GARM III Groundfish Assessment Review

Prepared by:
Cynthia M. Jones, Ph. D.

Prepared for
Center for Independent Experts

March 14, 2008

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The Groundfish Assessment Review Meeting (GARM) was held at the NEFSC in Woods Hole, MA from February 25-29, 2008. The chair of the review panel was Robert O'Boyle. Three CIE reviewers (Jose de Oliveira, Cynthia M. Jones, Paul Medley) and three non-CIE reviewers (Stratis Gavaris, James Ianelli, and Yan Jiao) comprised the panel. In addition, Dr. Doug Butterworth and Ms. Rebecca Rademeyer participated actively in the discussion in addition to presenting their reseach. The charge to the GARM panel was:

> *The panel is to determine and write down its viewpoint on the quality and soundness of the science, methods and data with regard to each Term of Reference (see Annex 1). Criteria to consider include whether: (1) the data are adequate and were used properly; (2) the analyses and models were appropriate and correctly accomplished; and (3) the conclusions are correct/reasonable.*

There were six terms of reference (ToR) to be considered for evaluating stock assessment modeling approaches of 19 groundfish stocks from Southern New England to the Gulf of Maine. The ToRs went from very specific advice for each stock (ToR 5) to increasing more general advice on modeling approaches and their use in establishing biological reference points (ToR 6). The ToR were:

> 1. For each stock, consider the applicability of one or more of the following modeling approaches to assess stock status:
> - Index methods
> - Production Models
> - Age- or Length-based Models
> 2. For certain stocks that are aged, compare and contrast the utility of statistical catch-at-age vs. VPA based models with respect to the following criteria:
> - Retrospective patterns
> - Flexibility to account for alternative parameterizations
> - Ability to incorporate external sources of information, especially tagging and environmental data
> -Ability to estimate parameters incorporating prior, external information.
> 3. Address the implications of zeros in the evaluation of fishery independent indices.
> 4. Examine potential factors responsible for retrospective patterns.
> 5. For each stock, define the assessment model that will be used to determine stock status and productivity characteristics until the next "benchmark" assessment is conducted. Where possible, apply the models to data (probably through 2006), to obtain current and historical estimates of F and B and estimates of uncertainty.
> 6. Evaluate the sufficiency of the assessment models to estimate measures of stock status consistent with Biological Reference Points.

Presentations were made during the meeting by NEFSC staff and by the consultant to industry, Doug Butterworth, that addressed each of the ToR. Discussions ensued after each presentation in the open meeting and a general discussion followed on Friday by the review panelists. The final product of the panel is a Summary Report written and edited by the panel. This report reflects the

panel consensus. At the time of my report to CIE (due 3/14/08) the final editing of the Panel Summary Report had not been completed (due 3/21/08).

The review panel first addressed the general issues with consideration of the models currently used in NEFSC assessments, and how to best address the problems of retrospective patterns, partial recruitment functions, and zeros in survey indices. It was clear that an in-depth review of each assessment was not possible for the 19 stocks within the allotted time. Thus, the panel's approach was not to select a specific model for each stock, but to suggest which class of models would be best suited. Due to the limited time available, we were unable to address the NEFSC approach to handling ecosystem-based management.

Background

In 2007-2008, stock assessments are being addressed for 19 stocks of groundfish in waters from the Gulf of Maine to Southern New England that are managed through the New England Fisheries Management Council. The third Groundfish Assessment Review Meetings (GARM III) is divided into four meetings: 1) Data Inputs (Oct 29- Nov 2, 2007), 2) Assessment Methodology (Feb 25-29, 2008), 3) Biological Reference Points (Apr 28-May 2, 2008), and 4) Assessments (Aug 4-8, 2008). Several of these stocks have been exploited since before the 1900s and, for some of these, there are historic records of landings in the region. Additionally, fishery-independent surveys extend back 45 years, resulting in an excellent vantage for developing accurate models.

The challenges to obtaining reliable assessment of the status of these stocks is a history of changing gears, changing regulations, inauguration of closed areas, and problems with survey methodology. For example, no matter how carefully the surveys are conducted, designing a survey that can precisely sample 19 stocks in a changing environment may seem difficult in the extreme. However challenging, careful attention to the use and formulation of stock assessment models is being attended to at the NEFSC to address these issues.

Issues relating to data quality and the extent of data used in support of modeling was addressed in the GARM III Data Inputs meeting held in the Fall of 2007. The next step in the GARM III process was to review the methods used in stock assessment for evaluating these 19 stocks. The result of the Assessment Methodology meeting will be used to inform discussion on biological reference points (BRP) and to help establish the models used in the final assessments themselves.

Description of Review Activities

My role as a CIE reviewer at the GARM III modeling meeting was to participate in the review meeting at the NEFSC in Woods Hole, MA, during February 25-29, 2008 (see Appendix 2 for meeting agenda) and to assist in writing and editing the Panel Summary Report. Background documents were available at: http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/GARM. To prepare, I read and became familiar with the relevant documents provided to the NEFSC scientists (Appendix 3).

I attended the review meeting from 9:00 25 February until 16:30 29 February. NMFS scientists and Dr Douglas Butterworth presented the results of simulations, exploration of various models, and results of the 19 assessments as PowerPoint or Pdf presentations. During their presentations, the Review Panel members asked questions about the interpretations and received clarifications. At the completion of the presentations for each ToR, each member was assigned a ToR to summarize, and, thus by the end of the meeting we had a rough first draft of the Summary Report. Presentations were finished by Friday morning at 11:00, and the Review Panel met to review the Draft Report from then until the meeting end that afternoon.

Subsequent to the meeting, I completed a more polished draft of our response to ToR 3 and emailed this to the Chair and Review Panel members. Upon further comment, I revised, and edited my assignment and reviewed the entire report on three subsequent occasions. The Review Panel reached an agreeable consensus. At the time I write this report to the CIE, I have available a well edited, but not final copy of the Panel Summary Report (Appendix 4).

Because time was limited at the meeting, we did not hear the presentation on how the NEFSC is approaching ecosystem-based management. The NEFSC did upload the Powerpoint presentation to the GARM website and I was able to review it. It is very difficult to comment much on this work because there was no discussion of it. However, the presentation showed that NEFSC scientists are using multiple approaches to discern the combined biomass that can be produced in this region and the amount of catch that can be sustained.

Summary of Findings

Evaluation of the Terms of Reference (Appendix 1)

ToR 1.

> ToR 1: For each stock, consider the applicability of one or more of the following modeling approaches to assess stock status:
> - Index methods
> - Production Models
> - Age- or Length-based Models

The Panel reviewed the use of models in general rather than on a stock-by-stock approach. NEFSC scientists presented examples of each modeling approach with specific stocks that best illustrated the advantages and disadvantages with that method. For the 19 stocks that were assessed, additional issues such as changing baselines due to historic depletion, difficulty in evaluating the level of discards, changes in spatial patterns of abundance, and changes in size at age concerned NEFSC scientists and influenced their choice of models.

The Fisheries Laboratory in Woods Hole, MA, has a long history of obtaining catch and age data from the groundfish stocks that we reviewed. Some have a history of catch data back before 1900. We discussed the value of these historical data in clarifying their early biomass baselines and encouraged NEFSC scientists to explore models that could incorporate these data. Certainly

these long time series are useful for establishing BRPs. There are also downsides to such long time series of catches, especially in the Northwest Atlantic where there have been major changes in management, including closed areas, changes in gears, and change in reporting requirements, among others. Such changes may also be causing the retrospective patterns that we saw in many stocks.

In 1998, an NRC Committee (NRC 1998) reviewed the performance of stock assessment models available then and concluded that the preferred approach should be to use multiple models, if possible. That way when models were in consensus about stock status, one could assume less uncertainty in the HCR based on these outcomes. Such an approach conforms well to the ideas put forth by Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE). In the subsequent decade after the NRC report, models have been developed and further refined such that this advice might be less necessary. Models now allow a greater range of flexibility in their formulation, while newer models such as Stock Synthesis 2 are more widely used. This begs the question whether one needs to use several models or whether different formulations of the same model (e.g. changes in the objective function) can accomplish NRC's intended goal. Nonetheless the NRC's advice should be followed when possible.

ToR 2.

> ToR 2: For certain stocks that are aged, compare and contrast the utility of statistical catch-at-age vs. VPA based models with respect to the following criteria:
> - Retrospective patterns
> - Flexibility to account for alternative parameterizations
> - Ability to incorporate external sources of information, especially tagging and environmental data
> -Ability to estimate parameters incorporating prior, external information.

I am in agreement with the Panel Summary Report. The Summary Report offers a concise table on model-feature attributes that neatly summarizes the considerations for choosing SCAA over VPA-based models.

I reiterate the Panel's concern that the use of domed partial recruitment should not be done with the sole justification that it improves the model fit. The use of a domed partial recruitment function must have corroborating evidence that old fish exist in the population but are not sampled. This can be accomplished through ancillary studies such as mark-recapture.

ToR 3.

> ToR 3: Address the implications of zeros in the evaluation of fishery independent indices.

I am in agreement with the Panel Summary Report. The ToR 3 specifically referred to the problem encountered when using a logarithmic transformation of mean abundance at age from surveys as input into age-structured models (VPA). The suggestions in the Summary are appropriate and the problem is not seen as a major problem, especially with the use of different transformations or model formulations.

Aside from what I wrote there, I suggested that the presence of zeros in the data can also be used to evaluate potential changes in spatial distribution temporally and might provide evidence for changes in species distributions. In several stocks that we reviewed, there were uncertainties as to the spatial extent of the stock and whether the stock distribution had changed during the assessment and so this issue is particularly relevant. These data exist in the presence of the spatial extent of individual zero tows. The data can be handled in graphical presentation but could be used with spatial statistics, such as response-surface analysis, to evaluate distributional changes quantitatively. The value of this approach would be to measure expansion or contraction or shifting of range. The potential of range shifting or contraction was an issue for several stocks.

ToR 4.

> ToR 4: Examine potential factors responsible for retrospective patterns.

I am in agreement with the Panel Summary Report.

This ToR specifically addresses structural errors in age-structured models. I want to emphasize a statement in the Summary Report (p 10) – "Adjusting the model assumptions … to remove the pattern does not guarantee the problem has been dealt with…". Many of the suggestion in the Summary Report address how to deal with existing patterns to minimize them. However, when patterns persist and indicate mis-specified models then targeted research is recommended. This might include tag-recapture studies to address selectivities, or targeted studies to better determine changes in vital rates or growth, among others.

ToR 5.

> ToR5. For each stock, define the assessment model that will be used to determine stock status and productivity characteristics until the next "benchmark" assessment is conducted. Where possible, apply the models to data (probably through 2006), to obtain current and historical estimates of F and B and estimates of uncertainty.

I am in agreement with the Panel Summary Report.

Among the general issues, I comment further on the use of tag-recapture methods to validate the use of domed partial recruitment (PR) functions. The use of domed functions assumes cryptic older fish which are unavailable for capture. Many new tag-recapture methods exist that could address the existence of cryptic fish. These include the use of archival pop-up tags, although these work less well for demersal species, or otolith-chemical tags when cryptic fish are thought to use refuges that have different temperatures or water mass characteristics. I suggest that these newer methods would be valuable in investigating if there really are older, cryptic fish.

I reiterate my comments on the value of historic catches in the context of estimating BRP either internally or externally. Both approaches can be justified. Even though there is some concern that

changes in exploitation patterns, gears, regulations, etc. can result in misinterpreting the long-term productivity of a stock, clearly order of magnitude changes in biomass indicate the decline in productivity that many of these stock have experienced, as indicated by studies such as Rosenberg et al 2005.

Rosenberg AA, Bolster WJ, Alexander KE, et al. 2005. The history of ocean resources: modeling cod biomass using historical records FRONTIERS IN ECOLOGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT Volume: 3 Issue: 2 Pages: 84-90

ToR 6.

> ToR 6. Evaluate the sufficiency of the assessment models to estimate measures of stock status consistent with Biological Reference Points.

I am in agreement with the Panel Summary Report.

The Panel did not have much time to discuss the benefit of using the Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) approach for these stocks. However, CIE panelists did remark that an MSE approach might have value for these stocks in the future. The MSE approach integrates an assessment of risk more formally and this would help managers better evaluate the potential risks that assessment advice holds. A part of an MSE is to use simulations to assess different models and different formulations, and NEFSC scientists presented several simulations during the meeting. However, an MSE integrates simulations with harvest control rules (HCR) and long-term management rules. For example, although the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council does not use a formal MSE, it does have a clearly delineated, tiered HCR structure that ties allowable catches to data availability and quality, and HCR become more precautionary with sparse data or poor quality. We did not see this type of structured approach in the stocks managed by the New England Fisheries Management Council. Based on recent literature, the MSE approach could prove valuable especially given the emphasis in the Magnuson-Stevens Act reauthorization on precautionary and ecosystem-based management.

Conclusions/recommendations

I find the GARM process to be very comprehensive. The availability of the Data Summary Report, along with the abundant supporting documents for assessment modeling provided by the NEFSC was good preparation for the Review Panel meeting. The sequence of workshops provides an excellent format for thoughtful stock assessments. The presentations at the Review Panel meeting were comprehensive, especially given that 19 stock assessments and their alternate models had to be reviewed in just five days. NEFSC scientists have done an admirable job in their presentations and response to our questions. The panel discussions were lively and thorough and the report reflects consensus.

One observation that I do have reflects my experience with previous CIE reviews for stocks managed by the Pacific Fisheries Management Council and SEDAR review for sharks. Perhaps it was the structure of the GARM meetings, or the historic approach of the New England Fisheries Management Council, but the connection between assessment objectives and long-term goals was much less obvious than in other regions. I think that the lack of a comprehensive approach made the evaluations of models to BRP much more secondary in our discussions. At times this felt like an afterthought rather than an integral part of the process. Again, this may be because the BRPs are handled in a separate workshop. Nonetheless, such an approach is disjointed.

My last comment fits with my concerns that a MSE approach to these stocks would be beneficial. NEFSC scientists are now using both "East Coast" and "West Coast" models and this is a major advance. They are also using simulations and multiple formulations of models to evaluate retrospective patterns and potential mis-specification of the models. The New England Fisheries Management Council needs to formulate a comprehensive, long-term management strategy that will better use these efforts toward rebuilding their stocks to sustainable levels and maintaining them there.

Appendices

Appendix 1. Draft Terms of Reference for the GARM-III "Models" Meeting

(Last Revised: Oct. 31, 2007; A final draft will be distributed to the Panel prior to the meeting.)
1. For each stock, consider the applicability of one or more of the following modeling approaches to assess stock status:
- Index methods
- Production Models
- Age- or Length-based Models
2. For certain stocks that are aged, compare and contrast the utility of statistical catch-at-age vs. VPA based models with respect to the following criteria:
- Retrospective patterns
- Flexibility to account for alternative parameterizations
- Ability to incorporate external sources of information, especially tagging and environmental data
-Ability to estimate parameters incorporating prior, external information.
3. Address the implications of zeros in the evaluation of fishery independent indices.
4. Examine potential factors responsible for retrospective patterns.
5. For each stock, define the assessment model that will be used to determine stock status and productivity characteristics until the next "benchmark" assessment is conducted. Where possible, apply the models to data (probably through 2006), to obtain current and historical estimates of F and B and estimates of uncertainty.
6. Evaluate the sufficiency of the assessment models to estimate measures of stock status consistent with Biological Reference Points.

Appendix 2. Draft Agenda of GARMIII Modeling Workshop

Draft Meeting Agenda
(last revised Feb. 9, 2008)
GARM III Models Meeting
Feb. 25-29, 2008

Monday February 25
0900-0910 Welcome (Deputy Director)
0905-0910 Introductions
0910-0940 Overview of GARM and objectives of this meeting (Chair)
TOR #1: Applicability of Models to Assess Stock Status
0940 -1020 Overview of GARM species, data availability, assessments
Working Paper 1.1- (Rago et al.)
1020-1040 Discussion
1040-1055 Break
1055-1125 Review of modeling approaches and rationale
Working Paper 1.2 – (Rago et al.)
1125-1200 Discussion
1200-1300 Lunch
TOR #4 Examine potential factors responsible for retrospective patterns.
1300-1430 Report of Working Group on Retrospective Patterns in VPA
Working Paper 4.1- (Legault)
1430-1500
1500-1600 Discussion
TOR #3 Model implications of zeros in fishery independent indices.
1600-1630 Working Paper 3.1 (Legault)
1620-1640 Working Paper 3.2 (Terceiro)
1640-1700 Working Paper 3.3 Report of ICES methods working group (Legault)
1700-1730 Discussion
1730-1800 Summary /Followup (Chair)
1800 Adjourn

Tuesday February 26
0900-0920 Progress review and Order of the Day (Chair)
TOR #2 Compare utility of statistical catch at age models
0920-0940 Overview of SCAA approaches—(Jacobson)
0940-1010 *Working Paper 2.1a* Georges Bank Yellowtail (Legault)
1010-1030 Discussion
1030-1045 Break
1045-1115 *Working Paper 2.1b* White Hake (Sosebee)
1115-1130 Discussion
1130-1200 *Working Paper 2.1c* Georges Bank Cod (O'Brien)
1200-1230 Discussion
1230-1330 Lunch
1330-1430 *Working Paper 2.2* Gulf of Maine Cod—ASPM model (Butterworth)
1430-1500 Discussion

1500-1515 Break
1515-1600 *Working Paper 2.3* Gulf of Maine Cod –ASAP model (Shepherd/Mayo)
1600-1745 Discussion—GOM cod
1745-1800 Summary/Followup (Chair)
1800 Adjourn

Wednesday February 27
0900-0930 Progress review and Order of the Day (Chair)
TOR #2 Compare utility of statistical catch at age models (cont.)
0930-1000 *Working Paper 2.3* Comparative Simulation Tests—Overview (Legault)
1000-1045 *Working Paper 2.3a GB Yellowtail* (Legault)
1045-1100 Break
1100-1130 Discussion—GB Yellowtail
1130-1200 Working Paper 2.3b White Hake (Sosebee)
1200-1230 Discussion—White Hake
1230-1330 Lunch
1330-1430 Working Paper 2.3c Georges Bank Cod (O'Brien)
1430-1530 Discussion—GB cod
1530-1545 Break
1545-1730 General Review—SCAA/Simulation test
1730-1800 Summary/Followup (Chair)
1800 Adjourn

Thursday February 28
0900-0920 Progress review and Order of the Day (Chair)
TOR #5 Recommendations on Model Selection for each stock
TOR #6 Linkage to Biological Reference Points
0920-1000 Working Paper 5.1 Model Recommendations/ Selection Criteria (Rago et al.)
1000-1045 Reviews by Species
1045-1100 Break
1100-1230 Reviews by Species (cont)
1230-1330 Lunch
1330-1430 Reviews by Species (cont)
1430-1530 Ecosystem Models for Reference Points—Progress Update
(Fogarty/Link/Overholtz)
1530-1730 Revisit Topics as Needed
1730-1800 Synthesis and Report Planning (Chair)
1800 Adjourn

Friday February 29
0900-0930 Progress review and Order of the Day (Chair)
0915-0945 Report development
1030-1045 Break
1045-1230 Report development
1230-1330 Lunch
1330-1600 Summary and Assignments
1600 Adjourn

Appendix 3. List of Papers Provided by the NEFSC for Review

List of Papers for the GARM-III Meeting (25-29 Feb. 2008)
Updated: 2/25/2008

TOR #1

WP 1.1	Data summary 19 stocks
WP 1.2	History of Model Selection 19 stocks
WP 1.1 & 1.2	Section M Pollock - corrected 2-22-08
WP 1.3	NE Fishery Observer Program Maps

TOR #2

WP 2.1	Statistical Catch at age models
WP 2.2-a	VPA vs ASPM - Gulf of Maine cod
WP 2.2-b	ASPM retrospective - Gulf of Maine cod
WP 2.3	ADAPT VPA vs ASAP models - Gulf of Main cod
WP 2.4	Simulated data sets
WP 2.5	ASPM - GB yellowtail flounder

TOR #3

WP 3.1	Filling Zeros
WP 3.2	zeros_2006
WP 3.3	ICES Report - zeros

TOR #4

WP 4.1	Report of the Retrospective Working Group

TOR #5

WP 5.1	Model selection - Initial Recommendations
for WP 5.1	Table 5.1 of WP 5.1

TOR #6

WP 6.1	Sufficiency of Models for BRPs

Supplementary Papers

TOR 1 -Gulf of Maine Winter Flounder - appendix 1 - scalerun
TOR 2 yellowtail.dome
TOR 2 GBYTF selectivity1 - Butterworth response

Background

GARM III - Data Meeting Report Dec 2007
GARM-II 2005 report
NEFSC 2002_ CRD02-04 BRPs
NEFSC 2002_ CRD02-12 Cod TRAC
TRAC 2005 01 GB YT flounder

Appendix 4. Draft Panel Summary Report of the GARM III Part 2. Models

Panel Summary Report of the Groundfish Assessment Review Meeting (GARM III)

Part 2. Models

By

Chairman: Robert O'Boyle

Review Panel: José De Oliveira, Stratis Gavaris, Jim Ianelli, Yan Jiao, Cynthia Jones and Paul Medley

Meeting Dates and Location:
25 – 29 February 2008
Northeast Fisheries Science Center
Stephen H. Clark Conference Room
Woods Hole, Massachusetts

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY

The models to assess the status and productivity characteristics of 19 New England groundfish stocks being considered at the 2008 Groundfish Review Assessment Meetings (GARM) were reviewed at the North East Fisheries Science Center in Woods Holes, Massachusetts during 25 – 29 February 2008. The review considered the applicability of a number of modeling approaches (relative trends to age and length – based models) and examined the utility of statistical catch-at-age formulations to address specific issues on each stock. The latter included the ability of these models to address observed retrospective patterns, the potential causes of which were also considered at the meeting. The review focused on the key observational error and model process assumptions for each stock to determine which class of assessment model was most appropriate to use and provided guidance on model formulations to address specific issues for each stock. The sufficiency of the assessment models to provide Biological Reference Points was also discussed as were the implications of zeros in fishery independent indices.

This was the second meeting of a four part process, with the first on data inputs (29 October – 2 November 2007) and the remaining two on biological reference points (28 April – 2 May 2008) and review of the assessments (4 – 8 August 2008). The GARM process has been designed so that each review can inform subsequent ones.

The body of this report consists of the recommendations of a seven member review panel in response to the meeting's terms of reference. The report also includes a synopsis of each of the working papers presented at the meeting along with the associated discussion, during which suggestions and recommendations were made to address identified issues. The panel considered these in drafting this report.

Overall, the meeting successfully fulfilled its terms of reference and represents an important contribution to the GARM III process.

INTRODUCTION

This document is the summary report of the review panel (herein termed the 'Panel') of the Groundfish Assessment Review Meeting (GARM) on assessment methodology. The GARM is a regional scientific peer review process developed in 2002 to provide assessments for the stocks managed under the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan (Multispecies FMP). The first two GARMs took place in October 2002 (NEFSC, 2002a) and August 2005 (NEFSC, 2005) respectively. This GARM III is the most comprehensive to date, intended to provide peer reviewed assessments on 19 groundfish stocks managed by the New England Fisheries Management Council (NEFMC).

The four meetings of GARM III include:

- Data Inputs (29 Oct – 2 Nov 2007)
- Assessment Methodology (25 – 29 Feb 2008)
- Biological Reference Points (28 April – 2 May 2008)
- Assessments (4 – 8 August 2008)

The first three meetings are to establish the analytical formulations of the assessments to be used in the last meeting. The first meeting (NEFSC, 2007) focused on the data inputs (e.g. catch, sampling, surveys, etc) to be used in the assessments. The second meeting, which is the focus of this report, considered the assessment approaches to be applied to the datasets of each stock discussed at the first meeting (see Terms of Reference, appendix 1). The applicability of classes of assessment models, from relative trends to age and length-based models, was considered as well as the ability of the age-structured models to address observed retrospective patterns. Additional issues included treatment of zeros in the evaluation of fishery independent indices (e.g. surveys) and the capacity of assessment models to provide measures of stock status consistent with biological reference points (BRPs). The latter will be an important consideration for the third meeting, which will focus on the determination of the biological reference points used to guide management decision – making (see terms of reference, appendix 2).

Many of the assessments displayed similar issues, for instance the presence of retrospective patterns. The review first examined general issues applicable to all stocks by considering how these were pertinent to three case studies (Georges Bank yellowtail, white hake and Georges Bank cod). The lessons learned from these then informed discussion on the assessment model to use for each of the 19 stocks.

The meeting opened on Monday morning (see agenda, appendix 3) with an overview of the current assessment approaches and challenges facing the 19 groundfish stocks, with consideration of working papers (appendix 4) on potential factors responsible for retrospective patterns and the model implications of zeros in surveys in the afternoon. Tuesday morning was devoted to consideration of the ability of statistical catch-at-age (SCAA) models to address issues raised, particularly causes of retrospective patterns, in the Georges Bank yellowtail, white hake and Georges Bank cod assessments. Tuesday afternoon was devoted to consideration of working papers examining the presence and influence of partial recruitment assumptions on the assessments. Discussion on Wednesday further explored the issues in the assessments (retrospective patterns in

Georges Bank yellowtail and cod and aging errors in white hake). Based on the discussions during the first three days, on Thursday and Friday morning, there was stock by stock consideration by the Panel of the most appropriate formulations to use for each assessment. Unfortunately, an update on work by the Northeast Fisheries Science Center (NEFSC) to develop ecosystem models which will inform the next meeting on biological reference points, which has been planned for Thursday, could not be provided, although the presentation was made available to the Panel. The last part of the meeting on Friday was devoted to the Panel reviewing its conclusions and discussing report assignments. The GARM review Panel consisted of José De Oliveira, Cynthia Jones, Paul Medley, Stratis Gavaris, Jim Ianelli and Yan Jiao. The first three reviewers were assigned to the review by the national Center of Independent Experts (see statement of work for these CIE reviewers in appendix 6) while the last three were invited by the NEFSC. All were invited based upon their extensive expertise and experience with the issues considered by the meeting. The list of meeting participants is provided in appendix 5.

The presentation highlight of each working paper and the ensuing discussion as recorded by assigned rapporteurs is provided in appendix 7. These were important reference material to the Panel in drafting its report.

It is important to comment on the effectiveness of the meeting to address its terms of reference. Other than Terms of Reference 5, the panel was presented with sufficient material to address the stated terms of reference. Some clarification is required for terms of reference 5. For each of the 19 groundfish stocks, terms of reference 5 called for

> ‘Assessment model that will be used to determine stock status and productivity characteristics until the next “benchmark” assessment is conducted. Where possible, apply the models to data (probably through 2006), to obtain current and historical estimates of F and B and estimates of uncertainty’

From the outset, it was apparent that in-depth review of the 19 assessments would not be possible. The approach taken at the meeting was to provide guidance on what class of model was most appropriate for each stock given the characteristics of the data (GARM III, 2007) and issues facing each assessment. Rather than focus on the software to be used, the Panel’s review focused on the formulation most appropriate to take account of observational errors and model assumptions. These formulation decisions were considered more important than the choice of software because most applications have the flexibility to accommodate the formulation variants. While the details of each assessment formulation (e.g. ages to use in plus group) were not discussed, there was considerable discussion and guidance provided at the meeting that would inform some of these detailed decisions. Overall, while time was not available for in-depth review of the details of each assessment, the guidance provided by the Panel was important at this stage of development of the analyses in establishing the class of model to be used in each assessment. From this perspective, the Panel considers that important aspects of terms of reference 5 were met. If the NEFSC requires an in-depth review of the assessment formulations, this will have to undertaken later in the process.

The Panel was concerned about the limited time it had during the meeting to develop its conclusions. The Panel had planned for a full day of consideration of its report on the Friday but the meeting’s agenda required the morning for completion of the

discussion started on Thursday. While this requirement was understandable and perhaps unavoidable, review panels need time during meetings to consult. This needs to be factored into future GARM agendas.

Throughout the report, reference is made to a number of technical terms. The glossary provided in appendix 8 helps to clarify these terms.

PANEL RESPONSE ON TERMS OF REFERENCE

ToR 1. Applicability of one or more of the following modeling approaches to assess stock status (Index methods, Production Models, Age- or Length-based Models)

The Panel considers that model features required for the stocks considered in this GARM-III review must capture the underlying dynamics of populations and the key uncertainties about these and the associated data; capturing these uncertainties may require consideration of different model formulations. Models should be adequately conditioned on data so as to form the basis for the provision of advice. Appropriate consideration of uncertainty should allow risk assessment to be undertaken. Reference point generation and the ability to perform projections under alternative management options are also key features of prospective models.

A range of model classes was considered:

1. Relative trend models: These are models that consider trends in relative abundance and fishing mortality (F), and include the relative fishing mortality / replacement ratio approach of NEFSC (called "AIM"). The lack of catchability (q) estimates for this class of models limits its utility to inform management on absolute levels of allowable catch (i.e. TAC). Also, reference points have to be generated based upon expert judgment and on an *ad hoc* basis. There may be merit in investigating and comparing a more formal model fitting approach e.g. Glazer (2008, see next bullet), relative to the more exploratory, non-parametric approach of AIM.

2. Production models: These are essentially replacement yield models of the form: $B_{y+1}=B_y+Y^{rep}-C_y$[1], where Y^{rep} can take a number of forms, including a constant ($Y^{rep}=a$; Glazer, 2008), a linear ($Y^{rep}=a+bB_y$) or a quadratic ($Y^{rep}=rB_y[1-B_y/K]$; implemented in the NEFSC software ASPIC) form. These models can be used when age data are not available but have encountered problems when there has been depletion but no recovery in the time series. Caution is needed when using constant Y^{rep} for stocks for which there is no historical reported catch but there is evidence (e.g. anecdotal) that this could have been high. In this situation, expert judgment may be needed to provide management with reference points based on these models.

[1] B_y = biomass in year y, C_y = catch in year y and Y^{rep} is the function describing the replacement yield

3. Age-based models: These span the range from statistical catch-at-age to VPA-type models, and are the preferred approach when reliable age and growth data are available.

4. Length-and-age-based models: These are applied when age data are too limited to use age-based models, yet sufficient growth data (e.g. length frequency compositions) are available. However, it is important to evaluate stationarity when a growth model based on data from a restricted period is used.

Where data are lacking and there are conflicting hypotheses of underlying processes, the Panel noted the need to bound alternative states of nature by considering opposing extremes of plausible scenarios. Such an approach may require the consideration of multiple model formulations. If it leads to the consideration of competing models, then a risk analysis may be needed to inform decisions.

The software environment has important implications for what can be achieved. For example, a single software environment that can explore the diversity of data and assumptions is useful for comparative purposes. The use of simple models requires limited support, but also addresses a limited number of issues. On the other hand, more complex models require extensive, well-supported software (e.g. ASAP and SS2) that may limit broad access. Moderately complex approaches (e.g. ADAPT) require some support but are more widely accessible.

When moving from one class of models to another, or even from one formulation to another within the same class, it is important to document changes for fisheries managers. The Panel considers that this should be done by presenting results for the former approach (with new data), along with those for the new approach (with the same data). This allows the source of the change (whether new data or new model) to be clearly identified. It is important to provide rationale for any change in assessment models and explain differences in the results of the two approaches.

ToR 2. For certain stocks that are aged, utility of statistical catch-at-age vs. VPA based models with respect to Retrospective patterns, Flexibility to account for alternative parameterizations, Ability to incorporate external sources of information, especially tagging and environmental data and Ability to estimate parameters incorporating prior, external information

Age structured fish population models use observations on catch-at-age to determine population abundance-at-age. It is generally necessary to incorporate ancillary information to make this determination. Most commonly, the ancillary information comprises observations on abundance indices-at-age, e.g., from surveys or fishery catch per unit effort (CPUE). The catch and index observations may be used as amount-at-age or as split components of totals and proportions-at-age. The choice will influence how the error structures are handled. Assuming natural mortality is specified, a fully and freely specified age structured fish population model requires one population abundance parameter for each year class and one fishing mortality parameter for each age and year. It is generally not possible to reliably estimate all these parameters.

Two common approaches used to reduce the number of estimated parameters are referred to as Virtual Population Analysis (VPA) and Statistical Catch-at-Age (SCAA). VPA makes the assumption that the errors in the catch-at-age are negligible relative to the errors in other observations. This assumption may be held in situations where the catch is well monitored. Though not obligatory, to further reduce the number of parameters to be estimated, VPA frequently makes the assumption that the fishing mortality on the oldest age is a specified function, e.g. average, of the fishing mortality on younger ages. SCAA, on the other hand, makes the assumption that the fishing mortality is the product of an annual fishing mortality and an age specific partial recruitment (PR). This assumption may be approximated in situations where the nature of the fishery has not changed substantially over years. Also, the SCAA dissociates the catch and index data from the model whereas in VPA, the "catch data" are bound to the algorithm for computing numbers at age. Both VPA and SCAA are approximations to the complex reality and are suitable as a basis for providing management advice.

For partial recruitment structure, index relationship to population, handling of natural mortality, and ability to incorporate 'prior' information on estimated parameters (Bayesian techniques), both VPA and SCAA are equally flexible. The principal consideration when comparing VPA and SCAA is the tradeoff between the magnitude of the error in the catch-at-age and the stability of the partial recruitment pattern over years. When the error in the catch-at-age is considered substantial, SCAA may be preferred. When the partial recruitment pattern is likely to be variable from year to year, VPA may be preferred. Often however, the results from VPA and SCAA do not differ substantially, suggesting that neither error in the catch-at-age nor departures from stable partial recruitment are critically important.

A more sophisticated variant of SCAA, referred to as semi-separable, relaxes the requirement for a stable partial recruitment pattern by allowing it to change over time. At the expense of having (usually many) more parameters, the semi-separable approach allows investigation to span the range from a VPA to a SCAA structure.

There are instances where, for some years of the analysis, the total catch is observed but the catch-at-age is unavailable. In these circumstances, only SCAA can be used to combine separate periods in the catch-at-age data. This may be of particular value for the estimation of reference points if there is an extensive initial period with total catch is observed but no catch-at-age data. Difficulties with a VPA application may also occur when errors in the catch-at-age are linked to some external or environmental observations.

An important issue in many fish stock assessments is the occurrence of retrospective patterns. These arise where the effect of removing recent data and re-running the assessment using earlier terminal years results in substantively different estimates compared to the result over the entire time period. These generally reflect incorrect model specifications or treatment of data and should be resolved. The panel reviewed results from a simulation experiment that investigated the performance of VPA and SCAA when retrospective agents were introduced and not accounted for in the model. The simulation operating model generated replicate observations which may have favored the SCAA approach because it used an underlying separable process for fishing mortality. A caveat on this is that the selectivity was length-based so the operating model was not entirely separable from an age perspective. Neither VPA nor SCAA were robust

to the retrospective agents and their results displayed similar retrospective patterns. To properly address the retrospective patterns, it is necessary to know the true source, timing and magnitude of the effect (see section below on terms of reference 4). Uncertainty in point estimates should be carried forward to assist in judging the significance of the retrospective patterns. This may reveal that the estimates of uncertainty for one modeling approach contained the retrospective pattern residuals within confidence bounds more consistently than an alternate approach.

For many assessments reviewed at the meeting, the difference between results from a VPA and a SCAA approach were not the principal concern. Options for other model features had greater impact on results and deserve priority attention (see section below on terms of reference 5). The following table organizes these features and provides some guidance on the considerations for evaluation.

Model Feature	**Variants** (not comprehensive, reflects options considered at GARM III)	**Considerations**
Structural Assumptions		
Population Model	- annual time step (no within year dynamics) - homogeneous unit (no spatial sub-structure) - sex aggregated - sex disaggregated	- seasonal/spatial distribution of catches - sexual dimorphism
Natural Mortality	- assumed known and constant for all ages and years - age specific natural mortality	- demographics
Fishing Mortality	- separable as annual F and age specific PR - separable as annual F and age specific PR, time block breaks/random walk - separable as annual F and PR as function of age, time block breaks/random walk - separable as annual F and PR as function of length - calculated using catch equation, oldest age group PR estimated - calculated using catch equation, oldest age group PR conditioned on younger ages	- reliability of total catch - accuracy and precision of catch age composition - plausibility of constant PR for years in time block - support for PR pattern/assumptions
Index Catchability	- proportional, time invariant within block of years - proportional, time block breaks	- support for change if applicable

Index Selectivity	- age specific, time invariant within block of years - function of age, time invariant within block of years - function of length, time invariant within block of years	- support for selectivity pattern
Error Assumptions		
Catch-at-age, expressed as catch numbers at age	- errors assumed negligible - Errors iid after log transform - Errors lognormal - Errors quasi-likelihood Poisson	- residual diagnostics - influential observations - magnitude of mean square residuals
Catch-at-age, expressed as total numbers and proportions at age	- errors assumed negligible on combined (total and proportion) - errors *iid* after log transform on combined - errors lognormal on proportion, assumed negligible on total - errors lognormal on proportion, lognormal on total - errors multinomial on proportion, assumed negligible on total - errors multinomial on proportion, lognormal on total - errors quasi-likelihood Poisson on combined	- residual diagnostics - influential observations -magnitude of mean square residuals
Indices at Age, expressed as abundance at age	- errors *iid* after log transform - errors lognormal - errors quasi-likelihood Poisson	- residual diagnostics - influential observations -magnitude of mean square residuals
Indices at Age, expressed as total and proportions at age	- errors multinomial on proportion, lognormal on total	
Penalty/Constraint	- none - recruitment conforms to Beverton-Holt form, log error, steepness<0.98 - recruitment conforms to Ricker form, log error - first year abundance conforms to equilibrium condition	- influence of constraints on estimates

	- on curvature of PR/catchability function - von-Bertalanffy growth	
Risk Analyses	- analytical confidence distributions - bootstrap confidence distributions - Bayesian posterior distributions - alternative states of nature	-confidence in measures of uncertainty

ToR 3. Implications of zeros in the evaluation of fishery independent indices

When abundance at age estimates in NMFS surveys result in stratified mean values of zero, standard operating procedures are to treat these values as missing. This was the approach reviewed by the ICES WGMG 2007 report (ICES CM 2007/RMC:04). However in a NMFS Office of Science & Technology review in 2006, reviewers recommended an interim approach to handling these zeros as small values instead, pending further study. This problem arises when surveys used for tuning do not capture specific age classes. The presence of zeros is particularly problematic as age-stratified survey mean abundances are log-transformed before being used in VPA. Three working papers showed the results of using alternate approaches instead of changing zeros to missing. The papers explored several scenarios, including: 1) using actual values, 2) replacing zeros with missing, or 3) an arbitrary small value, or 4) 1/6 times the smallest non-zero value. The simulations in working paper 3.1 showed that replacing zero with small values such as in scenario 3 or 4 was inappropriate because it resulted in bias. Prior to these simulations, previous studies (e.g. using g-statistic; Berry 1987) had identified a constant to replace zero based on obtaining normal skewness and kurtosis. However, any small constant is given considerable weight with a log-transform, whereas the Panel agreed that the zeros contain little information on stock size beyond abundance below some threshold. The Panel was in consensus that replacing zeros with arbitrary constants was not supportable because simulation results show that output can be biased when this is done. There was discussion as to how else to handle zeros as this poses a problem for models when abundances are low.

As an alternative to replacing zeros with an ad hoc value, the Panel discussed the potential of using other transformations beyond the log transform as a way to avoid problems with zeros. Several potential transformations of the Box-Cox type were briefly discussed, specifically the square root transform[2]. Such transformations can be used to stabilize the variance but may not always be appropriate; log transforms are from the same class of these transforms and have often been found to be suitable.

An additional approach would be to use other likelihood or quasi-likelihoods such as the Poisson or other distributions to handle zero-inflated models. Other distributions are used in modeling rare or elusive species and the Poisson has been

[2] For example, a least squares general form would be $\sum\left(\sqrt{O_i}-\sqrt{E_i}\right)^2$ preserving the linear relationship between the observed and expected variables

previously used in fisheries. Multinomial (e.g. as implemented in the ASAP software), Conditional and Delta distributions have been used in other contexts and may or may not be appropriate for use when fitting populations trends from survey indices, depending on the situation. Changing to another distribution, such as the Poisson, has implications for q and variance estimation that would require further analysis and simulation. While some distributions, like the Poisson, can be fitted using iterative least squares, others, such as the negative binomial, do not have a simple relationship between the mean and variance and an additional dispersion parameter needs to be fitted as well as the mean.

The aggregation of age groups was seen to be advantageous particularly for older ages in which zero observations are more probable. One suggestion was to aggregate differently for any given year to better handle zero observations in these age groups.

The pattern of zero values is qualitatively useful in informing the assessment scientist that there may be a significant decline in the population or that there are issues with migration or some type of refuge, particularly as an adjunct to assessing the validity of using dome-shaped partial recruitment functions in the models. Even when data are omitted from the model fit due to the frequency of zeros, this pattern should be acknowledged and the original data presented.

The current NEFSC software converts VPA to ASAP assuming a log normal likelihood for age composition data rather than a multinomial. Incorporating the multinomial option would facilitate inter-model comparisons.

Altogether, the Panel considered that omitting zeros was a reasonable approach and that this was not a major issue for most assessments at this time. However, this issue could require further attention in the case of a declining sequence of biomass from surveys and would probably require identification of an alternative likelihood to the log-normal for survey data.

ToR 4. Potential factors responsible for retrospective patterns

Retrospective patterns result from structural errors in the stock assessment model. Where the error is consistent through time (e.g. a misspecification of natural mortality), a retrospective pattern will not occur. It will only occur when there has been a change within the time series of observations. There are four potential causes of retrospective patterns in age structured stock assessments:

- An unrecorded change in catches
- A change in natural mortality
- A change in the abundance index catchability (q)
- A change in fishery selectivity

In all cases, either the biomass has changed (changes in natural mortality and unrecorded catch) or is perceived to have changed (changes in catchability or selectivity) in a way that cannot be explained by the catch-at-age data, and therefore is a structural error in the model. Random noise is an unlikely cause; although it was suggested that mis-specification of the likelihood function could bring about retrospective patterns through influential data points.

One mechanism identified as a possible cause for retrospective patterns is when a survey of sessile species includes an area closed to fishing. When there is effectively no movement of the population between the closed and open areas, the part of the population in the closed area becomes unavailable to fishing and relatively more abundant than the part of the population outside the closed area. This causes an overall apparent change in the survey catchabilities. However, this is unlikely to be a significant factor for groundfish.

The Panel notes that it is not possible to identify the cause(s) of the retrospective pattern from model diagnostics alone. Adjusting the model assumptions (e.g. altering survey q, catches or M) to remove the pattern does not guarantee the problem has been dealt with; the model may continue to be mis-specified. It is necessary to develop testable hypotheses concerning the cause, timing and magnitude of the effect. Additional information and analyses that might assist in discriminating between hypotheses include:

- Repeating the catch-at-age analysis on a "moving window" of time series data over the full time series to identify the timing of the cause;
- Examining the model residuals for a significant non-stationary pattern;
- Comparing trends in commercial and survey CPUE;
- Comparing the magnitude of survey catchability estimates across species and areas;
- Comparing swept area biomass estimates from surveys with those from the assessment model

Some solutions to retrospective patterns were considered by the Panel, which in certain circumstances, the following could resolve:

- Truncate the assessment time series to the most recent period to remove the retrospective pattern. Although the underlying problem may continue to exist, it has been dealt with in a consistent enough manner for the time series in question to inform the decision–making.
- Consider the use of robust likelihood approach, which could address cases where influential data points are causing the retrospective patterns (Fournier et al., 1991)

In considering the recommendations of the NEFSC report of the retrospective working group, the Panel concluded that:

- A retrospective analysis should always accompany a catch-at-age stock assessment to determine whether or not a retrospective pattern is present
- Hypotheses that might explain the cause(s) for the retrospective pattern should be developed and form the basis for further research; these need to be communicated to decision – makers as major sources of uncertainty
- Standardized criteria need to be developed to identify a significant retrospective pattern. The statistical test presented at the meeting, based on identifying a pattern that was unlikely to be caused by random error, looked promising. The properties and power of the test should undergo further examination.

- Where there are strong grounds to reject the best single model, the alternative models (hypotheses) which explain the retrospective patterns should be used to evaluate the consequences of management decisions. The uncertainty needs to be communicated to managers and decision-makers, through decision tables and other types of risk analysis.

ToR 5. For each stock, assessment model that will be used to determine stock status and productivity characteristics until the next "benchmark" assessment is conducted. Where possible, apply the models to data (probably through 2006), to obtain current and historical estimates of F and B and estimates of uncertainty

General Considerations

In this section, for each stock, the Panel provides guidance on the class of assessment model that are suitable given the nature and availability of the relevant data. Often, there was no compelling evidence to choose between a VPA and SCAA formulation. The analyses presented at the meeting using comparable VPA and SCAA formulations generally behaved similarly. In situations where the Panel considered that one formulation was more suitable, the preference is stated.

Following this, the most influential model features that need to be resolved for each stock are stated in order of priority. These are generally, but not always, intended to address retrospective patterns observed in current assessment formulations.

A number of issues arose that are relevant to all stocks and are discussed first.

Estimation of Partial Recruitment

The estimation of the partial recruitment pattern on the older age groups was a recurring issue in many stocks. Allowing dome-shaped fishery partial recruitment resolved some observed retrospective patterns but may lead to what was termed 'cryptic' biomass – biomass generated by the model that has not been observed in either the fishery or surveys.

The Panel considers that the burden of proof should be to convincingly demonstrate that the fish exist in the population when not observed in the fishery and surveys, even if the model fit with dome-shaped partial recruitment is better. The estimation of too many parameters in a model may lead to a tendency to estimate a dome-shaped partial recruitment pattern even when there was no dome present. At the very least, the consequences of adopting a dome-shaped as opposed to a flat topped partial recruitment should be documented for consideration in the management arena. When competing hypotheses of partial recruitment are being considered, all information, including external sources of data, should be examined to inform the merits of each. For example, it may be possible to disaggregate the plus group catch to assist in hypothesis testing. Analyses of tagged fish presented at the meeting offered promise for evaluating hypotheses about partial recruitment. A number of different hypotheses emerged at the meeting that could be formally investigated which the Panel encouraged.

When considering an SCAA formulation, it is often necessary to define blocks of time during which the separable assumption is likely to be met. However, care needs to be taken on how to define the transition between blocks. Abrupt changes in estimated partial recruitment may result from large errors in the observed data. Techniques (e.g. random walks) which constrain how much partial recruitment can vary between adjacent blocks of time should be explored.

The algorithm in the software of the NEFSC used to estimate the population numbers in the plus group gives rise to inconsistencies. It assumes that the fishing mortality on the plus group is some function of the fully recruited fishing mortality in the same year and, using the Baranov catch equation, estimates plus group abundance from the catch numbers of the plus group. This does not recognize abundance contributions of non-plus group and plus group ages from the year previous. An appropriate algorithm is provided in Anon. (2003). While the difference between the two algorithms is small when plus group catch is small, it can be important when plus group catch is large.

Weighting of Model Components

When fitting models to data, weighting factors are often used to emphasize or de-emphasize components, e.g. less weight given to the index for age 1 relative to others because it is considered 'noisy'. The Panel did not extensively explore how to define weights but offers some observations, based upon discussion at the meeting.

Weighting may be internal or external. In the first case, the weights applied to the fit of each model component are based on the measure of fit of the model to the data and are iteratively updated during the estimation process. In these situations, it may be useful to define a minimum bound on the weighting (e.g. minimum sigma) to ensure that no one model component draws an inordinate amount of the weighting.

External weightings may be derived from estimates of the variance in the input datasets (e.g. stratified variance in the survey dataset). In these cases, it is important to ensure that the estimate of the variance is precise enough to be useful. Small sample sizes can lead to imprecise estimates of the variance. It may be possible to generate externally derived weights based on a statistical analysis of trends in variance in the dataset (i.e. produce smoothed estimates of sigma). This would have to be justified on a case by case basis. Another consideration is when the sampling variance does not fully characterize the total error, which may result in inappropriate weighting of components. This situation could be rectified by introducing an additional variance parameter to be estimated (Germont and Butterworth, 2001; Punt et al., 1997).

Ad hoc external weighting (choice of weights based upon non-statistical arguments) should be avoided. If expert judgment is required to establish external weightings, the rationale should be clearly documented and the impact of the choice should be described. Experimentation with alternative weighting may be a useful tool for exploration of the influence of components.

During the meeting, two different ways to implement external weighting were discussed. The first involved multiplying the component's measure of model fit (least squares or likelihood) by a constant (lambda) while the second involved dividing the fit by a constant, in this case typically the scale parameter of the likelihood (sigma) for the

dataset under consideration. In some cases, both types of weighting were employed. The Panel considered that either approach, but not both simultaneously, is appropriate. Use of both an external lambda and an external sigma in the same model fitting process has the potential to confuse determination of what the weighting is.

Biological Reference Points (BRPs)

The relative merits of estimating biological reference points internally (within the model fitting process) or externally (analyzing the assessment results to produce the BRPs) was discussed. One of the main considerations in determination of BRPs is characterization of the stock - recruitment relationship. Often the variability about this relationship is very high. Accordingly, the weighting of this component in the model fitting is low so that determining its parameters internally will not greatly influence estimation of current stock size. Its real value is in estimation of BRPs. If the same data are used, internally (assuming non-informative priors) and externally derived BRPs would be expected to be similar.

A potential advantage of estimating BRPs internally, say within an SCAA formulation is that it allows inclusion of years in which only catch data are available. This allows consideration of years of data early in the history of exploitation of a stock which can provide a perspective of long-term productivity. This potential advantage has to be weighed against the possibility that productivity has not remained stationary over such extensive time periods.

Estimating BRPs externally is a useful way to corroborate the BPRs estimated internally using the same dataset and is encouraged by the Panel. If differences between the two approaches are encountered, these should be investigated and explained.

Stock by Stock Assessment Formulations

The ordering of the stocks below conveys the Panel's overall sense of priority to address assessment issues. This is not the priority for undertaking the assessment which may be driven by management need. Rather, it is based on the Panel's understanding of the status of the current assessment formulation and the likelihood of significant improvements being made to it.

Gulf of Maine Cod

Fishery sampling and aging data are generally good. While the recreational catch contributes larger errors, on balance, the data are sufficient to employ an age – structured model assuming negligible errors in the catch-at-age.

There is only a weak retrospective pattern using the current VPA. However, there is a need to confirm the partial recruitment on ages five plus as this is particularly influential on the estimation of biological reference points and on stock status determination. The analyses presented at the meeting (working papers 2.2 and 2.3) indicated that the model fit to the data favored a domed partial recruitment. Discrepancies in the results call for hypotheses on causative processes and external sources of information to resolve. Regarding the latter, the shape of the partial recruitment curve for

the older ages could be investigated through more detailed examination of the dynamics within the plus group (age 7+) as well as analysis of the available tagging data. The consequences of either hypothesis on management advice should be explored through a risk analysis.

Southern New England / Mid-Atlantic Bight Yellowtail

Given the good sampling rates and availability of aging information, the data are sufficient for an age structured model. The Panel felt that negligible error in the catch-at-age could be assumed although this assumption may need to be relaxed for the recent time period.

There is a strong retrospective pattern in the current VPA formulation that requires examination. Following the approach for the Georges Bank stock, it would be worthwhile splitting the survey time series to explore whether or not similar trends with survey catchability are present in Southern New England. If so, spatial differences in the survey selectivity and/or environmental covariates (temperature) should be investigated as potential causative processes.

The Panel noted the need to investigate long-term changes in stock productivity given the severe decline of the resource. This has implications for the determination of biological reference points. It could not comment on the details of this examination.

Gulf of Maine / Cape Cod Yellowtail

The Panel comments made for Southern New England / Mid-Atlantic yellowtail are also applicable to the Gulf of Maine / Cape Cod yellowtail stock.

Witch Flounder

Coefficients of variation on the catch-at-age overall are about 17%, there are no recreational catches and discards are low. The data are sufficient to use an age-structured model assuming negligible error in the catch-at-age. However, comparison with an SCAA model that allows for error in the catch-at-age may be useful in this case, following resolution of the retrospective issue.

While the current VPA formulation has been adequate in capturing the broad-scale dynamics of the stock, it has exhibited a consistent retrospective pattern that warrants exploration. The Panel could not comment on the nature of these explorations other than point out the potential sources of retrospective patterns made elsewhere in this report and the need to bring external sources of data to bear on identifying potential causative processes.

The Panel noted the desire of the NEFSC to use the ASAP software package to undertake these explorations. There are no compelling reasons not to switch from ADAPT to ASAP if this makes analyses easier.

Redfish

The data are sufficient for application of an age structured model. This is important given the strong evidence for infrequent large pulses of recruitment which persist in the stock over decadal time periods. The Panel could not evaluate if error in the catch-at-age could be assumed negligible. This should be examined to determine if a SCAA approach would be more suitable.

The fishery may target abundant year-classes as they move through the stock. It will be important in the assessment to relax the separable assumption to allow for this possibility and explore if it is occurring.

In relation to biological reference points, internal estimation of the stock - recruitment relationship in a SCAA formulation will need to take account of both the stock's inherent productivity and the presence of episodic large year-classes. In relation to the former, steepness (h) can be inferred from redfish resources elsewhere (e.g. West Coast). In relation to the latter, the analysis should consider setting the assumed error around the stock - recruitment relationship ($\sigma_{R,}$) at a low constant value (e.g 0.2 or less) for years when there is limited age data (i.e. little information on year-class strength) and then to increase it to an appropriate higher constant value (e.g. 0.4 or higher) for periods when age data are more plentiful (Maunder and Deriso, 2003). The Panel considers that the sensitivity of the assessment to these stock - recruitment assumptions should be checked through comparison of the model results without them. In addition, the Panel considered that an externally derived surplus production model should be investigated to evaluate the robustness of derived biological reference points.

Georges Bank – Gulf of Maine White Hake

The differentiation between red and white hake in the commercial fishery is an issue for this stock, particularly for discards which in some years can represent 50% of the catch, much of this being less than 60cm in length. While there is no commercial aging data since 2000, length frequency sampling is available for this period. Thus the data are sufficient for an age-structured model although negligible error in the catch-at-age cannot be assumed. A model should be used that can take advantage of the age and length frequency data available (e.g. SCALE). There is a potential for sexual dimorphism to confound this attempt at modeling, which should be considered in the model formulation if possible.

The speciation identification problem in catch samples for lengths less than 60 cm can be examined by consideration of species composition for these fish sizes in the survey dataset, calibrating these with available observer data.

Georges Bank – Gulf of Maine Plaice

The data appear to be sufficient to undertake an age-structured model. However, the Panel could not evaluate whether or not the error in the catch-at-age could be assumed to be negligible. Since the discards are an important fraction of the catch and appear not to be well-determined, it is appropriate to assume the presence of error in the catch-at-age (e.g. SCAA).

The current VPA formulation exhibits a moderate retrospective pattern, the causes of which require examination.

There is a potential problem of conducting an assessment on the combined Georges Bank and Gulf of Maine stock subcomponents if the relative proportion of abundance of these stocks is not stable over time. The survey trends in the two areas should be examined; if they are similar, then a combined assessment of the two components should not be problematic. However, if the trends are different, there may be a need to partition the catch-at-age between the two stocks and conduct separate assessments on each assuming that there is negligible migration between the two populations. .

Plaice growth rates have been observed to be different on Georges Bank and in the Gulf of Maine. This has consequences for the partial recruitment in each area. There is a need to validate the separable assumption of the SCAA when undertaking the assessment.

Georges Bank Winter Flounder

The Panel noted the improvement in commercial age and length sampling since 2000 although gaps in these data exist in the middle of the time series (1998-99). The data are sufficient to undertake an age - structured model but error in the catch-at-age may not be negligible. Thus, the stock is a candidate for a SCAA formulation.

The Panel could not assess the overall utility of a SCAA formulation without results to examine.

The Panel noted similar issues with the other two winter flounder stocks (Gulf of Maine and Southern New England / Mid-Atlantic Bight. While each has its challenges regarding data availability and other issues, the NEFSC should consider whether or not a common class of models could be applied to all three stocks. This will not only facilitate comparison of stock dynamics but also lead to new insights in each assessment.

Gulf of Maine Winter Flounder

It was noted that year-classes that can be identified in the commercial and survey length compositions do not appear in the respective age composition. This may indicate smearing across year-classes in the age-length keys. As well, commercial sampling intensity has been low. Thus, while the data appear sufficient for an age-structured model, negligible error in the catch-at-age cannot be assumed. In addition, a formulation that takes advantage of the available length frequency information would be appropriate (e.g. SCALE).

The current VPA formulation exhibits a strong retrospective pattern. There was a suggestion that the causes of the retrospective might be related to sexual dimorphism, which could be investigated through a sex-separate model, although the report of the NEFSC Retrospective Working Group (working paper 4.1) indicated that a strong retrospective pattern could not be generated by sexual dimorphism alone. It will also be useful to corroborate model output by comparing fishing effort trends implied by the models with reported fishing effort.

Conflicting patterns between the recruitment and biomass time series were noted. To represent these inconsistencies in the data, a risk evaluation should be undertaken, which compares results between models weighted towards either the adult or the

recruitment indices. The consequences of each weighting on harvest advice should be documented.

Southern New England / Mid-Atlantic Bight Winter Flounder

The data appear to be sufficient for an age-structured model and information available suggests that negligible error in the catch-at-age can be assumed.

The current VPA formulation exhibits a strong retrospective pattern but seems to be transitory as it is not evident in recent years. Some event may have occurred in the mid 1990s to cause the retrospective pattern that is no longer occurring.

The causes of the historical retrospective patterns should be explored using the current assessment formulation. A possible change in the catch-at-age around 1994 could be checked to see if the retrospective was due to a single event related to this. If the retrospective pattern does not reappear with the additional years of data to the assessment, then there is no need for further exploration. If on the other hand, it does reappear, consideration should be given to splitting the survey time series pre and post 1994. Further, as discussed in the section on terms of reference 4, a robust likelihood approach might address the retrospective pattern if some of the indices have been very influential.

Georges Bank – Gulf of Maine Pollock

While there are issues with determining the age structure of the commercial catch in the Canadian and distant water fleet components in the 1960s and early 1970s, the data may be sufficient for use of an age-structured model post 1977. The Panel could not evaluate if the error in catch-at-age was negligible.

The Panel considered that the Relative Trend class of models is likely informative given the strong relationship between the relative fishing mortality and replacement yield for this resource and thus could be the basis of the 2008 assessment.

The Panel noted that suspected transboundary US / Canada migration will impact the assessment. Joint research on stock structure with the Canadian Department of Fisheries and Oceans has been proposed (TRAC, 2007).

The aging data may be informative about recruitment and could augment the Relative Trend analyses. This information should be evaluated and presented at the April GARM III review.

Georges Bank – Gulf of Maine and Southern New England / Mid-Atlantic Bight Windowpane

Except for the fall 1999 NMFS survey, there is no commercial aging information for these stocks and only one year of survey aging (1999). Commercial and survey length frequency data are available that allow examination of the dynamics of recruitment and a plus group separately within an age structured model. A high percentage of the catch has been discarded, particularly since 2000 when it has been in excess of reported landings. It may not be appropriate to assume negligible errors in partitioning the recruitment and plus group, in which case SCAA would be more suitable.

While the current Relative Trends approach (AIM) appears to be adequate, there are benefits to using a common assessment framework for both stocks. Thus, whatever formulation is developed for one stock should be used on the other if possible.

Georges Bank Yellowtail

The data for this stock are sufficient to undertake an age - structured model assuming negligible errors in the catch-at-age.

A previous VPA formulation had exhibited a strong retrospective pattern. The Transboundary Resource Assessment Committee (TRAC, 2005) examined the causes of the retrospective pattern in detail and while not identifying the primary cause, developed an assessment formulation (termed the Major Change Model) that, through splitting the survey time series pre and post 1994 largely removed the pattern and was considered suitable as the basis for management.

There was nothing presented at this GARM III meeting which would lead to improvement of the Major Change Model and thus it should be the basis of the GARM III assessment.

Notwithstanding this, the primary cause of the retrospective pattern remains unresolved. It was noted that the splitting of the survey time series could be a proxy for changes in survey catchability related to habitat use by yellowtail. Yellowtail might be occupying more preferred habitat due to environmental or other influences, causing survey catchability to increase. This hypothesis should be investigated. If a mechanism for the apparent change in survey catchability in the mid- 1990s can be identified, this should be presented along with the current model.

The partial recruitment pattern on the ages four plus needs corroboration. Model fits presented at the meeting suggested dome partial recruitments in both the survey and commercial fishery which was at odds with the results of tagging analysis, which suggested no dome. There was discussion at the meeting on the potential confounding of the tagging results by other processes (e.g. gear avoidance, emigration, tag reporting rate). The pattern of partial recruitment on the older age groups requires further exploration using external data to inform this.

If a SCAA formulation is considered, conducting the analysis using the catch and discards by separate fleet components may improve model fits as the separable assumption is more likely to be met within these.

Finally, overall improvements in the stock assessment of yellowtail may be gained by considering all three stocks (Georges Bank, Cape Cod – Gulf of Maine and Southern New England – Mid Atlantic Bight) as a complex with migration between components. This is not suggested for immediate exploration.

Georges Bank Cod

The data are sufficient for an age-structured model in which it can be assumed that the error in the catch-at-age is negligible.

The current VPA formulation exhibits a weak to moderate retrospective pattern, the presence of which may be due to changes in the fishery partial recruitment since 1994. This may be related to major changes in management structures (e.g. closed areas,

mesh size) made at the time. Model formulations that allow investigation of changes in partial recruitment, particularly with regards to the older age classes in the recent time period (post 1995) should be pursued.

Georges Bank Haddock

The data are sufficient for an age-structured model which assumes negligible error in the catch-at-age. It is noted that catch-at-age data for this stock is available as a continuous time series as far back as 1930 (Clark et. al, 1982). These data should be included in the assessment.

The current VPA formulation exhibits only a weak retrospective pattern. However, recent changes in haddock size at age (declining) have implications for the assumption of stationarity of survey catchability at age and for the estimation of BRPs which will have to be addressed in any age structured model. If a SCAA formulation is considered, a number of partial recruitment blocks throughout the assessment's time period will likely be required.

Regarding biological reference points, in addition to the general comments made above, the last time that a stock – recruitment relationship was examined for this stock (NEFSC, 2002), a non-parametric form had to be used due to a lack of convexity in the relationship. This will likely persist, suggesting that the relationship might need to be considered externally to the assessment model.

Gulf of Maine Haddock

The data may be sufficient to undertake an age - structured model although it has not yet been processed. The Panel encourages completion of the processing of the relevant data as time is available. If this information is not processed before the next assessment is due, a Relative Trend class of models will have to be employed (e.g. AIM).

The spatial distribution of the catch and the surveys should be examined to determine whether or not the high landings and survey observations in the Great South Channel area are spill over from the Georges Bank stock. This may affect the perception of the productivity of this stock.

Ocean Pout

Recent landings are bycatch in other fisheries. While length frequency sampling for discards has been good, there are no aging data available. Consequently, the data are not sufficient for an age-structured model.

While the current Relative Trends approach (AIM) could be used for the GARM III assessments, alternative models should be explored that both have a stronger basis in biology and more explicitly address uncertainty. These include age-structured models using life history parameters derived from literature and other external sources as well as Bayesian biomass dynamics models. The sufficiency of available age data to construct the growth relationship to support these models requires exploration.

There is only a weak relationship between Relative Fishing Mortality and Replacement Ratio, suggesting that the Relative Trends class of assessment models is not

informative for reference points. It is possible that the stock's dynamics have been severely impacted by fishing historically, to the point that it may not be possible to determine the link between exploitation rate and productivity.

Atlantic Halibut

There is a long time series of landings data for this stock that could inform estimation of its productivity. Sampling intensity has been low and while length frequencies have been collected, there are no aging data. The data are not sufficient for an age-structured model.

The Panel suggests attempting a one parameter (for productivity) depletion analysis assuming a plausible landing level before 1893 and fit to available survey abundance trends. Notwithstanding this, the tagging returns of 28% from the Canadian zone suggest that this stock should be assessed in collaboration with Canadian assessment scientists.

ToR 6. Sufficiency of the assessment models to estimate measures of stock status consistent with Biological Reference Points

There are model approach implications for methods to estimate biological reference points. The Panel spent little time evaluating assessment model considerations relative to BRPs directly, although a number of issues related to this were raised throughout the meeting. Some of the key issues identified were:

- Length of time series considered (the problem of shifting baselines)
    - Assessment of stock status generally relates to the most recent time period while the estimation of BRPs requires a longer term perspective of productivity
    - Inclusion of historical catch data has implications for BRPs and long-term changes in stock structure needs to be considered
    - Temporal changes in biological parameters (e.g. recent declines in growth) need to be taken into account
    - For long catch time series (e.g., redfish) deriving an appropriate treatment for historical recruitment pattern consistent with removals is critical
- The estimation of stock - recruitment relationships internally and externally to the assessment models (see also comments on BPRs in section on terms of reference 5)
    - VPA and SCAA can estimate population stock-recruitment relationships integrated with survey and catch data and have the potential to estimate BRPs; SCAA can extend this analysis to years in the absence of a complete time series of catch-at-age data
    - It is desirable that the approach selected provides reasonably consistent estimates of BPRs (i.e., inter-assessment variability should be low)

    - Stock-recruitment assumptions are key for BRP estimation but less so for stock status. Also, the flexibility provided by both parametric and non-parametric estimation approaches should be considered
    - Where possible, the Panel encourages estimating BRPs both internally and externally, comparing the results and explaining differences
- The potential for ambiguity when BRPs are estimated using expert judgment (e.g. for stocks assessed using AIM). The Panel recommends the development of a consistent and defensible basis for estimating BRPs using the Relative Trends class of assessment model. This includes a transparent basis for estimating scale
- The extent that a stock can be considered adequately managed as a "unit" (i.e., the area is at the margins of the natural range for a stock - e.g., Atlantic halibut and SNE yellowtail flounder)
- Overall multispecies production (to be more fully addressed at the BRP GARM).
    - Technical interactions (bycatch of co-occurring species) methods need to be pursued for practical management applications

The above points need to be kept in mind when applying assessment methods for estimating BRPs.

The Panel suggested an approach for age-structured models to evaluate the impact of fishing on a stock using minimal assumptions about the underlying productivity (e.g., stock-recruitment relationships). Specifically, the historical time series of recruitment estimates from a particular assessment could be used to compute the subsequent spawning biomass levels as if no fishing had occurred. If a stock-recruitment relationship is estimated, the original recruitment estimates can be adjusted by the ratio of the expected recruitment given spawning biomass (with and without fishing) and the estimated stock-recruitment curve i.e. the recruitment under no fishing modified as:

$$R_t^{'} = \hat{R}_t \frac{f\left(S_t^{'}\right)}{f\left(\hat{S}_t\right)}$$

where $\hat{R}_t$ is the original recruitment estimate in year *t* with $f\left(S_t^{'}\right)$ and $f\left(\hat{S}_t\right)$ representing the stock-recruitment function given spawning biomass under no fishing and under the fishing scenario, respectively. This approach would be particularly useful where the stock-recruitment relationship is of the Ricker type, where recruitment begins to decline at higher stock biomass.

For example, application to Gulf of Maine cod using reference case estimates of recruitment, maturity and mean weights-at-age from the meeting working papers, are projected forward from age one but *without F*. Without any stock-recruitment effect, a current level of "depletion" is about 26% (figure 1). Adding an adjustment due to a stock-recruitment relationship is likely to change this pattern to some degree, particularly if a Ricker stock – recruit model is used, as noted above. This technique can be used to test both the impact of fishing and the assumptions about the stock - recruitment relationship.



Figure 1. Historical spawning stock biomass for Gulf of Maine cod based on the reference model (with fishing) compared to estimates assuming natural mortality of 0.2 only (without fishing)

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The meeting required an extensive suite of working papers prepared by scientists at the NEFSC and substantial and in-depth discussions at the meeting itself. This was a very significant workload by the Center, which the Panel acknowledges being of very high quality. The Panel would also like to acknowledge the valuable contributions at the meeting made by all participants, particularly those of Doug Butterworth and Rebecca Rademeyer, who attended on behalf of the fishing industry. Finally, the Panel would like to thank Andrea Strout of the NEFSC who assisted the chair in preparing this report. All these contributions made it possible for the GARM III 'models' review to meet its terms of reference.

REFERENCES

Ames, E.P. 2004. Atlantic Cod Stock Structure in the Gulf of Maine. Fisheries. 29: 10 – 28.

Anon. 2003. Workshop on Assessment Methods. NAFO Scientific Council Studies. 36: 215 – 216

Berry, D.A. 1987. Logarithmic transformations in ANOVA. Biometrics 43:439-456.

Brandao, A. and D.S. Butterworth. 2008. An updated assessment of the South African Kingklip resource including some sensitivity tests. Marine and Coastal Management document. WG-Dem: K:02 revision2

Butterworth, D.S., J.N. Ianelli and R. Hilborn. 2003. A Statistical Model for Stock Assessment of Southern Bluefin Tuna with Temporal Changes in Selectivity. Afr. J. Mar. Sci. 25: 331–361.

Clark, S.H.,Overholtz, W.J.,Hennemuth, R.C. 1982. Review and assessment of the Georges Bank and Gulf of Maine haddock fishery. J. Northw. Atl. Fish. Sci. 3: 1 – 27.

Fournier, D.A., J.R. Sibert, and M. Terceiro. 1991. Analysis of length frequency samples with relative abundance data for the gulf of Maine northern shrimp,(*Pandalus borealis*) by the MULTIFAN method. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 48: 591-598.

Germont, H.F. and D.S. Butterworth. 2001. Possible extensions to the ADAPT VPA model applied to Western North Atlantic Bluefin Tuna, addressing in particular the need to account for "additional variance". ICCAT Coll. Vol. Sci. Pap. 52: 1663-1705.

Glazer, J. 2008. Updated replacement yield estimates for the South African Monkfish resource, *Lophius vomerinus,* and analyses of trends in abundance. Marine and Coastal Management document. WG-Dem:A:01 revision1.

Herrington, W.C. 1935. Modifications in gear to curtail the destruction of undersized fish in otter trawling. US Bureau of Fisheries Report. 46 pp.

Maunder, M.N. and R. B. Deriso. 2003. Estimation of recruitment in catch-at-age models. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 60: 1204–1216.

NEFSC 2002a. Assessment of 20 Groundfish Stocks through 2001. Northeast Fisheries Science Center Reference Document 02-16.

NEFSC. 2002b. Re-Evaluation of Biological Reference Points for New England Groundfish. Northeast Fisheries Science Center Reference Document 02-04.

NEFSC. 2005. Assessment of 19 Northeast Groundfish Stocks through 2004. Northeast Fisheries Science Center Reference Document 05-13

NEFSC. 2007. Report of the Groundfish Assessment Review Meeting (GARM III). Part 1. Data Methods. NEFSC Report. 69 pp.

PUNT, A.E., Cooke, J.G., Borchers, D.L. and S. Strindberg. 1997. Estimating the extent of additional variance for Southern Hemisphere minke whales from the results of the IWC/IDCR cruises. Rep. int. Whal. Com. 47: 431-434.

Serchuk, F.M. and S.E. Wigeley. 1992. Assessment and Management of the Georges Bank Cod Fishery: An Historical Review and Evaluation. J. Northw. Atl. Fish. Sci., Vol. 13: 25–52.

TRAC. 2002. Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the Transboundary Resources Assessment Committee (TRAC), Woods Hole, Massachusetts, February 5-8, 2002. Northeast Fisheries Science Center Reference Document 02-12.

TRAC. 2005. Proceedings of the Transboundary Resources Assessment Committee (TRAC) Benchmark Review of Stock Assessment Models for the Georges Bank Yellowtail Flounder Stock. Transboundary Resource Assessment Committee. Proceedings 2005 / 01.

TRAC. 2007. Canada USA Scientific Discussions. 10 – 12 April 2007. Transboundary Resource Assessment Committee. Proceedings 2007 / 02.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Terms of Reference for the GARM-III Models Meeting

1. For each stock, consider the applicability of one or more of the following modeling approaches to assess stock status:
    - Index methods
    - Production Models
    - Age- or Length-based Models

2. For certain stocks that are aged, compare and contrast the utility of statistical catch-at-age vs. VPA based models with respect to the following criteria:
    - Retrospective patterns
    - Flexibility to account for alternative parameterizations
    - Ability to incorporate external sources of information, especially tagging and environmental data
    -Ability to estimate parameters incorporating prior, external information.

3. Address the implications of zeros in the evaluation of fishery independent indices.

4. Examine potential factors responsible for retrospective patterns.

5. For each stock, define the assessment model that will be used to determine stock status and productivity characteristics until the next "benchmark" assessment is conducted. Where possible, apply the models to data (probably through 2006), to obtain current and historical estimates of F and B and estimates of uncertainty.

6. Evaluate the sufficiency of the assessment models to estimate measures of stock status consistent with Biological Reference Points.

Appendix 2. Draft Terms of Reference for the GARM-III "Biological Reference Point (BRP)" Meeting (28 April – 2 May 2008)

1. For each stock, define feasible candidate BRPs for fishing mortality rate (F) and biomass (B) in light of the recommended assessment models from the GARM III "Modeling" Meeting.

2. For relevant stocks, consider the influence of retrospective patterns in estimates of F and B on the computation of BRPs and on specification of initial conditions for forecasting.

3.a.)For relevant stocks, identify trends in biological parameters (i.e., life history and/or recruitment) and assess their importance for the computation of BRPs and for specification of rebuilding scenarios; b.)If possible, summarize trends in pertinent environmental variables that might be related to the biological trends.

4. Ecosystem approaches to Gulf of Maine fisheries. a.) Determine the production potential of the fishery based on food chain processes; b.)Model the aggregate yield from the ecosystem; c.) Comment on aggregate single stock yield projections in relation to overall ecosystem production, identifying potential inconsistencies between the two approaches.

5. For Index stocks, identify appropriate measures of relative F and relative abundance for determining BRPs and for rebuilding strategies.

6. For each stock, estimate the fishing mortality rate and biomass BRPs that will be used to determine stock status.

7. For each stock, identify appropriate models for forecasting and for evaluation of rebuilding strategies.

Appendix 3. Draft Meeting Agenda of GARM III Models Meeting. Feb. 25-29, 2008, Stephen Clark Conference Room, NEFSC, Woods Hole, MA

Monday February 25

0900-0910 Welcome (Deputy Director)
0905-0910 Introductions
0910-0940 Overview of GARM and objectives of this meeting (Chair)
TOR #1: Applicability of Models to Assess Stock Status
0940 -1020 Overview of GARM species, data availability, assessments
Working Paper 1.1, 1.3 - (Rago)
1020-1040 Discussion
1040-1055 Break
1055-1125 Review of modeling approaches and rationale
Working Paper 1.2 - (Rago)
1125-1200 Discussion
1200-1300 Lunch
TOR #4 Examine potential factors responsible for retrospective patterns.
1300-1430 Report of Working Group on Retrospective Patterns in VPA
Working Paper 4.1 - (Legault)
1430-1515 Discussion
1515-1530 Break
TOR #3 Model implications of zeros in fishery independent indices.
1530-1600 *Working Paper 3.1* - (Legault)
1600-1620 *Working Paper 3.2* - (Terceiro)
1620-1640 *Working Paper 3.3* - Report of ICES methods working group (Legault)
1640-1730 Discussion
1730-1800 Summary /Followup (Chair)
1800 Adjourn

Tuesday February 26

0900-0920 Progress review and Order of the Day (Chair)
TOR #2 Compare utility of statistical catch-at-age models
0920-0940 Overview of SCAA approaches—(Jacobson)
0940-1010 *Working Paper 2.1a* – Georges Bank Yellowtail (Jacobson)
1010-1030 Discussion
1030-1045 Break
1045-1115 *Working Paper 2.1b* - White Hake (Sosebee)
1115-1130 Discussion
1130-1200 *Working Paper 2.1c* - Georges Bank Cod (O'Brien)
1200-1230 Discussion
1230-1330 Lunch
1330-1445 *Working Papers 2.2, 2.5* - ASPM model - Georges Bank Yellowtail and Gulf of Maine Cod – (Butterworth)
1445-1530 Discussion
1530-1545 Break

1545-1600 *Supplementary paper* and discussion on domed selectivity TOR 2. (Hart/Miller)
1600-1630 *Working Paper 2.3* - Gulf of Maine Cod –ASAP model (Shepherd)
1630-1745 Discussion—GOM cod
1745-1800 Summary/Followup (Chair)
1800 Adjourn

Wednesday February 27
0900-0930 Progress review and Order of the Day (Chair)
TOR #2 Compare utility of statistical catch-at-age models (cont.)
0930-1000 *Working Paper 2.4* - Comparative Simulation Tests—Overview (Legault/Brooks)
1000-1045 *Working Paper 2.4a* – Retrospective Pattern: GB Yellowtail (Legault)
1045-1100 Break
1100-1130 Discussion—GB Yellowtail
1130-1200 *Working Paper 2.4b* – Ageing Error: White Hake (Legault/Brooks)
1200-1230 Discussion—White Hake
1230-1330 Lunch
1330-1430 *Working Paper 2.4c* - Domed Selectivity: Georges Bank Cod (Legault/Brooks)
1430-1530 Discussion—GB cod
1530-1545 Break
1545-1730 General Review—SCAA/Simulation test
1730-1800 Summary/Followup (Chair)
1800 Adjourn

Thursday February 28
0900-0920 Progress review and Order of the Day (Chair)
TOR #5 Recommendations on Model Selection for each stock
TOR #6 Linkage to Biological Reference Points
0920-1000 *Working Papers 5.1, 6.1* - Model Recommendations/ Selection Criteria (Rago and Population Dynamics Branch)
1000-1045 Reviews by Species
1045-1100 Break
1100-1230 Reviews by Species (cont)
1230-1330 Lunch
1330-1430 Reviews by Species (cont)
1430-1530 Ecosystem Models for Reference Points—Progress Update (Fogarty/Link/Overholtz)
1530-1730 Revisit Topics as Needed
1730-1800 Synthesis and Report Planning (Chair)
1800 Adjourn

Friday February 29
0900-0930 Progress review and Order of the Day (Chair)
0915-1030 Follow-up Sessions if Necessary

1030-1045 Break
1045-1230 Report development
1230-1330 Lunch
1330-1600 Summary and Assignments
1600 Adjourn

Appendix 4. List of Working Papers for the GARM-III Assessment Methodology "Models" Meeting (25-29 Feb. 2008)

1.1 Rago, et al. 2008. Data Summary for Nineteen Groundfish Stocks in the Northeast U.S.

1.2 Rago, et al. 2008. Overview of Assessment Methods and Model Selection Criteria for Nineteen Groundfish Stocks in the Northeast U.S.

M.1 Mayo R, Col L, Traver M. 2008. Data Summary of Catch and Abundance Measures. (for Working Papers 1.1 & 1.2)

1.3 Hendrickson L, Col L. 2008. Maps Showing NEFOP Sampling Coverage and Management Areas

2.1 Jacobson L, Legault C, O'Brien L, Sosebee K. 2008. Utility of Statistical Catch-at-age Models for Assessing Northeast Groundfish Stocks (a workshop report)

2.2a Butterworth DS, Rademeyer RA. 2008. Statistical Catch-at-age Analysis *vs* ADAPT-VPA: The Case of Gulf of Maine Cod

2.2b Rademeyer RA, Butterworth DS. 2008. Retrospective Analysis for the Gulf of Maine Cod ASPM Reference Case Assessment

2.3 Shepherd G. 2008. Comparison of ADAPT VPA and ASAP Models for Gulf of Maine Cod

2.4 Brooks L, Legault C, Nitschke P, O'Brien L, Sosebee K, Rago P, Seaver A. 2008. Evaluation of NMFS Toolbox Assessment Models on Simulated Groundfish Data Sets

2.5 Butterworth DS, Rademeyer RA. 2008. Application of and Age-Structured Production Model to the Georges Bank Yellowtail Flounder

3.1 Legault C, Seaver A. 2008. Simulation Studies of Issues Associated with Filling Zeros in VPA Tuning Indices

3.2 Terceiro M. 2008. The Treatment of "Zero" Observations in the Summer Flounder ADAPT VPA Calibration

3.3 ICES Resource Management Committee. 2007. Report of the Working Group on Methods of Fish Stock Assessment (WGMG)

4.1 Legault et al. 2008. Report of the Retrospective Working Group

5.1 Rago et al. 2008. Recommended Modeling Approaches by Stock Initial Proposals for Consideration by the GARM III Review Panel

6.1 Rago et al. 2008. Sufficiency of Models for Biological Reference Points

Supplementary Papers

TOR 1 Gulf of Maine Winter Flounder SCALE Run 2

TOR 2 Miller T, Hart D, Cadrin S, Jacobson L, Legault C, Rago P. 2008. Analyses of Tagging Data for Evidence of Decreased Fishing Mortality for Large Yellowtail Flounder

TOR 2 Butterworth DS, Rademeyer RA. 2008. On Drawing Inferences Concerning Trends in Selectivity with Age from Tag-Recapture Information

TOR 2 Jacobson L. 2008. Questions about the Adjusted Lognormal Error Distribution used in Calculating Goodness of Fit for Survey and Commercial Age Composition Data in Preliminary ASPM Models.

TOR 2 Jacobson L. 2008. Pope vs Baranov

Appendix 5. List of Participants GARM III Models Meeting February 25-29, 2008

Name	Affliliation	Email
Bob O'Boyle	Beta Scientific (GARM Chair)	betasci@eastlink.ca
Paul Rago	NMFS	paul.rago@noaa.gov
Yan Jiao	Virginia Tech	yjiao@vt.edu
Paul Medley	CIE Reviewer	paulahmedley@
Toni Chute	NMFS	toni.chute@noaa.gov
José DeOliveira	CEFAS Lowestoft Lab	jose.deoliveira@cefas.co.uk
Cynthia M Jones	Old Dominion University	cjones@odu.edu
James Ianelli	AFSC	jim.ianelli@noaa.gov
Stratis Gavaris	Fisheries & Oceans Canada	gavaris@mar.dro-mpo.gc.ca
Fred Serchuk	NEFSC, Woods Hole	fred.serchuk@noaa.gov
Jim Weinberg	NEFSC, Woods Hole	james.weinberg@noaa.gov
Maggie Raymond	Associated Fisheries of Maine	maggieraymond@comast.net
Tom Nies	New England Fisheries Management Council	tnies@nefmc.org
Rich McBride	NEFSC, Woods Hole	richard.mcbride@noaa.gov
Rebecca Rademeyer	University of Cape Town	rebecca.rademeyer@uct.ac.za
Doug Butterworth	Univesity of Cape Town	doug.butterworth@uct.ac.za
Tim Miller	Pop Dy, NEFSC	timothy.j.miller@noaa.gov
Liz Brooks	Pop Dy, NEFSC	liz.brooks@noaa.gov
Paul Nitschke	Pop Dy, NEFSC	paul.nitschke@noaa.gov
Susan Wigley	Pop Dy, NEFSC	susan.wigley@noaa.gov
Larry Alade	Pop Dy, NEFSC	larry.alade@noaa.gov
Steven Correia	Mass DMF	steven.correia@state.ma.us
Chris Legault	NEFSC, Woods Hole	chris.legault@noaa.gov
Kohl Kanwit	ME DMR	kohl.kanwit@maine.gov
Mike Palmer	Pop Dy, NEFSC	michael.palmer@noaa.gov
Laurel Col	Pop Dy, NEFSC	laurel.col@noaa.gov
Jessica Blaylock	Pop Dy, NEFSC	jessica.blaylock@noaa.gov
Gary Shepherd	Pop Dy, NEFSC	gary.shepherd@noaa.gov
Yanjun Wang	St. Andrews Biological Station, D 70	wangy@mar.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Lou Van Eeckhaute	Fisheries & Oceans Canada	van-eeckhautel@mar.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Mark Wuenschel	NEFSC, Woods Hole	mark.wuenschel@noaa.gov
Andrea Strout	NEFSC, Woods Hole	andrea.strout@noaa.gov
Frank Almeida	NEFSC, Woods Hole	frank.almeida@noaa.gov
Loretta O'Brien	Pop Dy, NEFSC	loretta.o'brien@noaa.gov
Ralph Mayo	Pop Dy, NEFSC	ralph.mayo@noaa.gov
Mark Terceiro	Pop Dy, NEFSC	mark.terceiro@noaa.gov
Katherine Sosebee	Pop Dy, NEFSC	katharine.sosebee@noaa.gov
Lisa Hendrickson	Pop Dy, NEFSC	lisa.hendrickson@noaa.gov
Tom Wood	NRC/DMAST	awood@gso.uri.edu
Dan Goethel	SMAST	dgoethel@umassd.edu
Steve Cadrin	NOAA/Umass CMER	steven.cadrin@noaa.gov
Bill Overholtz	NMFS	william.overholtz@noaa.gov
Jiashen Tang	NEFSC, Woods Hole	jjtang@mercury.wh.whoi

Larry Jacobsen	NEFSC, Woods Hole	larry.jacobsen@noaa.gov
Dvora Hart	NEFSC, Woods Hole	dhart@mercury.wh.whoi

Appendix 6. Statement of Work of Center for Independent Experts at GARM-III "Models" Meeting

General

The Groundfish Assessment Review Meeting (GARM) brings together stock assessment experts to peer review work on the status of 19 important fish stocks that are managed by the New England Fishery Management Council. GARM-III takes place in 2007-2008, and it will consist of four meetings that are cumulative in nature (i.e., successive meetings incorporate methods and results that were accepted at previous GARM-III meetings). Each meeting will have a chairman as well as external panelists. A brief description and dates of the four GARM-III meetings are given below:

1. **"Data" Meeting (October 29 – November 2, 2007)**
   Review the commercial and survey data that will be used in the stock assessments. Identify appropriate statistical methods for analyzing those data (including bycatch and discard issues, changes in growth rates and other life history traits, issues related to merging databases, etc.). Other sources of data to be considered are tagging programs for cod and yellowtail flounder, and Industry-Based Surveys. Candidate sources of data relevant to ecological and ecosystem considerations will also be described.

2. **"Modeling" Meeting (Feb. 25 – 29, 2008)**
   Determine the most appropriate stock assessment methods and models for each of the 19 stocks. Perform runs of those models to obtain results (historical and current estimates of F and B) based on commercial and survey data, probably through calendar year (CY) 2006. Evaluate retrospective patterns and their importance for status determination.

3. **"Biological Reference Point (BRP)" Meeting (April 28 – May 2, 2008)**
   Update or redefine BRPs for each of the 19 stocks. Use data available through CY2006. Consider whether the BRPs are reasonable in light of results from the "Modeling" Meeting. Define the appropriate initial conditions for forecasting and rebuilding strategies, particularly with respect to trends in biological attributes, recruitment and survival rates. Comment on relevant ecosystem considerations as they relate to rebuilding strategies.

4. **GARM-III "Final" Meeting (August 4-8, 2008)**
   Use all of the methods proposed from the previous three meetings, along with survey and catch information through CY2007, to estimate fishing mortality rates and biomass for each stock. Based on procedures from the BRP Meeting, finalize the BRPs, appropriate initial conditions, and biological assumptions related to forecasts. Determine the status of each stock.

This SOW applies specifically to the GARM-III "Modeling" Meeting, which will take place at the Woods Hole Laboratory of the Northeast Fisheries Science Center (NEFSC) in Woods Hole, Massachusetts, from February 25 -29, 2008. The meeting will have a chairman (non-CIE) as well as external panelists, three of whom will be from the Center of Independent Experts (CIE).

Overview of CIE Peer Review Process

The Office of Science and Technology implements measures to strengthen the National Marine Fisheries Service's (NMFS) Science Quality Assurance Program (SQAP) to ensure the best available high quality science for fisheries management. For this reason, the NMFS Office of Science and Technology coordinates and manages a contract for obtaining external expertise through the Center for Independent Experts (CIE) to conduct independent peer reviews of stock assessments and various scientific research projects. The primary objective of the CIE peer review is to provide an impartial review, evaluation, and recommendations in accordance to the Statement of Work (SoW), including the Terms of Reference (ToR) herein, to ensure the best available science is utilized for the National Marine Fisheries Service management decisions.

The NMFS Office of Science and Technology serves as the liaison with the NMFS Project Contact to establish the SoW which includes the expertise requirements, ToR, statement of tasks for the CIE reviewers, and description of deliverable milestones with dates. The CIE, comprised of a Coordination Team and Steering Committee, reviews the SoW to ensure it meets the CIE standards and selects the most qualified CIE reviewers according to the expertise requirements in the SoW. The CIE selection process also requires that CIE reviewers can conduct an impartial and unbiased peer review without the influence from government managers, the fishing industry, or any other interest group resulting in conflict of interest concerns. Each CIE reviewer is required by the CIE selection process to complete a Lack of Conflict of Interest Statement ensuring no advocacy or funding concerns exist that may adversely affect the perception of impartiality of the CIE peer review. The CIE reviewers conduct the peer review, often participating as a member in a panel review or as a desk review, in accordance with the ToR producing a CIE independent peer review report as a deliverable. The Office of Science and Technology serves as the COTR for the CIE contract with the responsibilities to review and approve the deliverables for compliance with the SoW and ToR. When the deliverables are approved by the COTR, the Office of Science and Technology has the responsibility for the distribution of the CIE reports to the Project Contact. Further details on the CIE Peer Review Process are provided at http://www.rsmas.miami.edu/groups/cie/

Requirements for CIE Reviewers

Three CIE reviewers are requested to conduct an impartial and independent peer review in accordance with the Terms of Reference (ToR) herein. Each CIE reviewer's duties shall not exceed a maximum of 14 days conducting pre-review preparations with document review, participation on the SARC panel review meeting, editorial assistance for the SARC Chair, and completion of the CIE independent peer review report in

accordance with the ToR and Schedule of Milestones and Deliverables. CIE reviewers shall have working knowledge and recent experience in the application of modern fishery stock assessment models. Expertise should include both the use of statistical catch-at-age and traditional VPA approaches. Experience with comparative studies of these approaches is especially valuable. Reviewers should also have experience in evaluating measures of model fit, identifiability, uncertainty, and forecasting. Some experience with groundfish (such as cod, haddock, flounder) population dynamics would be useful.

Specific Activities and Responsibilities

The CIE's deliverables shall be provided according to the schedule of milestones listed on page 5. The GARM Chairman will use contributions from the CIE panelists as well as from other external panelists, to produce the GARM Panel Summary Report. In addition, each CIE panelist will write an individual independent report. These reports will provide peer-review information for a presentation to be made by NOAA Fisheries at meetings of the New England and Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Councils in 2008. The GARM Panel Summary Report shall be an accurate and fair representation of the GARM panel viewpoint on the quality and soundness of the science, methods and data with regard to each Term of Reference (see Annex 1). The report shall also contain recommendations for improvement that might be implemented in a future GARM meeting.

Charge to GARM panel

The panel is to determine and write down its viewpoint on the quality and soundness of the science, methods and data with regard to each Term of Reference (see Annex 1). Criteria to consider include whether: (1) the data are adequate and were used properly; (2) the analyses and models were appropriate and correctly accomplished; and (3) the conclusions are correct/reasonable. Where possible, the chair shall identify or facilitate agreement among the panelists regarding each Term of Reference.

During the course of the review, the panel is allowed limited flexibility to deviate from the results and recommendations of earlier GARM-III meetings. This flexibility may include minor alterations in procedures previously established at the peer review of the Data Methods Meeting in October 2007. Large scale changes, such as changing a stock definition would not be possible in view of the difficulties of implementing these changes in time available before the final GARM meeting in August 2008.

Furthermore, if the panel rejects certain assessment models, the panel should explain why those particular models are not suitable, and the panel should recommend suitable alternatives. If such alternatives cannot be identified, then the panel should indicate that the existing (status quo) models are the best available at this time.

Roles and responsibilities

<u>Prior to the meeting (GARM chair and CIE panelists)</u>

Review the reports produced by the Working Groups, and read background reports.

During the Open meeting

(GARM chair)

Act as chairperson, where duties include control of the meeting, coordination, control, and facilitation of the presentations and discussions, and ensuring that all Terms of Reference of the GARM are reviewed and completely addressed.

During the question and answer periods, provide appropriate feedback to the assessment scientists on the sufficiency of the analyses and when possible, suggest improved approaches. It is permissible to discuss the working papers, and to request additional information to clarify or revise existing analyses, if that information can be produced rather quickly.

(CIE panelists)

For each model approach, participate in panel discussions on the quality and soundness of the science, methods and data with regard to each Term of Reference (see Annex 1).

During the question and answer periods, provide appropriate feedback to the assessment scientists on the sufficiency of the analyses. It is permissible to request additional information if it is needed to clarify or revise existing analyses, if that information can be produced rather quickly.

After the Open meeting

(GARM CIE panelists)

Each panelist shall prepare an Independent CIE Report (see Annex 2). This report should comment on the quality and soundness of the science, methods, and data with regard to each Term of Reference.

If any modeling approaches are considered inappropriate, the Independent CIE Report should include recommendations and justification for suitable alternatives. If such alternatives cannot be identified, then the report should indicate that the existing modeling approaches are the best available at this time.

During the meeting, additional questions that are not in the Terms of Reference but which are directly related to the assessments may be raised. Comments on these questions should be included in a separate section at the end of the Independent CIE Report prepared by each panelist.

If a panelist feels that his/her comments are adequately expressed in the GARM Panel Summary Report, it will not be necessary to repeat the same comments in the Independent CIE Report. In this case, the Independent CIE Report can be used to provide greater detail on specific Terms of Reference or additional questions raised during the meeting.

(GARM chair)

The GARM chair shall prepare a document summarizing the background of the work to be conducted as part of the review process, and summarizing whether the process was adequate to successfully address the Terms of Reference. If appropriate, the chair

will include suggestions on how to improve the process. This document will constitute the introduction to the GARM Panel Summary Report.

(GARM chair, CIE and non-CIE panelists)

The GARM Chair will take the lead in preparing, editing, and completing the GARM Panel Summary Report, based on contributions from the external panelists (CIE and non-CIE). The panelists and the chair will discuss their views on each Term of Reference and whether their opinions can be summarized into a single conclusion for all—or only for some—of the Terms of Reference. For TORs where a consensus view can be reached, the GARM Panel Summary Report will contain a summary of such views. In cases where multiple and/or differing views exist on a given Term of Reference, the GARM Panel Summary Report will note that there was no agreement and will specify—in a summary manner—what the various opinions are and the reason(s) for the different opinions.

The chair's objective during this Summary Report development process will be to identify or facilitate the finding of an agreement, rather than forcing the panel to reach an agreement if this is not possible.

The GARM Panel Summary Report (please see Annex 3 for information on contents) should comment on the quality and soundness of the science, methods, and data with regard to each Term of Reference.

If any modeling approaches are considered inappropriate, the GARM Panel Summary Report should include recommendations and justification for suitable alternatives. If such alternatives cannot be identified, then the report should indicate that the existing modeling approaches are the best available at this time.

The contents of the draft GARM Panel Summary Report will be approved by the CIE panelists by the end of the Summary Report development process. The GARM chair will finalize all editorial and formatting changes prior to approval of the contents of the draft GARM Panel Summary Report by the CIE panelists. The GARM chair will then submit the approved GARM Panel Summary Report to the NEFSC contact (i.e., SAW Chairman).

Schedule of Milestones and Deliverables

The milestones and schedule are summarized in the table below. No later than March 14, 2008, the CIE panelists should submit their Independent CIE Reports to the CIE for review[3]. The Independent Reports shall be addressed to "University of Miami Independent System for Peer Review," and sent to Dr. David Sampson, via e-mail to David.Sampson@oregonstate.edu and to Mr. Manoj Shivlani via e-mail to mshivlani@rsmas.miami.edu

Milestone	**Date**
Open workshop at Northeast Fisheries Science Center (NEFSC) (begin writing reports, as soon as open Workshop ends)	Feb. 25 – 29, 2008
GARM Chair and CIE panelists work at the NEFSC drafting reports	Feb. 28 – 29

[3] All reports will undergo an internal CIE review before they are considered final.

Draft of GARM Panel Summary Report, reviewed by all CIE panelists, due to the GARM Chair **	March 14
CIE panelists submit Independent CIE Reports to CIE for approval	March 14
GARM Chair sends Final GARM Panel Summary Report, approved by CIE panelists, to NEFSC contact (i.e., SAW Chairman)	March 21
CIE provides reviewed Independent CIE Reports to NMFS COTR for approval	March 28
COTR notifies CIE of approval of reviewed Independent CIE Reports	April 4 *
COTR provides final Independent CIE Reports to NEFSC contact	April 4

* Assuming no revisions are required of the reports.
** The GARM Panel Summary Report will not be submitted, reviewed, or approved by the CIE.

The SAW Chairman will assist the GARM chair prior to, during, and after the meeting in ensuring that documents are distributed in a timely fashion. NEFSC staff and the SAW Chairman will make the final GARM Panel Summary Report and Independent CIE Reports available to the public. Staff and the SAW Chairman will also be responsible for production and publication of the collective Working Group papers.

Acceptance of Deliverables

By 28 March 2008, CIE shall complete and submit the independent CIE peer review reports in accordance with the ToR, which shall be formatted as specified in Annex 2. Upon review and acceptance of the CIE reports by the CIE Coordination and Steering Committees, CIE shall send via e-mail the CIE reports to the COTRs (William Michaels William.Michaels@noaa.gov and Stephen K. Brown Stephen.K.Brown@noaa.gov) at the NMFS Office of Science and Technology by the date in the Schedule of Milestones and Deliverables. The COTRs will review the CIE reports to ensure compliance with the SoW and ToR herein, and have the responsibility of approval and acceptance of the deliverables. Upon notification of acceptance, CIE shall send via e-mail the final CIE report in *.PDF format to the COTRs. The COTRs at the Office of Science and Technology have the responsibility for the distribution of the final CIE reports to the Project Contacts.

Key Personnel

Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR):

William Michaels
NMFS Office of Science and Technology
1315 East West Hwy, SSMC3, F/ST4, Silver Spring, MD 20910
William.Michaels@noaa.gov Phone: 301-713-2363 ext 136

Stephen K. Brown
NMFS Office of Science and Technology
1315 East West Hwy, SSMC3, F/ST4, Silver Spring, MD 20910

Stephen.K.Brown@noaa.gov Phone: 301-713-2363 ext 133

Contractor Contacts:

Manoj Shivlani, CIE Program Manager
University of Miami, RSMAS, 4600 Rickenbacker Causeway, Miami, FL 33149
mshivlani@rsmas.miami.edu Phone: 305-421-4608

Roger Peretti, NTVI Regional Manager
Northern Taiga Ventures, Inc., 814 W. Diamond Ave., Ste. 250, Gaithersburg, MD 20878
rperetti@ntvifed.com Phone: 301-212-4187

Project Contact:

James Weinberg, NEFSC Contact person and SAW Chairman
NMFS Northeast Fisheries Science Center, 166 Water Street, Woods Hole, MA 02543
James.Weinberg@noaa.gov Phone: 508-495-2352

Request for Changes

Requests for changes shall be submitted to the Contracting Officer at least 15 working days prior to making any permanent substitutions. The Contracting Officer will notify the Contractor within 10 working days after receipt of all required information of the decision on substitutions. The contract will be modified to reflect any approved changes. The Terms of Reference (ToR) and list of pre-review documents herein may be updated without contract modification as long as the role and ability of the CIE reviewers to complete the SoW deliverable in accordance with the ToR are not adversely impacted.

ANNEX 1: Draft Terms of Reference for the GARM-III "Models" Meeting

(Last Revised: Oct. 31, 2007; A final draft will be distributed to the Panel prior to the meeting.)

1. For each stock, consider the applicability of one or more of the following modeling approaches to assess stock status:
   - Index methods
   - Production Models
   - Age- or Length-based Models

2. For certain stocks that are aged, compare and contrast the utility of statistical catch-at-age vs. VPA based models with respect to the following criteria:
   - Retrospective patterns
   - Flexibility to account for alternative parameterizations
   - Ability to incorporate external sources of information, especially tagging and environmental data
   -Ability to estimate parameters incorporating prior, external information.

3. Address the implications of zeros in the evaluation of fishery independent indices.

4. Examine potential factors responsible for retrospective patterns.

5. For each stock, define the assessment model that will be used to determine stock status and productivity characteristics until the next "benchmark" assessment is conducted. Where possible, apply the models to data (probably through 2006), to obtain current and historical estimates of F and B and estimates of uncertainty.

6. Evaluate the sufficiency of the assessment models to estimate measures of stock status consistent with Biological Reference Points.

ANNEX 2: Contents of GARM-III Independent CIE Reports

1. The Independent CIE Report should comment on the quality and soundness of the science, methods and data with regard to each Term of Reference. CIE panelists should consider whether the work provides a scientifically credible basis for developing fishery management advice. Scientific criteria to consider include: whether the data were adequate and used properly, the analyses and models were carried out correctly, and the conclusions are correct/reasonable.

If a panelist feels that his/her comments are adequately expressed in the GARM Panel Summary Report, it will not be necessary to repeat the same comments in the Independent CIE Report. In that case, the Independent CIE Report can be used to provide greater detail on specific Terms of Reference or additional questions raised during the meeting.

2. If any modeling approaches are considered inappropriate, the Independent CIE Report should include recommendations and justification for suitable alternatives. If such alternatives cannot be identified, then the report should indicate that the existing modeling approaches are the best available at this time.

3. Any independent analyses conducted by the CIE panelists as part of their responsibilities under this agreement should be incorporated into their Independent CIE Reports. It would also be helpful if the details of those analyses (e.g., computer programs, spreadsheets etc.) were made available to the respective assessment scientists.

4. Additional questions that were not in the Terms of Reference but that are directly related to the assessments. This section should only be included if additional questions were raised during the GARM meeting.

ANNEX 3: Contents of GARM-III Panel Summary Report

1. The first section the report shall consist of an introduction prepared by the GARM chair that will include the background, a review of activities and comments on the appropriateness of the process in reaching the goals of the GARM. The next section will contain comments on the quality and soundness of the science, methods and data with regard to each Term of Reference. The GARM Panel should consider whether the work provides a scientifically credible basis for developing fishery management advice. Scientific criteria to consider include: whether the data were adequate and used properly,

the analyses and models were carried out correctly, and the conclusions are correct/reasonable.

If the CIE panelists, the non-CIE panelists and GARM chair do not reach an agreement on a Term of Reference, the report should explain why. It is permissible to express majority as well as minority opinions.

2. If any modeling approaches are considered inappropriate, the GARM Panel Summary Report should include recommendations and justification for suitable alternatives. If such alternatives cannot be identified, then the report should indicate that the existing modeling approaches are the best available at this time.

3. The report shall also include the bibliography of all materials provided during the meeting and any papers cited in the GARM Panel Summary Report, along with a copy of the CIE Statement of Work.

The report shall also include as a separate appendix the Terms of Reference used for the GARM Models Meeting, including any changes to the Terms of Reference or specific topics/issues directly related to the assessments and requiring Panel advice.

Appendix 7. Presentation Highlights and Discussion

This appendix includes the presentation highlights provided by the senior author of each working paper along the rapporteur's notes of the ensuing discussion. In regard to the latter, the emphasis was to capture the main points made. Some rapporteurs used prose while others bullet style. There was only modest editing of these during preparation of this report. Notwithstanding this, the text give a sense of the main topics discussed, areas of agreement, and areas of future work. While these were referred to by the Panel, statements herein should not be considered the final conclusions of the Panel, which are stated in the body of this report.

Applicability of Models to Assess Stock Status

Rapporteur: Toni Chute

Working Paper 1.1: Rago P, et al. 2008. Data Summary for Nineteen Groundfish Stocks in the Northeast US and

Presentation Highlights

The feasibility of any assessment model approach ultimately relies on the quality of underlying data. To that end this report incorporates the full set of data estimation improvements described and endorsed by the review Panel for the GARM Data Methods Meeting (October 29-November 2, 2007). The major revisions include:

- Improved methods for allocating landings to statistical area
- Revised approaches for estimation of total discards
- Improvements to software for estimation of landings at age

This document is a summary of the progress that has been made to date on the preparation of data for the Groundfish Assessment Review Meeting (GARM). The objective of this report is to provide the necessary background on the availability of data for each species, and to inform discussions on model selection. Each chapter includes a set of core tables that illustrate the available commercial landings and discards, recreational landings and discards, and survey indices. For species that are aged, additional information on biological samples and age composition is also provided. Not all of the age samples for 2007 have been processed.

Discard estimates and CVs are based on the SBRM methodology (based on a discard/kept of all species) described at the GARM Data Methods meeting in October 2007. In some instances, individual analysts varied the approach to more accurately account for known interventions that created large regulatory discards. For some species, discards were estimated using hindcast methods. A generalized database has been developed to facilitate the evaluation of alternative estimators. One of the important new aspects of this report is that measures of uncertainty in the discard totals are now estimated.

Recreational catch and landings have been revised by MRFSS and are summarized for 1981 to 2006. Compared to the more popular recreational species (e.g., striped bass) relatively few length frequency samples for groundfish are taken.

Standardized mean abundance and biomass (kg) indices are available for NEFSC spring (1968-2007), NEFSC autumn (1963-2007) and DFO spring (1986-2007) were summarized. The Massachusetts DMF spring and fall bottom trawl surveys (1982-2007) were are also included for stocks that frequent inshore waters. Numbers at age were also estimated for appropriate stocks.

The data summaries are preliminary. In particular, discard estimates may be revised as the individual analysts review the underlying data in more detail. Some of the chapters include more complete, but preliminary, investigations of model performance. Such chapters do not constitute assessments but will be used as a starting point for more comprehensive analyses.

<u>Working Paper 1.3.Hendrickson L and L. Col. 2008. Maps Showing NEFOP Sampling Coverage and Management Areas</u>

Presentation Highlights

Groundfish discards are estimated for the 2008 GARM from trips sampled by fisheries observers from the Northeast Fisheries Observer Program (NEFOP). The spatial distribution of the observed tows from these trips is shown on a series of GIS maps, by gear type during 1986-2006, in relation to statistical reporting areas and the three groundfish closure areas (CAI, CA II, and the Nantucket Lightship CA).

Discussion on Working Papers 1.1 and 1.3

- The important issue for this meeting is to ensure that the assessment models consider the key processes of each stock through considering changes in management and depletion over time, discards etc rather than going over all the data.
    - Also important is determining error through how precise the data is.
    - The meeting is looking primarily at the major case studies such as YT, cod, white hake, and GB cod and not looking at each stock – it is looking for patterns.
    - Fish sizes have been changing over time too, as a result of heavy fishing ; these patterns emerge across all stocks.
- Stock structure is defined by statistical areas which are informed by both the topography of the bottom and fishing areas.
    - Not all GB stocks have the same statistical areas associated with them; some GB stocks occupy statistical areas that other GB stocks do not.
    - Stocks are determined by both natural patterns of abundance and management areas. There is some migration between stocks and tagging programs are in place
    - The GOM has colder water and is not as productive as compared to GB
    - Survey strata mirror the statistical areas somewhat but are based on areas of similar depth and bottom type.

- Distant-water fleets exploited the resources very heavily until the Magnuson act in 1976.
    - Up to 500,000 metric tons a year were removed. Large reductions in biomass right around the time of the NMFS surveys.
- The reporting of landings has changed over time
    - Pre 1994 reporting was voluntary and supplemented with interviews, now it is a mandatory logbook system.
    - There are some problems determining the allocation of landings: e.g. where the fish were caught.
    - Dealer records have not changed much, although now they are electronic.
    - Observer coverage varies depending on circumstances such as a special access program, species, looking at about 2-5% coverage.
- Management has become more than just "a strong suggestion" and there has been some significant improvements in some species.
    - In 1994, it was planned to reduce the fishing by 50% in 5-7 years.
    - Closed areas were implemented in 1996, and rolling closures protect the stocks at certain times of year.
    - The closed area boundaries are heavily fished - 75% of haddock are caught within a few miles of the area boundaries.
- Discard estimation has been improved by stratifying the fleets and estimation by a discard to kept ratio.
    - Observer information is key.
    - Hindcasting discard estimates is difficult; both observer and survey data are used.
    - With changes in management, discard patterns have changed over time.
    - The average kept weight and average trip duration seem to be the same whether an observer is on board or not.
    - The probability of capture, given the particular fleet, gear and area plus the management effects are used to estimate probable discard.
- Regarding NMFS survey sampling (over 45 years), there is evidence of abundance clustering over time (high GINI numbers).
    - The definition of the "stock area" is what is used when determining whether there is a high GINI index for a certain species, not the whole survey area.
    - In some cases, the high concentration may be due to spawning aggregations.
    - There is no evidence of bias in the survey, but the sampling design is more targeted towards some species more than others.
- Number of tows within an area are used to calculate the concentration numbers, but some of the area within strata are not trawlable for a number of reasons
    - However, many untrawlable areas are only temporarily so.
    - Overall though, the survey coverage is generally good; there are not many holes.
    - Looking at areas of survey gear damage could point out where these untrawlable areas are.
    - Untrawled areas, if consistent over time, may not be that important.
- The definition of the plus group has changed over time due to the intensity of fishing, and changes in size of fish at age due to unknown causes.

Working Paper 1.2: Rago et al. 2008. Overview of Assessment Methods and Model Selection Criteria for Nineteen Groundfish Stocks in the Northeast US

Presentation Highlights

This report provides a summary of the assessment approaches that have been used to date for the 19 GARM stocks. Each section gives a brief overview of the methods that have been used to date, an evaluation of their strengths and weaknesses, and the prospects for implementing alternative approaches. This report complements the data and analyses summarized in Working Paper 1.1.

Model selection requires simultaneous consideration of multiple objectives. Alternative models should be technically superior in terms of modern statistical theory, flexibility to handle heterogeneous data and processes, stability of results, and expanded scope of inference. Alternative models must also allow for the provision of scientific advice with respect to reference points. One aspect of particular importance in the Northeast US is stock rebuilding. The model must include a forecasting component or be linked with forecasting program. This is necessary for the evaluation of alternative management strategies. Such evaluations are also required as components of the economic impacts of alternative harvest levels. Finally, coordination of assessment approaches with states and Canada is important for jointly-managed species.

This report addresses the model selection issues for 19 stocks. Each section includes a brief description and history of current approach, its key strengths and weaknesses, and the feasibility of changing assessment models. At the 2005 GARM, only one stock was assessed using a forward projecting age-structured model. For this GARM there is a general tendency to consider the application of forward projection models for several stocks including Georges Bank and Gulf of Maine cod, Georges Bank haddock, all of the yellowtail stocks, and redfish, and white hake. For other species, the current age based assessment models are performing well and may not need further exploration. Several index-based assessments (e.g., white hake, Gulf of Maine haddock) may be upgraded to age or length based models.

Discussion on Working Paper 1.2

- Relative F equation
  - Catch over three years is average of index of abundance.
  - Relative F approach is more of a descriptive tool, not to provide an assessment number.
  - Recruitment is not taken into account when using the averaged 3 indices, allow fish a few years to be caught, but the uncertainty in the survey is why there are 3.
  - The very last year where there is no T+1 you would calculate using a different basis All abundances are expressed in biomass, weight per tow.
- Placement of surveys in time may affect the way the data are smoothed since the surveys are conducted at different times of the year.

    - Spatial patterns in the survey data have not affected the definition of central tendency.
    - Finer scale changes in the surveys may change the apparent pattern of the fish.
    - Does one go back and look at the survey areas where the aggregated (high GINI number) fish are found to see whether it is in a specific place. This is not an issue in design-based surveys but knowing the variation from tow to tow may be helpful for the model
- Model vs. index-based assessment
    - ability to age all the species was important
    - Some sampling years were not good so a model had to be used to cover the times of poor age data.
    - Model selection needs to be assisted by considering the summary of data is available and what the time spans and ranges of data are
- Dealer data have no sampling error in terms of biomass. Re area allocation, are the interviews and VTR comparable?
    - Interviews not a census, based on an experienced person's interview.
    - Impute statistical area from trips, ports when they are not there.
    - Error in location caught is not huge, and statistical area is less certain than stock area.
- Error in and especially amount of discard has a bearing on the kind of model you should use
    - How accurate is the size frequency coming from the observers for the whole stock? Pretty good, but some of the CVs were pretty high for the catch
    - Overall, error in catch-at-age are probably small compared to the indices at age.
- What is the relative magnitude of error from all of the different data sources?
    - Stocks that have some data peculiarities are the ones that have special modeling needs
    - Are there any commonalities in the assessments that do not work? Generally for flatfish and stocks in the Gulf of Maine.
- Need to put some work into defining uncertainty in the catch
- Replacement yield models
    - Considers replacement yield constant
    - Need to estimate the other parameters (catchability and growth rate).
    - Need model to fit what is happening in the present, not what happened 20 years ago.
    - Could fit model to different periods of time (e.g. 5, 10, 15 years) in the historical dataset to examine model mis-specification
    - Paper by Glazer (2008) briefly presented and discussed

Potential factors responsible for retrospective patterns

Rapporteur: Susan Wigeley

Working Paper 4.1: Legault C et al. 2008. Report of the Retrospective Working Group

Presentation Highlights

This report summarizes a wide range of work related to retrospective patterns in stock assessment, culminating in conclusions and recommendations. A retrospective pattern is a systematic inconsistency among a series of estimates of population size, or related assessment variables, based on increasing periods of data (Mohn 1999). This pattern of change in estimated values can have severe consequences for management of a stock, potentially resulting in depletion of a stock even though the assessments indicate the targets are being met. Retrospective patterns have been observed in some but not all of the stocks in New England, as well as other stocks around the world. Retrospective patterns are not limited to virtual population analysis, having been observed in a wide range of models including statistical catch-at-age models. Instead retrospective patterns are an indication something is inconsistent in the data or model assumptions. However, retrospective patterns are just one diagnostic for stock assessments and lack of a retrospective pattern does not necessarily imply that all is well.

Simulation analyses have demonstrated a number of sources for retrospective patterns, including, missing catch, an increase in natural mortality rate, or a change in survey catchability. The working group examined a number of potential methods to determine the source of a retrospective pattern using simulated data, but was unable to do so. However, the working group found it does appear possible to identify the timing of an intervention which leads to the retrospective pattern in some cases. Similarly, a number of methods were examined to fix retrospective patterns. While the fixes did in fact remove the retrospective pattern, the new assessment was not always closer to the truth than the original assessment, even though the diagnostics of the new model were good. This means that caution must be exercised when applying any fix to an actual assessment to remove the retrospective pattern.

The working group recommends that stock assessment scientists always check for the presence of a retrospective pattern and that a strong retrospective pattern is grounds to reject the assessment model as an indication of stock status or the basis for management advice. The working group also recommended future research to be conducted on the topic to define objective criteria for acceptance of an assessment with retrospective patterns and to determine what type and level of adjustment in management advice is appropriate through management strategy evaluations.

Discussion on Working Paper 4.1

The simulations were useful in illuminating the complexity and importance of identifying the sources and timing of the retrospective patterns as well as indicating where further research could be directed. This research has a broad application because retrospective patterns can occur regardless of the analytic model and occur not only in Northwest Atlantic stock assessments but also in the Northeast Atlantic, Pacific and Southern Ocean stock assessments.

In addition to the sources of retrospective patterns examined through simulation [changes in catch, changes in natural mortality and changes in survey catchability (q)], it was noted that changes in partial recruitment could also cause retrospective patterns.

Informal meta-analyses which examined commonalities among stocks that exhibit retrospective patterns have been conducted; however, no consistent patterns among stocks have emerged with regard to source or timing. It was suggested that the meta-analysis be expanded to examine survey catchabilities among stocks and across areas.

It was also suggested that swept area values, instead of survey catchabilities, be used when investigating this source of retrospective patterns. The use of swept area values may be helpful in the interpretation of survey catchabilities because the values are cast in more realistic terms by translating the survey catchabilities into proportions that are scale-able and this may allow for easier detection of survey trends that could be at odds with the model. The expectation is that the survey values would be on the order of 1 or 2, not 10.

During the discussion, it was noted that while the timing of the change may be known, it may not be possible to determine which portion of the time series is 'true'. It is insufficient to simply split the series to remove the retrospective pattern because while this could remove or diminish the retrospective pattern, it will not necessarily lead to true estimates. To acquire the true value of the estimates, it is necessary to know both the time of the change and the source of the change.

It was pointed out that the simulations conducted to evaluate if retrospective patterns occur by random chance used both realistic noise values (similar to values observed in Northeast stock assessments) as well as unrealistically large noise values. Regardless of the noise level, there was no evidence that retrospective patterns occur by chance alone. It was noted that additional simulation work could be expanded to include correlated noise (e.g. year effects in surveys).

During the discussion of closed areas as a source of retrospective patterns, it was noted that closed area affects could be from regulatory closed areas or from a concentration of effort in a particular area while survey indices were derived from the entire area. It was emphasized that the source of retrospective patterns created by closed areas was limited to sessile animals because the simulations revealed that the retrospective patterns diminished when movement between the closed and open areas was added into the simulations.

Since retrospective patterns arise from a change within a time series, one possible solution to remove a retrospective pattern would be to shorten the assessment time frame. It was noted that shortening the time series used in the assessment is contrary to the belief that a longer time series is preferable; however, given a retrospective pattern, a shorter time series may provide more accurate estimates of current stock status. Using moving window was also discussed as an alternative to shortening the assessment time series. A moving window may also be beneficial in identifying the timing of the change.

When a retrospective pattern occurs, what action should be taken: use another model, shorten time period, or reject the assessment? No conclusion was reached.

Alternative states of nature are analogous to calculating the confidence intervals around estimates and provide estimate bounds for managers. It was emphasized that to properly determine the alternative states of nature, many analyses would be necessary to evaluate all possible sources when the source and timing of the retrospective pattern was not known.

The panel offered the following suggestions to analysts as they prepare their assessments:

1) check for retro patterns
2) evaluate diagnostics (not only retro patterns) and
3) use other auxiliary information when possible (CPUE, landings, etc.) to identify the source(s) and timing of a change(s) within the time series.

It may be possible to account for differences created by a retrospective pattern; however, it assumes the direction of the difference is known but without the knowledge of the source, there is no mechanism to indicate where the truth lies. Caution should be used.

Management strategy evaluations (MSE) were discussed regarding their ability to appropriately determine adjustment levels when providing management advice. The MSE will be limited because they will be conditioned on a given source and timing of the cause for the retrospective pattern. The MSE would have to be cast in a risk analysis framework in order to evaluate different types of adjustments.

The panel agreed that it is important to communicate the retrospective patterns to managers due to the implications of these patterns on reference points and advice on catch and projections.

Model implications of zeros in fishery independent indices

Rapporteur: Larry Jacobson

Working Paper 3.1: Legault, C. and A. Seaver. 2008. Simulation Studies of Issues Associated with Filling Zeros in VPA Tuning Indices

Presentation Highlights

Surveys occasionally do not encounter fish of a given age in a specific year. Since age-specific survey tuning indices are usually assumed to have a lognormal error, zeros are not allowed. The NEFSC standard procedure is to treat the zeros as missing. However, during the 2006 review of the summer flounder assessment, it was claimed that this procedure introduces a bias into the assessment because no information is being presented to the model when the product of abundance and survey catchability for an age are low. No support was provided for this statement beyond this theoretical argument. An approach was recommended to fill the zeros with 1/6 of the smallest non-zero value in the series. It was claimed that this approach reduced the retrospective pattern in the assessment. This claim was later shown to be false. Many changes were made during the assessment with an end result of higher catch advice. This created a perception that filling the zeros causes higher catch advice and so it was requested that this approach be applied to the Northeast groundfish stocks as well. This working paper presents three studies demonstrating why zeros should not be filled.

The first study simply created a time series of abundance and then created deterministic indices with different detection levels for truncating low values to zero. It was shown that filling a sequence of zeros with any constant value introduces a bias by creating a flat index for these years when in fact the actual population is changing. The second study used a population simulator to create datasets for analysis by virtual population analysis under 4 scenarios: 1) all data is used, 2) tuning indices below a set

value were truncated to zero and treated as missing, 3) same as case 2 except the zeros filled with a constant value of 0.01, and 4) same as case 2 except the zeros filled according to the 1/6 approach. Cases 1 and 2 had similar levels of bias while case 4 was highly biased relative to the known underlying population N and F. Case 3 had more bias than cases 1 or 2, but not as much as case 3. These simulations demonstrated no support for the claim that treating zeros as missing introduces bias and also showed that filling zeros with a constant can induce large biases. The third study (presented in the appendix) was a simple regression example to demonstrate why filling zeros with a constant can lead to bias. Random data were created and error added to "observed" values which were truncated to zero below some cut-off. When the zeros were treated as missing a regression of the log of observed and true values had a slope near one with the 90% CI of observations covering zero. When the 1/6 rule was applied, the slope of the regression was strongly bias with the 90% CI not covering zero even though it was nearly twice as large as case 1.

These studies concluded that making up data is bad. In the short term, treating zeros as missing is recommended. In the long term, a different error distribution should be found for use instead of the lognormal which allows for zero values. However, this distribution must allow for the truncation effect instead of just treating all zeros as the same value, as a square root transform would, for example.

Working Paper 3.2: Terceiro, M. 2008. The Treatment of "Zero" Observations in the Summer Flounder ADAPT VPA Calibration

Presentation Highlights

There is no consistent pattern in the identification of the additive constant that minimizes the absolute value of Berry's (1987) *g* statistic. There is no strong relationship between the absolute magnitude of the index values, the length of the time series, the number of zeros, the magnitude of the smallest observed value, or any of the usual statistical moments of the series (mean, maximum, non-zero minimum, CV, skewness, kurtosis), and the value of the additive constant that minimizes *g*. Further, while the "one-sixth" of the minimum observed value was identified as the "best" additive constant in 5 of the 24 (21%) cases examined, this level is not high enough to justify this approach as a reliable rule-of-thumb. In fact, the additive constant of 0.01 was identified as "best" for a higher percentage of series (6 of 24 = 25%). Given the inability to identify a constant that consistently minimizes *g*, the best rule is to maintain the current approach of making no adjustment and continue to treat "zero" observations as "missing."

Working Paper 3.3: ICES Resource Management Committee. 2007. Report of the Working Group on Methods of Fish Stock Assessments (WGMG).

Presentation Highlights

The ICES Working Group on Methods of Fish Stock Assessments (WGMG) met in Woods Hole 13-22 March 2007. During the meeting, a working paper was presented on the topic of zeros in tuning indices. The WGMG discussed the working paper, but did

not spend any additional time on the topic. It was noted that the ICES standard approach is to treat zeros as missing values when they occur in tuning indices. The WGMG concluded that a different error structure than the typical lognormal error should be developed which allows the use of zeros. However, simulation testing is required to ensure that such an approach is robust to outliers. The delta approaches were suggested but rejected, while a quasi-likelihood function with quadratic term deserves consideration. The WGMG concluded that one should not change data to fit the model, but rather change the model to fit the data.

Discussion on Working Papers 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3

Comments generally supported the conclusions given in the working papers. It was noted that zeroes in fisheries are more likely a problem of truncation than a problem of true zeroes because the density of fish is always non-zero. Sub-sampling and sample size are important factors in the occurrence of zeroes because, for example, in addition to sampling relatively rare large fish in length composition data, it is necessary to sub-sample relatively rare old ones in the age-length key to observe an old fish in catch-at-age data. A zero survey observation generally means that no fish were taken in a number of tows across a number of strata. The frequency with which zeroes occur may be critical because effects of omitting zeros rarely and at "random" intervals has different consequences than omitting long strings of zero values that occur when very young or old organisms become rare for long periods of time.

One reviewer undertook a quick literature search and produced 28 pages of references for zero inflated statistical models that could be evaluated and potentially applied. It was noted that Berry's (1987) approach was designed for analysis of experimental data, rather than data used in stock assessments. Different approaches (other than logs) to transforming data may be optimal in stock assessment when zeroes are present. The possibility of using the square root transformation (which is applicable to zeroes and tends to standardize variance in lognormal data) was discussed but there was some concern about effects on the scale of the mean and variance. Over-dispersed Poisson or negative binomial distributions might be useful. It might be useful to vary the composition of the "plus" group for the youngest and oldest ages to eliminate zeroes at these ages. These suggestions have promise but there was insufficient time to evaluate their merits prior to the GARM.

There was a suggestion to explore robust likelihood approaches to avoid excessive influence on model fitting of data affected by some of the issues noted above.

Utility of statistical catch-at-age models

<u>Working Paper 2.1. Jacobson L, C. Legault, L. O'Brien and K. Sosebee. 2008. Utility of statistical catch-at-age models for assessing Northeast groundfish stocks: Overview (a workshop report for sections 2.1a, 2.1b, 2.1c)</u>

Rapporteur: Tim Miller

Presentation Highlights

A training workshop using the SS2 (Stock Synthesis, version 2) statistical catch-at-age stock assessment model for northeast groundfish was held at the Northeast Fisheries Science Center (NEFSC) in Woods Hole, MA during 4-7 February 2005. The workshop was successful in developing potentially useful but preliminary SS2 models for three example stocks. In particular, a model for white hake was developed that spanned a period with missing fishery and survey age data. Previous attempts to assess white hake using a variety of models were problematic. Estimates from an SS2 model for Georges Bank (GB) cod appear relatively precise, presumably because of high quality of the available data. Preliminary SS2 models for GB yellowtail flounder suffered from many of the same problems as VPA models in the last assessment and a number of different model configurations were explored in SS2 that help address these problems.

Experience at the workshop with all three stocks indicates that statistical catch-at-age models are applicable and promising for northeast stocks. SS2 and VPA estimates were generally similar, particularly when configured in similar ways. As exemplified by Georges Bank cod, the data available for northeast stocks are adequate for application of statistical catch-at-age models. In fact, data available for all three example stocks were more comprehensive that the data available for many stocks where statistical catch-at-age models are used routinely. Results for white hake show that statistical catch-at-age models may be useful for stocks with missing age data or stocks currently without an analytical assessment approach. The inherent flexibility of statistical catch-at-age models may be advantageous in dealing with difficult assessment problems and complex data, although results for GB yellowtail flounder indicate that there are no "silver bullets" and that some chronic issues are likely to persist.

Participants at the workshop agreed that SS2 was substantially more difficult to apply than the traditional ADAPT VPA and that training and technical support are absolutely necessary at the outset for new users. Events elsewhere show that even experienced users require technical support and access to the software development team on an ongoing basis.

Although it has been used around the world for a large number of stocks, SS2 was developed originally for relatively slow growing, long-lived and unproductive rockfish stocks on the west coast of North America with limited data and relatively low fishing mortality rates. A number of changes were made to the program to accommodate different circumstances in the northeast. Additional work along these lines will probably be required if SS2 is used for northeast groundfish.

Discussion on Working Paper 2.1

A point was raised that, as with SCAA models, recruitment could be estimated freely with VPA models which supported the presenter's assertion that VPA and SCAA can both be parameterized to model the same processes. Moving to the Baranov catch equation from the Pope approximation was discouraged unless absolutely necessary because of computation burdens especially for Bayesian inferences. Shortening the time step is an alternative to maintaining the Pope approximation but this could increase the number of selectivity parameters. There was some disagreement about whether maximum likelihood estimation of the variance of deviations around the stock

recruitment relationship was possible. However, the estimation of this parameter was thought likely to be biased.

One reviewer pointed out that knowledge of the relative weighting of the age composition of the landings and surveys would be helpful in determining the respective influences on the overall objective function in a SCAA model. It was also asserted that the variance of age composition residuals should roughly match the assumed variances. However, the method of dealing with effective sample size of age composition varies among researchers and currently, there is no consensus. Along with variance assumptions for the age composition, distributional assumptions should affect the estimation of parameters in SCAA. Finally, one reviewer suggested using Bayesian approach to help in treating uncertainty in different data components.

Working Paper 2.1. Jacobson L, C. Legault, L. O'Brien and K. Sosebee. 2008. Utility of statistical catch-at-age models for assessing Northeast groundfish stocks: Section a on Georges Bank Yellowtail

Rapporteur: Tim Miller

Discussion on Working Paper 2.1: Section a on Georges Bank Yellowtail

There was only limited discussion on section a as much of the time available had been devoted to the overview.

Working Paper 2.1. Jacobson L, C. Legault, L. O'Brien and K. Sosebee. 2008. Utility of statistical catch-at-age models for assessing Northeast groundfish stocks: Section b on White Hake

Rapporteur: Ralph Mayo

Discussion on Working Paper 2.1: Section b on White Hake

Trends in residuals from surveys suggest a change in catchability (q) around 1985. This is likely the result of the doors changes; however there are no conversion factors available from the gear comparison studies.

The fishery selectivity declines sharply after 114 cm. This is likely due to large fish inhabiting deeper water unavailable to some gear types. The drop in survey selectivity may also be due to larger fish inhabiting deeper water out of range of the survey. It is also possible that the fishery may be operating in areas outside of the area covered by the survey.

When asymptotic selectivity was imposed on the fishery, model fit was poor. Therefore, flat top selectivity is not an option so additional work is required on the shape of the dome.

The assessment model generates numbers at age which are then converted to number at length to derive selectivity at length. In years with length compositions but no age compositions, it is possible to use a growth model internally to convert age compositions to length compositions. This conversion can also be done externally using

existing methods (e.g Kimura) using, for example, age data from adjacent years. Additional age data may be obtained from observed trips, although these otoliths have not aged.

Based on the plot of length vs. age, the variance of length at age seems large, especially for younger ages. The range of length at age represents the range from both spring and autumn surveys, leading to a wider range than if they were plotted by seasonal age.

Working Paper 2.1. Jacobson L, C. Legault, L. O'Brien and K. Sosebee. 2008. Utility of statistical catch-at-age models for assessing Northeast groundfish stocks: Section c on Georges Bank Cod

Rapporteur: Jessica Blaylock

Discussion on Working Paper 2.1: Section c on Georges Bank Cod

It was remarked that the VPA before this was working adequately, except that the retrospective pattern was a little high or moderate compared to other stocks.

There was discussion on the mimic-VPA model that showed a 180 degree 'flipped' pattern in all three stocks (GB Yellowtail, White Hake, and GB Cod) from the pattern exhibited by the SCAA model. This raised the question of whether this is more than a coincidence (i.e. is the way the models are handling this saying something about the retrospective problem?). On this subject, it was pointed out that if the SS2 model had been parameterized to have the same biomass as the VPA, then the retrospective pattern would probably not have flipped between the two models.

On a procedural note, the Chairman reminded the panel that, for all 19 stocks, if the use of a new model is advised, it will be important to be clear about why the 'old model' is not as good as the 'new model'. Why did we change the model? What issues will be addressed better?

Concern was expressed about fitting the likelihood (fixed catch) and its influence on parameter estimation. Fixing the weighting so high (lambda = 100) has a large influence on other parameters in the model. This was done here for both runs because of the assumption the catch was known.

The panel was reminded that these were exploratory runs, but that future sensitivity runs could be done. Suggestions included allowing for a dome-shaped selectivity pattern instead of forcing a flat-topped pattern, and setting selectivity and letting catch vary.

A suggestion was made to let selectivity follow a random walk across years, in the context of parameterizing the SS2 differently to mimic the VPA better. However, caution would be necessary since a change in selectivity implies a change in q.

There was consensus that caution would be necessary if going to a full length-based versus age-based model.

Supplementary Working Paper 2.1: Jacobson L. 2008. Georges Bank Yellowtail; Questions about the adjusted lognormal error distribution used in calculating goodness of fit for survey and commercial age composition data in preliminary ASPM models

Presentation Highlights

The likelihood of age composition data and details of calculation are important in SCCA modeling. For example, in preliminary SS2 models for Georges Bank yellowtail flounder, results for recent years depend on whether the model solution favors (tends to fit) survey and commercial age composition data at the expense of survey trend data, or vice-versa. All approaches are approximate because the statistical distribution of age composition data is hard to specify and model misspecifications complicate the matter further. Still, it is important to understand and weight the advantages of the approach taken, particularly if it is new.

According to equation A21.9 in the working paper 2.2-a by Butterworth and Rademeyer, the negative log likelihood of survey and commercial age composition data in the preliminary ASPM for Gulf of Maine cod is:

$$-\ln\left(L^{CAA}\right)=\sum_{y}\sum_{a}\left\{\ln\left(\sigma_{com}\Big/\sqrt{p_{y,a}}\right)+p_{y,a}\left[\ln\left(p_{y,a}\right)-\ln\left(\hat{p}_{y,a}\right)\right]^{2}\Big/2\sigma_{comm}^{2}\right\} \quad \text{A2.19}$$

Where $p_{y,a}$ and $\hat{p}_{y,a}$ are observed and predicted proportions of the total catch age *a* during year *y*, and the standard deviation σ_{comm} associated with the catch-at-age, which is estimated in the fitting procedure using:

$$\hat{\sigma}_{comm}=\sqrt{\sum_{y}\sum_{a}\left\{p_{y,a}\left[\ln\left(p_{y,a}\right)-\ln\left(\hat{p}_{y,a}\right)\right]^{2}\right\}\Big/\sum_{y}\sum_{a}1} \quad \text{A2.21}$$

Thus, the log likelihood term is calculated assuming that measurement errors in catch-at-age arise from a weighed log-normal distribution. Lognormal distributions are often used for catch-at-age data and not cause for concern. However, the weighting factor (i.e. the observed proportion $p_{y,a}$) for each age is unusual and has uncertain statistical properties that should be evaluated and explained. The text following equation A2.2.1 explains "*Punt (pers. comm.) advised weighting by the observed proportions (as in equation A2.19) so that undue importance is not attached to data based upon a few samples only.*"

The following are three concerns that occur to this reviewer immediately. First, the magnitude of the proportion $p_{y,a}$ has no necessary relationship to the number of samples. A very low observed proportion would naturally occur for a rare event in any number (small or large) of samples. Secondly, this approach gives zero weight to data in age composition bins with zero observations, even though the data likely contain valid and reliable information concerning the rarity of fish of that particular age. Finally, use of the observed, rather than the predicted, proportion implies that the observed proportions are more precise as estimates of the population proportion than the predicted ones. If the observed proportions are more precise, then why bother calculating the predicted values? In any case, the observed values probably include measurement and process errors that contribute variance that is not desirable in weights.

Discussion on Supplementary Working Paper 2.1

Discussion on this working paper was postponed until after the next working paper.

Working Paper 2.2a: Butterworth, D.S. and R.A. Rademeyer. 2008. Statistical Catch-at-age Analysis *vs* ADAPT-VPA: The Case of Gulf of Maine Cod

Rapporteur: Bill Overholtz

Presentation Highlights

The WP commences with an historical overview. In 2003, given an estimate of the spawning stock biomass (B^{sp}) in 2001 of only 27% of the corresponding level at MSY (B^{sp}_{MSY}) on the basis of an ADAPT-VPA assessment that used data from 1982 onwards only, the Gulf of Maine cod stock was classified as "overfished" in the context of the Magnusson-Stevens Act, and a recovery plan put in place. However, an alternative Statistical Catch-at-age (SCAA; alternatively termed Age Structured Production Model – ASPM) assessment at the time, which took account of survey data back to 1964, suggested that the stock was above B^{sp}_{MSY}. An independent panel appointed as part of the process to review this and other US Northeast groundfish assessments during that year recommended further investigation of this to better understand the difference. The WP addresses and discusses this issue together with a range of other (sometimes conflicting) suggestions made during a number of reviews of the assessment of this stock over the past decade. It finds that the primary reason for the different results is that the ADAPT-VPA assessment imposed asymptotically flat selectivity-at-age in circumstances where there is strong statistical evidence for dome-shaped selectivity in the data. Making allowance for this under either assessment method reverses perceptions that recent fishing mortalities have exceeded F_{MSY}, and robustly estimates B^{sp} relatively close to B^{sp}_{MSY} rather than below the threshold of $0.5\,B^{sp}_{MSY}$ for an "overfished" ("depleted") classification. Compared to the ADAPT-VPA approach which is limited to the period for which catch-at-age data are available, the SCAA/ASPM approach allows the longer series of research survey data available to be taken into account, thus providing a better basis to estimate management quantities linked to MSY-related targets, and doubling the related precision in some cases. Given that such targets play important roles in the implementation of the Magnusson-Stevens Act, the SCAA/ASPM approach would seem to be preferred over ADAPT-VPA for assessing this stock. The calculations conducted also point more generally to the need for care in treatment of the plus-group in analyses, as well as in use of the Beverton-Holt spawning biomass recruitment relationship which can lead to inappropriately low estimates of B^{sp}_{MSY} in certain circumstances, and to the importance of using flexible parameterizations of selectivity-at-age in SCAA/ASPM assessments to avoid possibly misleading impressions of the precision with which quantities such as natural mortality *M* can be estimated.

Discussion on Working Paper 2.2a

Statistical Distributions

- Does it matter which distributions one uses? Needs to be checked in the model.

Ricker vs Beverton and Holt (BH) Stock - recruitment model

- Fitting problem at low stock size.
    - No observations at high stock size. Is there a decline at high stock size. Problem arises if data suggest a negative correlation; BH cannot give a negative correlation; BH will give you a steepness of 1 in these circumstances.
    - Presented formulation provides information on pristine stock size so it helps with the issue of no data at high stock size.

    - Put in a prior on steepness, sometimes the data gives too strong a signal.
- Has S/R data from the VPA been considered for guidance? Not yet
- Does the the ASPM have an S/R?
    - It must have since ASPM has production component built in: implies a S/R relationship
    - VPAs, however, are restricted to years with recruitment data.
- Parameterize the S/R directly?
    - Bayesian prior, every year there is a deviation from the mean of an S/R.
    - Intermediate world-search routine approximates randomization (random effects) (Maunder and Deriso, 2003)
    - Error in variables may be accounted for, better to estimate the S/R internally.
    - Pg 52 sigma r constraint: autocorrelation should it be subsumed? Not in presented formulation; don't put zero correlation in; Residuals from S/R are usually not randomly distributed
- Is Rho fixed?
    - Yes run with a fixed Rho first.
    - Is there autocorrelation in the S/R data? Errors for several sources. Model cannot resolve, outliers rule the day.
    - Are S/R residuals usually autocorrelated (AC)? There is AC in the other data as well, if ignored you are overweighting. At end this cannot be estimated, confidence intervals are usually estimated as too narrow.

<u>GOM Cod example</u>

- How about just running with the catches starting in 1893?
    - Couldn't get it to run, suggested have to start 100-200 yrs earlier.
    - Looked at sensitivities for starting year, things don't change much for management, but k's change dramatically depending on starting point.
- Subcomponents have been fished out
    - if true, then no recovery, has implications for calculating BRPs.
    - What is tradeoff for including long-past history? Problem is in uncertainty. Long vs short-term uncertainty. Never know the past, but can use it, and sometimes need to use it. Starting in 1893, back to pristine in 1960, catches decreased and stock rebuilt. Assuming a BH, a Ricker more often fits better. Highest biomass has poor recruitment. A concern if you have relatively few data points. Need a phase plane plot to show chronology of data? All the high stock sizes are in the 60s when the stock was being fished down quickly.
- Run 18-30% of initial biomass in 1893 and look at sensitivity runs
    - Results wash out in first 20 years
    - Most recent years are very similar in most of the sensitivity runs
    - S/R plot only shows 1963 onward, the early points may not be representative. This series is a one-way trip.
- Reference points: Parametric or non-parametric S/R? Parametric forms are not mandatory, perhaps this is a case for nonparametric.
    - Uncertainty suggests a BH model would be better.
- Landings: Modern statistics began in the 1930s.

    - 5Y data set starts in the 1940s
    - Data collection systems are different now
    - Perhaps should examine the landings series better and consider the impact of starting in 1893
- Likelihood: PR commercial, most from ages 5,6,7.
    - Using a plus group, but cannot push the fit any more
    - Can all the ages (beyond 7+) be examined for the stock assessment? Yes, this should be looked at. Data suggests a dome for commercial PR.
- Is Pope equation working here?
    - Doesn't work at high Fs. Working paper used Pope because NEFSC was using it at the time
    - Only becomes a problem in 1990, and doesn't seem to present a problem here in this ASPM assessment.
- Is selectivity changing in 2003-2006, it appears so from the bubble plots? Why is survey selectivity lower for younger ages than the commercial when survey uses a liner?
    - The model is based on what the data suggests.
- Why is survey selectivity higher on older fish?
    - Caution needed on two counts: curves are normalized, and the data rules here
- GOM interventions: 1976, 1994, rolling closures, gears.
    - Many different characteristics in the data
    - The ASPM approach lets the data rule the day.
- High reference points for ASPM?
    - Fully selected Fs in ASPM model, not averages like VPA. Compare apples and apples
- Long versus short time series of data
    - Long series good for BRPs, but, may be good idea to use shorter series for status determination.
    - Full time series don't include discards, haddock is a good example, many millions of young fish were discarded pre-1960s. Sensitivities to this should be explored.
- Why do outputs shift back and forth between MLE and MCMC.
    - Acknowledged that results are presented in a mixed mode, Bayesian and frequentist.
- Sensitivity analysis: Management parameters are highly skewed, are priors overly influential?
    - Management parameters are just outputs.
    - The only priors that are informative in the ASPM are on S/R parameters. S, k, h are all uninformative (uniform)
    - Skewness could be real.
- Results: data pre 1982, likelihoods are different for different approaches. Yes, because different data was used. Can't compare two models with different data in AIC sense.
- Clarification: Model used bounds for priors in ADMB.

- MSY calculations: Are S/R functions in R/S units? Intersection point on SR curve, comes from a per recruit perspective. Slope of the replacement line.
- How much does the choice of a S/R model affect the results?
- Scaling: if you assume a Ricker with poor recruitment in early years, then scale is higher. If all due to catch, then scale is lower. Need to look at sensitivities.

Working Paper 2.3: Shepherd G. 2008. Comparison of ADAPT VPA and ASAP models for Gulf of Maine cod

Rapporteur: Bill Overholtz

Presentation Highlights

Gulf of Maine cod stocks were most recently assessed for GARM II using an ADAPT VPA (Mayo and Col 2006). The same input data was used in a forward projecting catch-at-age model (ASAP) (Legault and Restrepo 1998) for comparison purposes. The ASAP model was setup to evaluate five selectivity scenarios: model 1 selectivity was the average (geometric mean) from the last three years in the VPA; model 2 was a fixed equilibrium selectivity pattern used in the yield per recruit calculations; model 3 was a flat-top pattern fitted to ages 1-5 and held constant (1.0) for ages 6-7; model 4 was a fitted using a single logistic curve; and model 5 was a dome shaped selectivity pattern fitted using a double logistic model.

The ASAP model produced fishing mortality and abundance results very similar to the VPA. Among the configurations examined, the selection curve fitted with a single logistic model had the best diagnostics. However, strong retrospective patterns in the ASAP models suggests further examination is needed to determine if alternative configurations would provide a better model fit.

Discussion on Working Paper 2.3

- Compare retrospective pattern for various model formulations of ASAP.
    - Why are the patterns different? Abundance depends on younger ages, SSB driven by older ages.
- ASAP or other models and blocks of time
    - Estimates in time blocks can do strange things; Changing the position of a time block can change results
    - ASAP has no dependence between time steps.
- Likelihood: double logistic had highest likelihood
    - Model 5 had the highest tll
    - Does single selectivity pattern apply? Yes
- How many blocks in the ASAP? One block for all models. Fits to catch-at-age must be poor. Yes, but improved for later part of the time series.
- SSB? ASAP had peak in 1989, VPA acts as a smoother. Can't answer at this point. Rivard wts were used for SSB, Start up approach may account for the differences.
- Where was ASAP plused. At age 7+.
- Means wts at 7+ ? They are weighted averages.

Working Paper 2.5: Butterworth, D.S. and R.A. Rademeyer. 2008. Application of an Age-Structured Production Model to the Georges Bank Yellowtail Flounder

Rapporteur: Tim Miller

Presentation Highlights

The WP provides the results for a Reference Case application of ASPM to the Georges Bank yellowtail flounder, together with those for three sensitivies. Strong residual patterns in the fits to survey indices of abundance, particularly to that for the Canadian DFO Spring survey, raise concerns about the compatibility of the population model and these indices. The model fits strongly favour domed over asymptotically flat selectivity. Selectivity assumptions are key to estimates of stock status, with fits to a fully flexible selectivity parameterization indicating the resource to be effectively at its MSY level B_{MSY}^{sp}, whereas the imposition of asymptotically flat selectivity sees the stock estimated to be below the "overfishing" threshold of 0.5 B_{MSY}^{sp}.

Discussion on Working Paper 2.5

There were only points of clarification made with discussion held off until after the follow-up dome-selectivity analysis of tagging data presented by Tim Miller.

Supplementary Working Paper TOR 2: Miller, T, D. Hart, S. Cadrin, L. Jacobson, C. Legault, and P. Rago. 2008. Analyses of tagging data for evidence of decreased fishing mortality for large yellowtail flounder

Rapporteur: Liz Brooks

Presentation Highlights

We performed two analyses of yellowtail tagging data from an ongoing cooperative NMFS tagging study. The first compares expected probability of recovery by age class for tagged fish based on estimates of age-specific fishing mortality by Working Paper with the observed proportions of recoveries (by sex) for different length classes (and approximate corresponding ages) in the yellowtail tagging data. In the second analysis, we fit a series of finite-state continuous-time models to the yellowtail flounder tagging data to estimate different fishing mortality parameters by length class at release while also estimating migration and natural mortality rates along with reporting probability and a scalar to adjust fishing mortality in the first month after release. None of our analyses showed evidence of decreased selectivity for large yellowtail flounder.

Discussion on Supplementary Working Paper TOR 2

- Presentation stated dimorphic mortality
    - It was queried whether there was evidence or published results to this fact. Presenter replied that the survey has skewed sex ratio at older ages, and also pointed to tagging results (Cadrin et al) that suggest lower recovery rate of

males—which could be explained by higher natural mortality on males (among other possible explanations).

- Presentation offered clarification regarding the net flux in movement (instantaneous rates) versus the realized difference in abundance between the three regions (given vastly different stock sizes in each area).
- Reviewer asked for the size bins for the 3 size classes—those values were not immediately available.
    - Motivation for specifying the break points was to examine the veracity of the dome proposed in working paper 2.5 rather than to attempt to estimate the true selectivity at size.
- Reviewer asked for clarification on the negative correlation between M and reporting rate; reviewer asked for the difference in high reward value
    - It was clarified that there was a $100 instant winner for high reward, but a regular tag got put into a once-a-year $1000 lottery.
    - A question asking for the difference in reporting rate, assuming high reward equaled 100% reporting and 60% reporting of regular tags
    - It was also stated that the overall recovery rate is 13% (presumably for all tags, both high and regular reward).
- A question was asked regarding detection probability for the tags; it was responded that the fish go through a filleting machine, and that they have gotten returns from the processors, so he doubts that the tags could be missed.
- It was asked whether they were to use this information to recommend information in assessments (regarding scale of F in assessments) or just to inform on PR.
    - Were the data meeting conclusions suggesting that these rates of Fishing Mortality were most precise and should be used to check assessment results?
    - What are we supposed to do with the different F at the end from assessment vs. the tagging data?
    - Clarification was made that the tagging data were to inform the assessment, and in particular in this case, it was informing as to partial recruitment rather than providing estimates of F.
- Regarding estimated movement (pattern and magnitude), it was noted that the high rate of perceived movement could be a result of where the fish were tagged (i.e. right on the border between SNE and GB).
- Question regarding mixing of one month only after release
    - hypothesis of fully mixed after one month had not yet been tested, but it could be tested by modeling two periods, allowing the first period to vary in length, and then determining when the mixing coefficient in the second period became non-significantly different from 1.0.
- A question was asked about recoveries in closed areas? A conclusion (second bullet) was that no evidence for emigration of yellowtail to un-fished areas.
    - This bullet referred to the dome selectivity resulting from a closed area.
- Another question was asked about tag reporting in the case of discards? This would decrease the reporting rate.
    - It noted that they did receive tags from the scallop fleet, and that those recoveries were not only from observed trips.

- Presenter also noted that only very small amounts of yellowtail flounder were retained in scallop fishery.

Supplementary Reply TOR 2: Butterworth, D.S. and R.A. Rademeyer. 2008. On Drawing Inferences Concerning Trends in Selectivity with Age from Tag-Recapture Information

Rapporteur: Liz Brooks

Presentation Highlights

The WP shows that the implications of dome shaped selectivity for tag recovery proportions as a function of age depend on whether the drop in selectivity at large age arises from a gear selection effect or is surrogating emigration. A simple extraction of summary statistics from tag-recapture data, including a measure of mean tag return time, is suggested to throw further light on the mechanisms actually in play for various stocks.

Discussion on Supplementary Reply TOR 2

- Presentation suggested that fish behavior, specifically swimming strength of older fish, could create a dome shape.
    - It was pointed out that if one extended the "strong swimming" argument further, one would expect eventually that selectivity of slow swimmers would continuously decrease availability of slow swimmers until you only have fast swimmers surviving.
- Presentation also suggested that emigration from the fishing grounds would make fish unavailable and could also generate a dome shaped selectivity.
    - Reviewer asked about the fact that estimated migration rates were low (as a means of arguing against emigration masking selectivity). Presenter suggested that there could be some confounding between reporting rate and an emigration rate. There was debate regarding mean time to recovery and confounding between emigration and reporting rate.
    - It was explained that this has been investigated (mean time to recovery) and that a difference in mean time to recovery by age could not be found.
- It was noted that the Miller et al. model incorporates the time specific info by modeling recaptures individually.
    - While the presenter's mathematics provides an informative check, the Miller model can incorporate these same sorts of features.
- It was interjected that these hypotheses don't sound biologically plausible for yellowtail.
    - Presenter agreed that *a priori* these hypotheses sound far more plausible for cod.
    - One still need a hypothesis to explain the disappearance from both survey and fishery at 4-5 year olds.
    - It was suggested that a more credible explanation is a higher M on males from age 3 on.

Working Paper 2.4: Brooks, L., C. Legault, P. Nitschke, L. O'Brien, K. Sosebee. P. Rago and A. Seaver A. 2008. Evaluation of NMFS Toolbox Assessment Models on Simulated Groundfish Data Sets.

Rapporteur: Tim Miller

Presentation Highlights

A simulation study was performed to evaluate the performance of five NOAA Fisheries Toolbox assessment models (AIM, ASPIC, SCALE, VPA, and ASAP). Data sets corresponding to three representative groundfish stocks (Georges Bank yellowtail flounder, Georges Bank cod, and white hake) were simulated with PopSim, a simulation program in the Toolbox. For each simulated stock, a base case data set was produced as well as three data sets with a known error. There were 12 data sets in total (three stocks with four data sets each) and for each data set, 100 random realizations were generated with PopSim. Each model performed an "assessment" on the simulated datasets, and the results were compared with the "true" value (i.e., the known parameter values used to generate the data sets). Results for each model in each of the 12 cases were summarized with respect to bias and precision (CV). The base case served as a benchmark to determine how well each model could replicate the truth, and as a point of comparison for model performance on the data sets with known error. In general, no model was a clear winner in all cases. Data sets that reflected errors associated with sampling (aging error or number of length samples) were best handled by models that either did not use age (AIM) or models that incorporate error into catches (ASAP). The VPA, because it matches catch exactly, suffered the most bias and had the poorest precision in these cases. However, when the source of error introduced a "break" in the time series (as in all of the yellowtail flounder cases), none of the model configurations was robust to the effect. The "east coast" approach of tuning to age-specific survey indices appears to be robust to the shape of the selectivity function. In the case of misspecification of the fleet selectivity (assuming logistic when it is dome), both forward and backward projecting models were impacted, but the effect was only apparent at the oldest ages (as would be expected). ASPIC failed in all simulated data sets, but this was due to the nature of the simulated data (all of which were one-way trips), and not to deficiencies in the model.

Discussion on Working Paper 2.4: Overview

There were only a few clarifications on the generalities of the presentation before getting into the specific sections.

Working Paper 2.4: Brooks, L., C. Legault, P. Nitschke, L. O'Brien, K. Sosebee. P. Rago and A. Seaver A. 2008. Evaluation of NMFS Toolbox Assessment Models on Simulated Groundfish Data Sets. Section a on Georges Bank Yellowtail

Rapporteur: Tim Miller

Discussion on Working Paper 2.4: Section a on Georges Bank Yellowtail

In general, ASAP and VPA performed similarly with regard to bias and precision, but ASAP is somewhat more flexible. For Georges Bank Yellowtail, it was pointed out that other work that simulated data over longer time series showed bad fits of ASPIC as well.

One participant wondered whether the differences in the behaviors of the models was related to the weightings of different data components was the cause. It was pointed out that a simpler model like AIM would put zero weight on some data components. One panelist wondered whether changes in the signal could be picked up with the age-structured models, but the presenter pointed out that, while this is true, which data component was the cause would still be unknown. However, one reviewer pointed out that detecting these changes is more difficult with the simpler model AIM, but perhaps this could be modified to do so. It was also pointed out that the behavior of SCALE not being any better than other models was somewhat surprising since selectivity is set up as a function of length in POPSIM.

Working Paper 2.4: Brooks, L., C. Legault, P. Nitschke, L. O'Brien, K. Sosebee. P. Rago and A. Seaver A. 2008. Evaluation of NMFS Toolbox Assessment Models on Simulated Groundfish Data Sets. Section b on White Hake

Rapporteur: Ralph Mayo

Discussion on Working Paper 2.4: Section b on White Hake

NEFSC checking with Ralph re notes

Working Paper 2.4: Brooks, L., C. Legault, P. Nitschke, L. O'Brien, K. Sosebee. P. Rago and A. Seaver A. 2008. Evaluation of NMFS Toolbox Assessment Models on Simulated Groundfish Data Sets. Section c on Georges Bank Cod

Rapporteur: Jessica Blaylock

Discussion on Working Paper 2.4: Section c on Georges Bank Cod

Some clarification was provided as to the plus group in this analysis (10), in relation to the dome selectivity pattern.

There was discussion concerning why ASAP did not do better with the fleet domed PR. This was because a single logistic growth was estimated, so the flat-topped pattern was forced. This was accepted to be an important question, and that one should also look at the confidence intervals in this context.

Recommendations on Model Selection for each stock

Working Paper 5.1: Rago P, et al. 2008. Recommended Modeling Approaches by Stock Initial Proposals for Consideration by the GARM III Review Panel.

Rapporteurs: Mike Palmer and Kathy Sosebee

Presentation Highlights

This Working Paper provides a review of initial recommendations of anaylsts for preferred assessment models. The appropriate assessment model for each stock is influenced by attributes of the species and their fisheries, and the ability of the model to capture the salient features of the stock dynamics. A primary consideration is the availability of age data. Before 1995 the selection of models for Northeast groundfish was less complicated because fishing mortality greatly exceeded natural mortality and incoming cohorts were quickly fished out. Various management measures reduced fishing mortality and altered the spatial pattern of fisheries. In particular, large closed areas on Georges Bank differentially affected more sedentary species which would benefit from the reductions in F afforded those fish which remained in closed areas. Increases in abundance for some stocks such as Georges Bank yellowtail flounder and haddock were dramatic. As population age structure broadened, the importance of model features such as plus groups became more important as the number of ages in the plus group increased. Model assumptions that were tenable under high F became less so with reduced F. This has motivated the exploration of a class of forward projecting models that allow greater flexibility for characterizing recent trends and extension of assessments back to periods when landings were much greater.

Individual stock dynamics were summarized with six-panel plots that illustrate the relationships among survey abundance, catches, relative F and replacement ratios. High correlations between the replacement ratio and relative F suggest that the population's rate of growth is responsive to the rate of removal. In turn this suggests that parametric models may be applicable. Disparities that arise at the end of a time series are also important and may be indicative of process changes that lead to retrospective patterns.

These recommendations herein will be reconsidered during the meeting as the results of alternative models and simulation tests are reviewed by the Review Panel.

Two appendices were included. The first examined statistical properties (mean, CV, Gini indices, and estimated design effect) of the NEFSC fishery-independent bottom trawl surveys. The second provided an overview of the AIM (An Index Method) model and an example application.

<u>Working Paper 6.1: Rago P, et al. 2008. Sufficiency of Assessment Models to Estimate Measures of Stock Status Relevant to Biological Reference Points</u>

Presentation Highlights

The definition of Biological Reference Points (BRP) for fish stock is an essential component of stock assessment. Measures of abundance and harvest rates derived from assessment models are compared to standards that constitute desirable states for each stock. These states are designed to achieve maximum sustainable yield and may include some consideration of uncertainty in estimation. For stocks that are subject to mandatory rebuilding programs, the assessment model must produce outputs that can be

forecast under various harvest scenarios. This working paper summarizes the basic approaches for estimation of BRPs associated with the candidate models and highlights special considerations associated with reference point estimation.

Biological reference points can be derived as part of the model identification and estimation process. These can be called internal estimates of BRPs as they rely on specification of stock recruitment relationship within the assessment model. The derived parameters can either be used to directly define reference points or, where analytical solutions are more complicated, to parameterize simulation or forecasting models to derive BRPs and measures of uncertainty. Internal estimates are advantageous since they incorporate the full uncertainty of the model estimation. This can also be a disadvantage when the model does not fit particularly well. In these cases, the BRPs can be unstable, varying with minor changes in model configuration.

"External" estimators of BRPs use model outputs of abundance, SSB, recruits and fishing mortality as inputs to stand-alone models. In the Northeast these include stock recruitment models (SRFIT), yield per recruit models (YPR), and stochastic population projection models (AGEPRO). The SRFIT program uses AIC methods to identify appropriate models from either Beverton-Holt or Ricker stock-recruitment models with and without correlated error terms. When an acceptable model can be defined, standard approaches can be used to estimate Fmsy and Bmsy values.

If none of the parametric models are acceptable, a nonparametric method is used to estimate proxy values for Fmsy and Bmsy. These proxies are derived by combining standard yield per recruit (YPR) and SSB per recruit (SSB/R) methods with model based estimates of absolute recruitment. Model parameters can be used to define appropriate partial recruitment vectors for YPR analyses leading to estimates of Fmax. Fmax serves as a proxy for Fmsy. SSB/R estimates for F=Fmax can be multiplied by some function of the recruitment time series to obtain an estimate of SSBmsy or Bmsy. The term "some function" can imply a simple mean of the recruitment series, a measure of central tendency, or a restricted . Consideration of ecosystem conditions, trends in other populations or evidence of environmental trends can be relevant. A simplified overview of the candidate models used for estimating stock status and their relationship to biological reference points is provided.

Discussion on Working Papers 5.1 and 6.1(stocks ordered as per working paper 6.1)

<u>Georges Bank Cod</u>

The Panel recommended inclusion of historical catch (back to 1930s) and surveys (back to 1963) in the calculation of biological reference points to provide additional information on stock productivity. Presence of the retrospective pattern in the VPA suggests that after 1995, there may have been changes in the fishery selectivity. There were major changes to the management structure (closed areas, mesh size) at this time which may explain these changes. The Panel felt that model formulations should be examined which investigated changes to the selectivity curve, particularly with regards to the older age classes in the recent time period (post 1995). No preference was given to whether changes in selectivity were examined in a VPA or SCAA model.

<u>Georges Bank Haddock</u>

The Panel recommended including catch (landings and discards) back to 1930's referring to the VPA performed on historical data in Clark et al., 1982. It was also recommended that model formulations be explored that consider changes in selectivity over time with a particular focus on the recent time period. A recommendation was made by the Panel to explore a domed shaped selectivity pattern though the specifics were not discussed. It was pointed out that recent changes in size at age will have ramifications on the calculation of the biological reference points. There was discussion on a parametric vs. nonparametric fitting of the stock recruit relationship, noting that a non-parametric approach was chosen the last time biological reference points for this stock were discussed (NEFSC, 2002b) which suggests that this may be required again. This requires exploration.

Georges Bank (GB), Southern New England /Mid-Atlantic Bight (SNE / MA) and Gulf of Maine / Cape Cod (GOM/CC) Yellowtail Flounder

The Panel did not recommend any changes to the current major-change Georges Bank VPA model (split survey q's). This is the same model formulation accepted during the most recent TRAC benchmark review (TRAC, 2005). The Panel supported efforts to build on the current formulation of the model to resolve observed retrospective patterns. The Panel recommended splitting the time series for the GOM / CC and SNE / MA stocks to resolve observed retrospective patterns in these assessments. The suggested areas of exploration included (1) investigation of spatial differences in the survey selectivity and/or environmental covariates (temperature) which may explain changes; (2) partial recruitment of the plus-age groups (particularly with regards to the uncertainty in the catch-at-age of the SNE stock); (3) using selectivity blocks; (4) changes in productivity/regimes over time (particularly with regards to severe decline of SNE stock). There was some concern that the major-change model is not based on an accepted causative process but rather based upon removal of the retrospective pattern. The Panel felt that their responsibility was to recommend which models can be used to offer sound management advice. The Panel made no recommendations on whether explorations should be performed with ASAP or ADAPT which is a software choice based upon ease of use.

Gulf of Maine Cod

The panel discussed whether there was significant error in the catch-at-age (CAA). Large recreational catch may result in larger than normal error in CAA. Inclusion of discards may also increase the error due to management actions (i.e. 30 lb trip limit in 1999). However, the coefficients of variation (CVs) on ages 3-5 in the landings are less than 10% while other ages are between 20 and 30%.

There is a weak and inconsistent retrospective pattern for this stock, although the formulation of VPA tends to produce some high fishing mortality (F) on certain ages.

It may be worth changing the assumption on F at oldest age to explore dome-shaped partial recruitment. If a dome appears, a hypothesis is needed to explain the domed selectivity. It may be useful to conduct a risk analysis on the assumption of a dome when flat-topped and vice versa. It may also be useful to examine the tagging data for independent confirmation of a dome and it may be useful to extend the age composition to explore the dome hypothesis.

The Panel found no compelling reason to switch models other than extending the series of catch and survey back in time when reviewing biomass reference points. The landings data prior to the 1930s may not be useful since these data were prorated using stock splits which may or may not have been the most appropriate values. Even with VPA, stock size estimates may be hind-cast using survey data back to 1963 to develop reference points.

Formulation of stock-recruit relationship is important for reference points including whether the relationship is fit internal to the model or externally. The Ricker model provided a good fit but there are may be other issues such as the extreme peak in recruitment (1987 year class). The value for gamma ranged from 0.5 to somewhat over 1. The Panel recommended estimating reference points both externally and internally to examine if there is a difference or if either are appropriate.

Witch Flounder

The Panel recommended exploring the reasons for the retrospective pattern that is seen in this stock. There are no compelling reasons to switch from VPA to SCAA unless this would make it easier to do the exploration.

American Plaice

The Panel discussed the potential problem of combining the data for the Gulf of Maine and Georges Bank portions of the stock. If the relative proportion between the two areas is stable, it is not a problem to combine them. The Panel recommended examining the survey trends for the two areas separately. If the trends are similar, the assessor could continue with a single catch-at-age in either VPA or SCAA. If the trends are different, there is a need to separate the CAA into two areas. Since the discards may not be well-determined, it may be better to move to an SCAA but the separability assumption needs to be explored.

Gulf of Maine Winter Flounder

The Panel recommended exploring the SCALE model since the year-classes which seem to track in the length composition do not appear to track in the age composition. There may be some smearing in the age-length keys. The sex ratio effect on the retrospective pattern was very slight if there were very strong differences between sexes. Something else appears to be causing the pattern. The Panel recommended examining implied fishing effort resulting from the model compared to reported effort in the area. There appear to be conflicting patterns between the recruitment time series and the biomass time series. A risk evaluation may be needed to choose between the consequences of believing one or the other.

Southern New England / Mid-Atlantic Bight Winter Flounder

The Panel recommended exploring the reason for the retrospective pattern. It appears that it may be a transient effect that may now be gone. If additional years of data do not make the retrospective pattern reappear, then nothing more is needed. If the pattern reappears, then the assessor should split the survey series at a reasonable time (e.g. 1994). It may be useful to examine if a robust likelihood might remove the

retrospective pattern because some of the indices may be very influential as years in the retrospective analysis are dropped.

Georges Bank Winter Flounder

The Panel recommended exploring age-based assessment with ASPIC as fall-back model. It felt that the stock is a candidate for a separable model (SCAA) due to the uncertainty in the CAA during the middle of the time series. However, without first examining results, it was not possible to assess the utility of this approach. The Panel recommended that one approach be chosen and if there are no problems observed then there is no need to explore an alternative approach.

White Hake

The Panel recommended assessing white hake using the SCALE model. It was recognized that there exist problems differentiating between red and white hake in the commercial fishery, particularly with regards to discards. The Panel recommended that the speciation problem should be examined by using survey data to speciate small (< 60 cm) fish and calibrate these results with observer data. There is a potential for sexual dimorphism that may confound a SCALE model and this should be considered. The Panel recommended using all available information as SCALE allows tuning to age data. To ensure that a bridge exists from AIM to SCALE, the Panel recommended running SCALE on the existing data set.

Pollock

The Panel recommended staying with AIM for the current assessment but to provide reasonable justification for selection of reference points. The Panel recommended exploring a state-space production model and examining recruitment variability. The desire for US / Canada scientific collaboration was noted, particularly on the stock assessment.

Redfish

The Panel had questions on the current state of the fishery. It was clarified that there is currently no market. The historical market was driven by a few-centrally owned vessels and once these vessels left the fishery, they were not replaced. Current commercial groundfish gear does not catch sufficient fish to supply a market and there exists no small mesh targeted fishery. Use of an age-structured model was recommended based on strong evidence for infrequent large pulse recruitment which persists for decadal time periods. The major recommendations for model formulation were to relax separable assumptions and use a S / R steepness estimate from west coast species (e.g., Pacific ocean perch), allow σ_R to vary (and go large), but make σ_R small where data are uncertain. The Panel expressed a desire to see an SCAA run performed as a check of the current RED model. An additional suggestion was to investigate an externally derived surplus production model (e.g., Jacobson approach).

Ocean Pout

The Panel recommended exploring other models that consider uncertainty in the relative F (e.g., Glazer, 2008) and/or better incorporate available biological information

on the species life history parameters such as a Bayesian biomass dynamics model or catch-at-age model with fixed parameters. It was felt that these approaches could be useful in providing management advice. Sufficiency of available age data upon which to construct a growth relationship to support the later recommendation should be explored.

Gulf of Maine / Georges Bank (GOM/GB) and SNE / MA Windowpane Flounder

Discards are important for both stocks. The Panel recommended exploring the use of SCAA in a Collie-Sissenwine formulation as the assessment model, particularly for the GOM/GB stock as AIM is problematic. For SNE/MA windowpane flounder, AIM is an acceptable model.

Gulf of Maine Haddock

The Panel recommended exploring an age-structured model if time permits. Otherwise, AIM is acceptable. The Panel recommended exploring the spatial distribution of the catch and the surveys to determine if the high values of landings and survey catches may be spillover from the Great South Channel area. This may affect the perception of the productivity of this stock. There appears to be a difference in survey selectivity between fall and spring possibly due to large fish spawning in the spring in areas not sampled by the spring survey.

Halibut

The Panel recommended extending the model to fit to the survey trend and input of a productivity parameter and landings prior to 1893. This probably should be assessed with the Canadian coastal stock of halibut as tagging studies have shown large migrations to Canadian waters.

Appendix 8. Glossary of Terms

Term	Definition
Age-structured Models	Class of assessment models which incorporates age and sometimes size information into its estimation of year-classes strengths in a stock
Biomass Pool Models	Class of assessment model which does not consider the age structure of a stock but rather describes the relationship between its standing biomass, changes in this due to losses (natural mortality) and additions (recruitment and growth) and yield. The ASPIC software package is commonly used for these models.
Catchability	The parameter (q) relating an index of abundance (e.g. survey) to the stock abundance or I = q N. It is thus a measure of the survey's ability to sample the stock. Generally, the higher the parameter q, the more 'catchable' the fish. The catchability can be either of a group of ages or specific to a defined age e.g. survey catchability at age 5. Typically, changes in q are considered over time while changes in q over age are synonymous with selectivity (a combination of gear vulnerability and availability).
Relative Trends models	Class of assessment model which does not include a parameter for catchability (q) and thus only describes relative as opposed to absolute trends in stock size and fishing mortality. The terms 'index-based' and an 'index method' (AIM) have been used for these models although most assessment models use indices.
Partial Recruitment (PR)	The degree of availability of a stock's age or size group to fishing with one time period on a zero to one scale. Thus a PR of 1.0 for age 5 fish indicates that all age 5 fish are available to being caught – they are 'fully recruited' to the fishery. A PR of 0.5 for age 5 fish indicates that this year – class is only 'partially recruited' to the fishery as only 50% are available to being caught. PR, sometimes called selectivity, is a function of gear vulnerability and availability.
Plus group	Aggregation of data on year classes above a specific age into one grouping. For instance, an age five plus group indicates that the data (e.g. population or catch numbers) on all age five and older fish are aggregated into this group.
Retrospective Pattern	Systematic under - or over – estimation of stock related parameters (typically abundance, biomass and fishing mortality) produced by assessments as additional years of data are added. For instance, an assessment in 2003 might estimate the 2003 fishing mortality to be 0.4 while the assessment in 2008 might estimate the now historical fishing mortality to be 0.8. This under-estimation of fishing mortality by the assessment model, if systematically consistent, is termed a retrospective pattern.
Risk Assessment	Formal process which uses the impact of an hypothesis and the probability of this hypothesis to measure the risk of specified objectives not being met. The approach puts the chosen array of hypotheses on the same scale which facilitates understanding of their relative risks.
Selectivity	The degree of availability of an age or size group of fish to a survey or fishing. When scaled to the group fully selected, this and the partial recruitment are equivalent.
Selectivity blocks	Blocks of years in assessment tables in which the selectivity at age is considered to be the same for all years. Validity of the 'Separable Assumption' is a key feature of the sub-class of assessment models which allows error in the catch-at-age (e.g. SCAA)
Separable assumption	The fishing mortality on an age or size group is considered to be the product of two terms – one age and the other time (typically year) related. The fishing mortality is

	'separable' into an age and time effect. This assumption is typically employed in the class of assessment models which allow errors in the catch-at-age (e.g. SCAA).
Statistical Catch-at-age (SCAA)	Assessment model which allow errors in the catch-at-age. Using values on stock abundance at some age for each year class, and fishing mortality derived from a separable assumption for specified selectivity blocks, calculates population abundance at age. Comparisons between predicted and observed catch-at-age and abundance indices are made for model fitting. ASAP and SCALE are software packages which allow exploration of this sub-class of model.
Stock - recruitment Relationship (S/R)	Relationship between a stock's spawning biomass and the ensuing recruitment. Two of the most widely assumed S/R relationships are that of Beverton & Holt and Ricker. They differ in the degree of density dependence assumed occurring in the stock, with the latter having a stronger negative relationship between density dependence and stock size.
Virtual Population Analysis (VPA) And Cohort Analysis (CA)	Assessment models which assume negligible error in the catch-at-age. Using values on stock abundance at some age for each year class and the observed catch-at-age, calculates population abundance at age. Comparisons between predicted and observed abundance indices are made for model fitting. VPA and CA differ by the precise form of the calculating catch equation. ADAPT is a software package used to implement VPA.