

## **MRIP Transition Team: Atlantic and Gulf Subgroup**

### **FINAL Summary**

**February 27, 2015**

Anson, Bagwill, Bell, Bray, Carmichael, Curtis, Didden, Errigo, Kelly, Kerns, Knowlton, Rago, Strelcheck, Tromble, Turner, Van Voorhees, Wright

After two weeks of separate stock assessment and management group meetings, the full subgroup met to finalize the Transition Timeline Options Report. Prior to the call, Dave Van Voorhees posed two questions to the group for discussion:

1. Is it likely that stock assessment scientists would we be able to process more "key" stock assessments in 2017 (under the 3-year plan) than in 2016 (under the 2-year plan)? If not, would they be able to process the same number in less time? In other words, would the extra year of preparation allow for greater efficiency in the incorporation of revised catch statistics into assessments when they become available?
2. Is it likely that fishery managers would we be able to process management actions for more "key" stocks in 2017-2018 (under the 3-year plan) than in 2016-2017 (under the 2-year plan)? If not, would they be able to process the same number in less time? In other words, would the extra year of preparation allow for greater efficiency in the incorporation of revised catch statistics and revised assessment results into management actions when they become available?

Several members of the group stated that it is more likely that with the 3-Year Approach, both stock assessment and management actions would be able to address a greater number of key stocks. With the 2-Year Approach it will be far more disruptive to reschedule 2016 assessments if it is determined a third year is necessary than to just plan for three years. By having two full years of benchmarking before attempting calibration of the time series, uncertainty in the model and potential of having to redo assessments will decrease, thus increasing stakeholder confidence. Additionally, with the 3-Year Approach, similar stocks could be 'packaged' together and selected based on changes in estimates, whereas the 2-Year Approach would need to focus on the more controversial species. These types of metric are key to include in the group's reasoning for preferring the 3-Year Approach. Overall, an increase in efficiency will occur with the 3-Year Approach that you could not get with the 2-Year.

Van Voorhees brought up a change in timeline to the group for approval of not allowing a potential fourth year of benchmarking with the 3-Year Approach. The group supported this as having a set schedule is more desirable than any uncertainty. The reasoning for the change was to be able to make a definitive end date of the Coastal Household Telephone Survey.

The remainder of the call focused on addressing comments and edits made to the report. Mainly, in the full Transition Plan, the *Lessons Learned* section needs to be added, the peer review timing, and a more detailed (as possible) description of the management timeline.