptions, notably those relating to the values selected in the models for M (natural mortality coefficient) and h (recruitment steepness parameter). Given the information placed at its disposal on how the values for both had been selected, the choice ultimately decided on in the assessment was deemed by the Panel to be well founded, but some of the work suggested for the inter-assessment period can hopefully place both selections on a sounder scientific footing.

Other issues addressed in the assessment review and not resolved, or resolved as best as possible and suggestive of further work included:

- Discard mortality rate – considered by the fishers on the panel to be overestimated for certain catching techniques (e.g. the value of 28% applied to the commercial fishery);
- General linear modeling – some of the new runs during the meeting were unable to assuage some doubts in the minds of certain panelists that trends were real;
- Recruitment variability – for a marine species, the recruitment seemed to be “too stable” from year to year, though there may be pertinent reasons for this. Continued use of annual age/length keys may be one way to investigate whether this trend is real or an artifact;

- Assessment model choice – although the ICA and fleet-specific models were appropriately chosen this time, the panel felt there would be value in exploring the use of other, e.g. length-based, models;
- Retrospective bias – this had not been explored adequately in the assessment, for reasons of time-limitation, so it remained a useful subject for investigation before the next assessment;
- Data series weighting – attempts were made during the workshop to evaluate the sensitivity of the models used to the weighting applied to the various data series, but the results were inconclusive. The results presented were therefore upheld and those responsible for the assessment asked to conduct more intensive analyses before the next assessment;
- Inconsistency in biomass index trends – the panel explored this subject intensively and drew heavily on the experience of the fishers. Technological creep in some indices was identified as an explanatory factor, but concern was expressed over the appropriateness of the reef visual survey index, given the survey protocol. Although the issue did not influence stock status conclusions, it was clearly another subject for review in future;
- Fishing power and catch-per-unit-effort (cpue) – there was much debate on the relationship between improving fishing power and the cpue indices in the commercial and recreational fisheries. No resolution was reached, but those responsible for the assessments and provision of data were asked to investigate this issue in greater detail in the months ahead.

To address all the above research concerns, some clear research proposals were tabled. They included better determination of the release mortality rate; collection of discard data for the headboat fishery and better determination of the discard rate in all sectors of the fishery; thorough evaluation of the reef visual survey index of cpue; investigation of alternative methods of incorporating changes in catching efficiency into the assessment; continued use of annual age/length keys and better validation of age estimates; and investigation of stock structure with, *inter alia*, genetics.

Goliath grouper

There was no assessment for this species, because the data workshop consensus had been that an assessment was not possible. That conclusion was challenged by many of those present, because many assessments of marine species are made in data-poor conditions, and the results are still accepted for management. Further, it was noted that a decision had not been made by the Councils on whether goliath grouper were to be managed as a potential non-consumptive resource or as a fishery to be prosecuted if stocks recovered sufficiently. Therefore, it was recommended that the Councils debate and make that decision on use of the resource and then put in place the means to conduct an assessment of current status.

Notwithstanding the generalization above on the need for an assessment, the Panel discussed what was currently known about the species and also recommended a few areas for enhanced research that could lend credence to future assessments. The primary

suggestions were:

- Estimating population size across the geographic range of the species, a crucial parameter because of the apparently narrow home ranges and site fidelity of the species. Tag/recapture research and studies with data storage tags were mentioned as potential monitoring tools.
- Monitoring the demographics of the population, particularly age composition.
- Developing further understanding of the reproductive biology, e.g. identification of spawning locations, duration and periodicity of spawning, identifying spawning migrations, if any, early life history of the species in mangroves.
- Obtaining information on historical abundance, perhaps via old logbooks.

Of lesser importance, but still valuable should research funding be available, were estimating unrecorded mortality from accidental or intentional sources, deriving information on stock structure, investigating bioenergetics and trophic relationships, and seeking information identifying changes in mangrove abundance and distribution, and hence changing available nursery habitat (goliath grouper spend their first 6-7 years in mangrove areas).

Final Comments

The meeting had a clear objective, enshrined in the Terms of Reference of the meeting, namely to evaluate the assessment for yellowtail snapper. The system by which the yellowtail snapper assessment came into being is clearly sound and should be followed for other SEDAR-managed stocks and species. Rigorous evaluation of the data at a data workshop, followed by in-depth analysis of stock assessment options at a stock assessment workshop is obviously a healthy procedure, especially if both initial workshops involve as many of those involved in researching, monitoring and prosecuting the fishery as possible. In particular, the involvement of stakeholders in at least the data workshop and the review is a very healthy situation and should be continued. The fact that the assessment we were provided hardly changed despite being subjected to extra sensitivity tests and runs speaks volumes for its quality and the competence of those providing it, and the staffers of the Florida Marine Research Institute deserve much credit for what they produced. Scientifically it is a very good piece of work.

Perhaps a little frustrating for me as chair was not really knowing the audience for whom the review was being produced. I am distinctly aware that this is the first time two Fishery Management Councils have worked together on a SEDAR project, but it was a little disconcerting to have to be regularly reminded that each had their own agenda and that sometimes one, and sometimes the other, was ahead of the game in terms of management understanding. No doubt politics will play a large role in implementation of any of the proposals produced in the workshop, as they naturally will too in implementing enhanced management of the stock. However, I believe that the output from the review will be valuable in informing both Councils on how best to manage this stock for the benefit of present and future generations of citizens, so I think it also

achieved its “political” objective, even though none was written. That statement applies equally to the work on yellowtail snapper and goliath grouper.

The SEDAR process is extremely valuable in ensuring the credibility of fisheries science and scientific advice. I would like to take that message back to Europe with me, and certainly will give my support for the process whenever I am asked. However, it would not work without the professionalism and competence of all panelists appointed and advisors mandated to work through the voluminous literature. Without a single exception, the meeting itself was conducted in excellent spirit, despite the rigorous and probing debate. I also enjoyed and personally benefited from the discussion around the fringes of the meeting, over refreshments and sometimes late into the evening. I can therefore say that I wholeheartedly enjoyed myself and consider myself privileged to have been selected to assist in some small manner. My personal thanks are due to the CIE for having sufficient confidence to entrust me with chairing this challenging meeting, to my two non-local co-panelists (Larry Jacobson, NEFSC; Chris Francis, NIWA/CIE), with whom I shared many hours of discussion inside and outside the meeting room, to John Merriner for efficiently coordinating the meeting arrangements with Gregg Waugh and Steve Atran and in ensuring that I had access to all material I required, and to all participants (panelists, presenters and observers) for their valuable, personally hugely appreciated, contributions. Without everyone's contributions, the meeting output would not have been as comprehensive and scientifically rigorous as it turned out to be.

Appendix 1

PANELISTS AND ADVISERS

Panel

PANEL CHAIR:	Dr Andrew Payne
REVIEW PANELIST:	Mr Chris Francis
SAFMC:	Mr Gregg Waugh
GMFMC:	Mr Steve Atran
NMFS SEFSC:	Dr Joseph Powers
NMFS NEFSC:	Dr Larry Jacobson
FISHERS:	Mr William Kelly Mr Robert Zales Mr Peter Gladding
NGO REPRESENTATIVE:	Ms Nadiera Sukhraj
SSC REPRESENTATIVES:	Mr Doug Gregory Mr Billy Fuls Dr Al Jones Ms Carolyn Belcher Dr Robert Trumble Dr Rocky Ward

Non-Panel

PRESENTERS:

<i>AW Coordinator</i>	<i>Dr Luiz Barbieri</i>
<i>Lead Analysts</i>	<i>Dr Robert Muller</i>
	<i>Mr Michael Murphy</i>
<i>Goliath grouper</i>	<i>Dr Anne-Marie Eklund</i>

*AW/RPanel SUPPORT STAFF: Dr John Merriner
Dr Janaka de Silva*

*Mr Roy Williams
Dr Tom McIlwain
Dr Joe Kimmel
Mr Mark Robson
Mr Stu Kennedy
Dr Roy Crabtree
Dr Behzad Mahmoudi*

Appendix 2

TERMS OF REFERENCE OF STOCK ASSESSMENT REVIEW WORKSHOPS

The Stock Assessment Review Panel consisting of assessment scientists, conducts an independent peer review of the stock assessment. Core participants include NMFS-SEFSC, NMFS-NEFSC, Special Reef Fish SSC, and 1 or more representatives from the Center for Independent Experts. Also included may be one representative each from the Reef Fish AP and NGO interests (non-AP representatives with assessment expertise may be substituted). The Stock Assessment Review Panelists will receive the Stock Assessment Workshop report, supplemental analytical materials and the consensus data sets for their review prior to the scheduled meeting. The Stock Assessment Review Panel will do the following:

1. Evaluate adequacy and appropriateness of fishery-dependent and fishery-independent data used in the assessment.
2. Evaluate adequacy, appropriateness, and application of models used to assess the stock and to estimate population benchmarks.
3. Evaluate adequacy, appropriateness, and application of models used for rebuilding analyses.
4. Develop recommendations for improving data collection and assessment and future research (both field and assessment)

The panel will provide a final brief report to the Council, including its comments on the assessment, its findings on stock and fishery status, and recommendations for management under SFA guidelines.

Appendix 3

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anon. 2003. Goliath Grouper Data Workshop Report, March 2003. 11 pp.
- Muller, R. G., Murphy, M. D., de Silva, J., and Barbieri, L. R. 2003. A stock assessment of yellowtail snapper, *Ocyurus chrysurus*, in the Southeast United States. Draft Report submitted to the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council as part of the Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review (SEDAR) III. St Petersburg, FL; Florida Marine Research Institute: 182 pp.
- Restrepo, V. R. *et al.* (1998). Technical guidance on the use of precautionary approaches to implementing National Standard 1 of the Magnuson–Stevens Fishery Management and Conservation Act. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS–F/SPO–31.
- South Atlantic Fishery Management Council 1990. Jewfish. Amendment Number 2, regulatory impact review, initial regulatory flexibility analysis and environmental assessment for the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region. SAFMC, Charleston, South Carolina. 28 pp. + 4 Figures + 10 Tables.

Appendix 4

STATEMENT OF TASK

Consulting Agreement between the University of Miami and Dr. Andrew Payne

June 11, 2003

General

The **South East Data, Assessment, and Review (SEDAR)** process for stock assessment and review is used in the NMFS- Southeast Fisheries Science Center's area of responsibility. This new program provides the framework for independent peer review of stock assessments undertaken jointly by NMFS-SEFSC, three Regional Fishery Management Councils, and two Interstate Fishery Commissions, and state fishery agencies. The SEDAR process uses a three phase approach: a data workshop, an assessment workshop, and a peer review panel workshop. The peer review panel is composed of stock assessment experts, other scientists, and representatives of the Council, the fishing industries, and non-governmental conservation organizations. The communication elements of SEDAR include a stock assessment report from the Assessment Workshop, a review panel report evaluating the assessment(s) (drafted during the Review Panel Workshop), presentation of the peer reviewed assessment results to the Council(s) and public, and publication of collected documents for stock assessments considered in that cycle of the SEDAR process.

The assessment to be reviewed by this SEDAR Peer Review Panel is yellowtail snapper in the area of jurisdiction of the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Councils. The Review Panel will meet July 28-31, 2003 at the Tampa, Florida Airport Hilton Hotel. A data workshop was held March 3-4, 2003 in St. Petersburg, FL. The assessment workshop was held during week of June 9-13, 2003 in St. Petersburg, FL. The SEDAR Review Panel for the yellowtail snapper assessment may include 12+ members: 1 senior assessment scientist each from NMFS- NEFSC and -SEFSC, 2 Council Staff scientists (South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico), 2 assessment scientist members of the Scientific and Statistical Committee of South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Councils, commercial/recreational fishermen from the Snapper-Grouper (SA) and Reefish (GM) Advisory Panel with special experience with the species, 2 scientist representatives (SA and GM) from non-governmental organizations, and 2 members from the Center for Independent Experts (Chairperson and reviewer). Assessment scientists from Florida FWC and NMFS-SEFSC will present the assessment and be available to provide supplemental information as requested by the review panel.

SEDAR Assessment Review Panel Tasks

The Panel will evaluate the yellowtail snapper assessment, the input data, assessment methods, and model results as put forward in the stock assessment workshop report.

Specifically, the review panel will:

1. Evaluate the adequacy and appropriateness of fishery-dependent and independent data used in the assessment (i.e. was the best available data used in the assessment).
2. Evaluate the adequacy, appropriateness and application of models used to assess these species and to estimate population benchmarks (MSY, Fmsy, Bmsy and MSST, i.e. Sustainable Fisheries Act items).
3. Evaluate the adequacy, appropriateness, and application of models used for rebuilding analyses.
4. Develop recommendations for future research for improving data collection and the assessment.
5. Prepare a report summarizing the peer review panel's evaluation of the yellowtail snapper stock assessment. (Drafted during the Review Workshop; Final report due two weeks after the workshop-August 15, 2003).
6. Prepare a summary stock status report including management recommendations. (Drafted during the Review Workshop, Final report due two weeks later -August 15, 2003)

It is emphasized that the panel's primary duty is to review the existing assessment. In the course of this review, the Chair may request a reasonable number of sensitivity runs, additional details of the existing assessment, or similar items from technical staff. However, the review panel is not authorized to conduct an alternative assessment, or to request an alternative assessment from the technical staff present. To do so would invalidate the transparency of the SEDAR process. If the review panel finds that the assessment does not meet the standards outlined in points 1 through 3, above, the panel shall outline in its report the remedial measures that the panel proposes to rectify those shortcomings.

The Review Panel Report is a product of the overall Review Panel, and is NOT a CIE product. The CIE will not review or comment on the Panel's report, but shall be provided a courtesy copy, as described below under "Specific Tasks." The CIE products to be generated are the Chair's report, also discussed under Specific Tasks.

Specific Tasks

Designee will serve as Chair of a SEDAR Stock Assessment Review Panel which is to convene in Tampa, FL at the Airport Hilton during 28-31 July 2003. The Panel meeting will begin mid-day on the 28th and conclude early afternoon on the 31st. The Panel will review the stock assessment provided for yellowtail snapper in the area of jurisdiction of South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Councils. The SEFSC shall provide the Chair with copies of the all background documents.

It is estimated that the Chair's duties will occupy a total of 17 days - several days prior to the Review Panel meeting for document review; four days at the SEDAR meeting; several days following the meeting to ensure that the final documents are completed, and several days to complete a Chair's report for the CIE.

Roles and responsibilities:

1. Prior to the Review Panel meeting the Chair will be provided with the stock assessment workshop report and other associated documents on yellowtail snapper. The Chair shall read and review these documents to gain an in-depth understanding of the stock assessment itself and the resources and information considered in the assessment.
2. During the Review Panel meeting, the Chair shall control and guide the meeting, including the coordination of presentations and discussions, and document flow.
3. The Chair shall facilitate the preparation and writing of the Peer Review Panel Report (item 5 above) and a Draft Summary Stock Status Report (item 6 above). Review panel members, SEFSC staff, and stock assessment scientists present will assist the Chair as needed. The Chair shall be responsible for the editorial content of the two review workshop reports. These reports shall be drafted during the Review Workshop, with the final reports due to the recipients listed below in item 4 two weeks after the workshop- August 15, 2003. These reports are products of the Review Panel meeting, and are not CIE products.
4. The Review Panel Report and the Draft Summary Stock Status Report, which are not CIE products, shall be provided to Nancy Thompson, NMFS-SEFSC, 75 Virginia Beach Drive, Miami, FL 33149 (e-mail, Nancy.Thompson@NOAA.GOV); John Merriner, NOAA Beaufort Laboratory, 101 Pivers Island Road, Beaufort, NC 28516 (e-mail, John.Merriner@NOAA.GOV); Robert Mahood, South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, One Southpark Circle, Suite 306, Charleston, SC 29407 (e-mail, Robert.Mahood@safmc.net), and Wayne Swingle, Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, 3018 North U.S. Highway 301, Suite 1000, Tampa, FL 33619-2272 (e-mail, Wayne.Swingle@noaa.gov). Dr. David Sampson of the CIE shall also be provided a courtesy copy of these documents via e-mail at david.sampson@oregonstate.edu.
5. The Assessment Workshop Chair and SEDAR Coordinator will assist the Chair prior to, during and after the meeting to ensure that final documents/results are distributed in a timely fashion.
6. No later than August 15, 2003, the Chair shall submit a written chair report¹ addressed to the “University of Miami Independent System for Peer Review,” and sent to Dr. David Sampson, via email to David.Sampson@oregonstate.edu, and to Mr. Manoj Shivlani, via email to mshivlani@rsmas.miami.edu.

Contact persons:

NMFS contact: Dr. John Merriner, Beaufort Laboratory, 101 Pivers Island Road, Beaufort, NC 28516. Phone 252-728-8708. FAX 252-728-8784. E-mail john.merriner@noaa.gov

SAFMC contact: Mr. Gregg Waugh, One Southpark Circle, Suite 306, Charleston, SC 29407, phone 843-571-4366, FAX 843-769-4520, E-mail gregg.waugh@safmc.net.

¹ The written report will undergo an internal CIE review before it is considered final. After completion, the CIE will create a PDF version of the written report that will be submitted to NMFS and the consultant.

ANNEX I: Contents of Chair Report

1. Synopsis/summary of the meeting – to provide context for the comments rather than to rewrite the summary report. (The latter is a product of the meeting, and is not a CIE product.)
2. Views on the meeting process, including recommendations for improvements on:
 - The meeting process itself;
 - The outcome(s) of the meeting;
 - Materials provided for the meeting, including their timeliness, relevance, content, and quality;
 - The guidance provided to run the meeting.
3. Other observations on the meeting process.
4. Appendices, including:
 - Statement of Work;
 - Bibliography of the materials provided for the meeting;
 - Summary report (if available at the time of report submission).