Appendix: Stock Assessment Terms of Reference for SAW/SARC59, July 15-18, 2014
(To be carried out by SAW Working Groups) (v. 1/17/2014)

A. Gulf of Maine (GOM) haddock

1. Estimate catch from all sources including landings and discards. Include recreational discards, as appropriate. Describe the spatial and temporal distribution of landings, discards, and fishing effort. Characterize the uncertainty in these sources of data. Investigate the utility of commercial or recreational LPUE as a measure of relative abundance.

2. Present the survey data being used in the assessment (e.g., indices of relative or absolute abundance, recruitment, state surveys, age-length data, etc.). If available, consider whether tagging information could be used in estimation of stock size or exploitation rate. Characterize the uncertainty and any bias in these sources of data.

3. Evaluate the hypothesis that haddock migration from Georges Bank influences dynamics of GOM stock. Consider role of potential causal factors such as density dependence and environmental conditions.

4. Estimate annual fishing mortality, recruitment and stock biomass (both total and spawning stock) for the time series (integrating results from TOR-3), and estimate their uncertainty. Include a historical retrospective analysis to allow a comparison with previous assessment results and previous projections.

5. State the existing stock status definitions for “overfished” and “overfishing”. Then update or redefine biological reference points (BRPs; point estimates or proxies for B_{MSY}, B_{THRESHOLD}, F_{MSY} and MSY) and provide estimates of their uncertainty. If analytic model-based estimates are unavailable, consider recommending alternative measurable proxies for BRPs. Comment on the scientific adequacy of existing BRPs and the “new” (i.e., updated, redefined, or alternative) BRPs.

6. Evaluate stock status with respect to the existing model (from previous peer reviewed accepted assessment) and with respect to a new model developed for this peer review. In both cases, evaluate whether the stock is rebuilt (if in a rebuilding plan).
   a. When working with the existing model, update it with new data and evaluate stock status (overfished and overfishing) with respect to the existing BRP estimates.
   b. Then use the newly proposed model and evaluate stock status with respect to “new” BRPs and their estimates (from TOR-5).

7. Develop approaches and apply them to conduct stock projections and to compute the statistical distribution (e.g., probability density function) of the OFL (overfishing level) (see Appendix to SAW TORs for definitions).
   a. Provide numerical annual projections (3 years). Each projection should estimate and report annual probabilities of exceeding threshold BRPs for F, and probabilities of falling below threshold BRPs for biomass. Use a sensitivity analysis approach in which a range of assumptions about the most important uncertainties in the assessment are considered (e.g., terminal year abundance, variability in recruitment, migration from Georges Bank).
   b. Comment on which projections seem most realistic. Consider the major uncertainties in the assessment as well as sensitivity of the projections to various assumptions.
c. Describe this stock’s vulnerability (see “Appendix to the SAW TORs”) to becoming overfished, and how this could affect the choice of ABC.

8. Review, evaluate and report on the status of the SARC and Working Group research recommendations listed in most recent SARC reviewed assessment and review panel reports. Identify new research recommendations.
B. Sea scallop

1. Estimate removals from all sources including landings, discards, incidental mortality, and natural mortality. Describe the spatial and temporal distribution of landings, discards, and fishing effort. Characterize the uncertainty in these assumptions and sources of data. If possible using sensitivity analyses, consider the potential effects that changes in fishing gear, fishing behavior, and management may have on the assumptions.

2. Present the survey data being used in the assessment (e.g., regional indices of relative or absolute abundance, recruitment, size data, etc.). Characterize the uncertainty and any bias in these sources of data.

3. Investigate the role of environmental and ecological factors in determining recruitment success. If possible, integrate the results into the stock assessment.

4. Estimate annual fishing mortality, recruitment and stock biomass for the time series, and estimate their uncertainty. Report these elements for both the combined resource and by sub-region. Include a historical retrospective analysis to allow a comparison with previous assessment results and previous projections.

5. State the existing stock status definitions for “overfished” and “overfishing”. Then update or redefine biological reference points (BRPs; point estimates or proxies for $B_{MSY}$, $B_{THRESHOLD}$, $F_{MSY}$ and MSY) and provide estimates of their uncertainty. Comment on the scientific adequacy of existing BRPs and the “new” (i.e., updated, redefined, or alternative) BRPs.

6. Evaluate stock status with respect to the existing model (from previous peer reviewed accepted assessment) and with respect to a new model or model formulation developed for this peer review.
   a. Update the existing model with new data and evaluate stock status (overfished and overfishing) with respect to the existing BRP estimates.
   b. Then use the newly proposed model and evaluate stock status with respect to “new” BRPs and their estimates (from TOR-5).

7. Evaluate the realism of stock and catch projections and compute the statistical distribution (e.g., probability density function) of the OFL (overfishing level).
   a. Provide numerical annual projections (through 2016). Each projection should estimate and report annual probabilities of exceeding threshold BRPs for F, and probabilities of falling below threshold BRPs for biomass. Use a sensitivity analysis approach in which a range of assumptions about the most important uncertainties in the assessment are considered (e.g., terminal year abundance, variability in recruitment).
   b. Comment on the realism of the projections. Consider the major uncertainties in the assessment as well as sensitivity of the projections to various assumptions.
   c. Describe this stock’s vulnerability (see “Appendix to the SAW TORs”) to becoming overfished, and how this could affect the choice of ABC.

8. Review, evaluate and report on the status of the SARC and Working Group research recommendations listed in most recent SARC reviewed assessment and review panel reports. Identify new research recommendations.
Appendix to the SAW Assessment TORs:

Clarification of Terms
used in the SAW/SARC Terms of Reference


\[
\text{Acceptable biological catch (ABC)} \text{ is a level of a stock or stock complex’s annual catch that}
\text{ accounts for the scientific uncertainty in the estimate of [overfishing limit] OFL and any other}
\text{ scientific uncertainty…}^{(p. 3208)} \text{ [In other words, OFL ≥ ABC.]}\]

\[
\text{ABC for overfished stocks. For overfished stocks and stock complexes, a rebuilding ABC must be set}
\text{ to reflect annual catch that is consistent with schedule of fishing mortality rates in the rebuilding}
\text{ plan. (p. 3209)}\]

NMFS expects that in most cases ABC will be reduced from OFL to reduce the probability that
overfishing might occur in a year. (p. 3180)

\[
\text{ABC refers to a level of ‘‘catch’’ that is ‘‘acceptable’’ given the ‘‘biological’’ characteristics of the}
\text{ stock or stock complex. As such, [optimal yield] OY does not equate with ABC. The specification of}
\text{ OY is required to consider a variety of factors, including social and economic factors, and the}
\text{ protection of marine ecosystems, which are not part of the ABC concept. (p. 3189)}\]


\[
\text{‘‘Vulnerability. A stock’s vulnerability is a combination of its productivity, which depends upon its}
\text{ life history characteristics, and its susceptibility to the fishery. Productivity refers to the capacity of}
\text{ the stock to produce MSY and to recover if the population is depleted, and susceptibility is the}
\text{ potential for the stock to be impacted by the fishery, which includes direct captures, as well as}
\text{ indirect impacts to the fishery (e.g., loss of habitat quality).’’ (p. 3205)}\]

Rules of Engagement among members of a SAW Assessment Working Group:

Anyone participating in SAW assessment working group meetings that will be running or presenting
results from an assessment model is expected to supply the source code, a compiled executable, an
input file with the proposed configuration, and a detailed model description in advance of the model
meeting. Source code for NOAA Toolbox programs is available on request. These measures allow
transparency and a fair evaluation of differences that emerge between models.

One model or alternative models:

The preferred outcome of the SAW/SARC is to identify a single “best” model and an accompanying
set of assessment results and a stock status determination. If selection of a “best” model is not
possible, present alternative models in detail, and summarize the relative utility each model,
including a comparison of results.