

Participation

Board Members Attending:

Bob Alverson (Commissioner)	Dan Hull	Per Odegaard
Rachel Baker	Adam Keizer (Co-chair)	Peggy Parker
Michele Culver (Co-chair)	Jim Lane	Paul Ryall (Commissioner)
Gregg Elwood	Scott Mazzone	Chris Sporer
Robyn Forrest	Tom Marking	John Woodruff (May 9)
Bruce Gabrys	Scott Meyer	

IPHC Staff Attending:

Allan Hicks
Steve Keith
Bruce Leaman
Josep Planas

Visitors Attending:

Carey McGilliard (NMFS/AFSC)

Absentees:

Shane Halverson
Jeff Kauffman
Ryan Littleton
Loh-Lee Low
Brad Mireau

Facilitators:

Chris Joseph (Swift Creek Consulting)

Meeting Objectives

1. Become familiar with Dr. Allan Hicks and develop a common vision for modeling and evaluation.
2. Achieve agreement on MSAB terms of reference.
3. Achieve agreement on work plan for next two years.
4. Achieve agreement on outreach plan and begin formal implementation of outreach.

Summary of Actions

Number	Description
1.	Keizer, Culver, Hull, Baker, and Sporer will edit the ToR based on group discussion, and this new version will be published on the MSAB Sharepoint site for MSAB review by June 1, 2016.
2.	Keizer and Culver to request guidance from Commission on “fishery” definition and MSAB membership in advance of the next MSAB meeting.
3.	Culver will draft descriptions of the intent behind MSE goals and objectives for MSAB review, and this revised document will be published on the MSAB Sharepoint site for MSAB review by June 1, 2016.
4.	Keith will resend Sharepoint link to MSAB by June 1, 2016 to facilitate MSAB members’ review and editing of draft documents.
5.	Hicks, with Keizer’s help, will revise the workplan based upon discussions and MSAB concerns, and this new version will be published on the MSAB Sharepoint site for MSAB review by July 1, 2016.
6.	Hicks to work with other staff to outline the current harvest policy and the realized decision-making practiced by the Commission, and to evaluate these relative to existing MSE objectives. Staff will solicit SRB views on how elements of the harvest policy should be updated or whether the MSAB’s efforts should focus on developing a new harvest policy. Details will be presented at the next MSAB meeting.
7.	Parker and Sporer will revise the outreach plan and this new version will be published on the MSAB Sharepoint site for MSAB review by June 1, 2016.
8.	Keith to make edits to MSAB website as advised during group discussion.
9.	Keith to work with the MSAB to identify an appropriate set of dates for the next meeting by August 31.

Meeting Agenda

May 9, 2016

1-1:45pm	Introductions and Housekeeping
1:45-2:45pm	Recap of IPHC Annual Meeting
2:45-4pm	MSAB Draft Terms of Reference
4-5pm	MSAB Work Plan for Next Two Years (start discussion)
5pm	Adjourn Day One

May 10, 2016

8:30-8:45am	Recap Day One
8:45am-12pm	MSAB Work Plan for Next Two Years (Continue Discussion)
12-1pm	Lunch
1-2pm	MSAB Work Plan for Next Two Years (Continue Discussion)
2-3pm	Outreach Plan and Begin Implementation
3-4pm	Wrap-up and Next Steps
4pm	Adjourn Day Two

Key Points of Discussion

Housekeeping

- Action items from October 2015 meeting were reviewed. The MSAB had no comments with respect to action items.
- The MSAB formally approved the October 2015 meeting minutes.
- Hicks introduced himself, including his academic background, training, and hopes and ambitions with respect to the MSE.

MSAB Presentation to IPHC Annual Meeting

- Keizer and Culver gave an overview of their presentation on MSAB activities at the IPHC Annual Meeting in January 2016. The presentation to the Annual Meeting covered the following topics:
 - the MSAB's use of co-chairs, an agenda committee, and a facilitator;

- the MSAB's use of the MSE App (previously known as the Shiny Tool) and how useful the hands-on application of this tool was for the group in the October 2015 meeting;
- management strategies being considered in the MSE;
- the challenges that members of the MSAB have interacting and working with one another due to the short amount of time that the MSAB spends together and the diverse and geographically-dispersed make-up of MSAB members;
- the MSAB's communication challenges with stakeholders given the complexity of MSE; and
- key elements of the draft outreach strategy.
- Key feedback to the MSAB received at the Annual Meeting, and MSAB discussions about this feedback, included:
 - stakeholder concern that the MSAB might be usurping the IPHC's existing consultative and decision-making processes for setting harvest advice;
 - stakeholder interest in further technical assistance from IPHC staff with respect to how to use and interpret results of the MSE App;
 - the importance of keeping the Processors Advisory Group (PAG) and Conference Board abreast of MSAB activities;
 - the need for MSAB members who work for government agencies (e.g., DFO, Washington Fish & Wildlife) to take on a greater role in connecting the MSAB with agency staff and the stakeholders that the agencies represent or otherwise deal with;
 - interest in the MSAB examining size limits, and interest in the MSAB developing and exploring long-term objectives for the fishery;
 - direction by the Commission to the MSAB to evaluate the current harvest policy;
 - concern regarding the current harvest policy, including the harvest control rule and the harvest rate, with respect to different rates by regulatory area;
 - interest in a spatially-explicit model and the MSAB exploring results and policy options using such a model given area-specific fishery objectives;
 - the complexity of MSE, and the challenges communicating with stakeholders about MSE (i.e., outreach);
 - interest in the fisheries footprint concept; and
 - concerns regarding the usefulness of the MSE operating model due to uncertainty.

Draft Terms of Reference

- Keizer and Culver presented a draft ToR that they had developed prior to this meeting, and the MSAB discussed several sections of the draft ToR that were concerning to the group.
- With respect to the MSAB's mandate:
 - some felt that the ToR should specify that the purpose and objectives of the MSAB concern evaluating harvest policies, while others thought that the ToR should state more broadly that the purpose and objectives were to respond to tasks assigned to it by the IPHC;
 - some felt that specific terminology and concepts in the ToR required further clarification, including exactly what 'fishery' was the focus of the MSE (i.e., does it include bycatch?);
 - concern regarding how fisheries not under the control of the IPHC (such as fisheries with Halibut bycatch) would be dealt with by the MSE – the group discussed how bycatch would be dealt with in the MSE as a scenario and that this could be explicitly mentioned in the ToR.
- With respect to the section on membership, the following issues were discussed:
 - some members were concerned about ensuring representation on the MSAB across sectors and/or geographic area, while others felt that the MSAB currently has a good cross-section of skills and this is most important;
 - whether Kauffman, who is an MSAB member but who had recently been appointed Commissioner, would continue to serve on the MSAB as a regular board member or as a third Commissioner (there was general agreement that Kauffman would serve as a board member and not act as a Commissioner while participating in MSAB activities);
 - that the MSAB might be opened up further to observers and their active participation in meetings, how observer participation should best be facilitated, but that board members should be the primary conduit for stakeholders in order to maintain the MSAB at a manageable size;
 - that the ToR spell out procedures for addressing turnover in MSAB membership;
 - the previously established "agenda setting committee" be replaced by a "steering committee" that consists of the co-chairs and the former agenda setting committee;
 - that a one to two page meeting summary (versus more detailed meeting minutes) could play a useful role as an outreach product for MSAB members to send out to their constituents or as talking points in conversations with their constituents.

- With respect to MSAB decision-making, the group discussed what consensus-based decision-making looks like. The group agreed that this method of decision-making was fine as long as dissenting views are recorded in meeting documentation.
- The MSAB requested guidance from Commission with respect to:
 - defining the “fishery” to be examined through the MSE as referred to in the ToR;
 - how many Commissioners from each country sit on the MSAB; and
 - procedures for replacing current members and identifying new members.
- **Action #1:** Keizer, Culver, Hull, Baker, and Sporer will edit the ToR based on group discussion, and this new version will be published on the MSAB Sharepoint site for MSAB review by June 1, 2016.
- **Action #2:** Keizer and Culver to request guidance from Commission on “fishery” definition, MSAB membership, in advance of the next MSAB meeting.
- **Action #3:** Culver will draft descriptions of the intent behind MSE goals and objectives for MSAB review, and this revised document will be published on the MSAB Sharepoint site for MSAB review by June 1, 2016.
- **Action #4:** To facilitate resolution and editing by MSAB members, Keith to resend Sharepoint link to MSAB by June 1, 2016.

Workplan for Next Two Years Starting May 2016

- Hicks gave a presentation on the draft workplan that outlined proposed tasks and deliverables of the MSAB over the next two years. The group discussed the completeness and adequacy of the draft workplan.
- Discussions revolved around several gaps, requests, and concerns:
 - whether the workplan provided sufficient detail, including tracking when tasks will get done, accountability for completing tasks, and staff support for MSAB members;
 - the interrelationships between tasks, and the need to make these linkages more explicit in the workplan;
 - recognition of the value of revisiting and refining work already done, but also an interest in moving forward with the evaluation;
 - sufficient detail regarding deliverables including when a revised workplan would be completed
 - the current harvest policy, and the need for its evaluation;
 - members noted the current harvest policy has not been strictly followed, meaning there are two management strategies that need to be evaluated: the current harvest policy as detailed in IPHC documents, and the realized decision-making practiced by the Commission;

- the MSAB discussed how Hicks should initially outline the current harvest policy, explore it with the SRB, and eventually evaluate it relative to the defined objectives;
- however, to evaluate the policy, the group discussed how staff and MSAB must review MSE objectives, and refine performance measures, and then Hicks will need a framework to evaluate the harvest policy in (i.e., closed-loop simulation);
- a request that proposed tasks 1 through 3 in the workplan would be complete by the October 2016 meeting;
- the role of 'aspirational' goals in directing the MSAB's activities with regards to improving management of the fishery, but how the workplan needed to be guided by realistic goals;
- the need to have sufficient interaction and integration with the SRB so that SRB guidance can improve the MSE (such as with respect to the IPHC's current harvest policy), and the need to ensure that the workplan supports sufficient feedback and integration with other types of scientific and regulatory input, including what has been learned in other MSEs;
- the roles and responsibilities of MSAB members in the workplan, including their role in helping identify scenarios to be explored in the MSE;
- the MSAB's meeting schedule, and the most effective use of everyone's time (some felt that more meetings per year might speed the MSE up, others expressed a dislike for having more than two meetings per year and that as IPHC staff require time between meetings to make progress on the MSE workplan two meetings per year might be most appropriate, and some suggested longer meetings as the solution);
- updating of educational materials in Task 7 to assist with the MSAB's outreach activities;
- use of the MSE App or another tool for screening management strategies, scenarios, uncertainty, or other facets to be examined in MSE, but also a sense that further effort refining the MSE App (Task 7) may not be worthwhile and staff efforts would more appropriately be focused on model development;
- regarding Task 8, the need and role of a spatially-explicit model, what resolution would be needed but also what resolution would be possible, and concern that spatially-explicit modeling might not be worthwhile in terms of supporting the achievement of the objectives of the MSE; and
- the need to broaden the workplan to further development of the operating model and scenarios.

- In the course of discussion, Hicks took the group through a simplified closed-loop simulation exercise to show typical modeling outputs, and this led to the group discussing aspects of fish stock and harvest modeling such as: differences between IPHC staff's (Stewart's) assessment model to inform the IPHC's annual setting of harvest limits and MSE modeling to evaluate harvest policies; appropriate time horizons in MSE modeling; and important metrics and information to glean from MSE modeling results.
- In the course of discussion Hicks and the MSAB determined that MSAB concerns with the draft workplan could be addressed. By the end of the discussion the MSAB was satisfied with Hicks revising the workplan and resending to the MSAB for review.
- **Action #5:** Hicks, with Keizer's help, will revise the workplan based upon discussions and MSAB concerns, and this new version will be published on the MSAB Sharepoint site for MSAB review by July 1, 2016.
- **Action #6:** Hicks to work with other staff to outline the current harvest policy and the realized decision-making practiced by the Commission and evaluate relative to existing MSE objectives. Staff will solicit SRB views on how elements of the harvest policy should be updated or whether efforts should focus on development of a new harvest policy. Details will be presented at the next MSAB meeting.

MSAB Outreach Strategy

- Parker and Sporer reviewed the draft outreach plan they had developed prior to the meeting based upon the outreach strategy prepared by Compass Resource Management in 2015.
- Discussions included:
 - stakeholders' need to know who among the MSAB and/or IPHC staff to contact regarding MSE, and who MSAB members do and do not represent;
 - the importance of minimizing burdens on Hicks – such as extraneous interaction with stakeholders – given the need for him to focus on modeling and other activities in the workplan;
 - how the webpage could be made clearer with respect to the above items;
 - the appropriate format and purpose of a short (i.e., 1 to 2 page) meeting summary, and logistics of getting this summary completed shortly after MSAB meetings;
 - how to mesh MSAB outreach with other agencies' and organizations' activities and protocols; and
 - how to ensure that stakeholders are clear as to how to participate in the MSE.

- The MSAB agreed that the outreach plan would be satisfactory if its concerns were addressed in a next iteration.
- **Action #7:** Parker and Sporer will revise the outreach plan and this new version will be published on the MSAB Sharepoint site for MSAB review by June 1, 2016.
- **Action #8:** Keith to make edits to MSAB website as advised during group discussion.

Reflections on the Meeting, and Planning for the October 2016 Meeting

- The final session of the meeting entailed reflecting on the meeting and organizing for the next meeting, likely to occur in October.
- A common sentiment among the MSAB was that this May meeting was productive and that members were inspired and looking forward to progress with the MSE given the new workplan. Many members also indicated appreciation for:
 - having the co-chairs, agenda committee, and facilitator in terms of organizing for meetings and helping make meetings effective;
 - Hicks and Leaman's efforts on the workplan; and
 - the group's ability to help each other stay on track.
- Several members expressed how they were looking forward to the evaluation of the current harvest policy as detailed in IPHC documents (as directed by the Commissioners), and the realized decision-making practiced by the Commission.
- The MSAB decided that the next meeting would be as long as two full days should there be a need to extend the meeting to this length, i.e., only if there was sufficient material to cover).
- The group expressed a desire to make measurable progress against the work plan.
- Some agenda items for the next meeting were discussed including:
 - formally adopting the ToR, workplan, and outreach plan;
 - exploring how spatial management areas can be defined with available information, and gaining a better understanding of area-specific harvest data;
 - reviewing goals, objectives, and performance metrics; and
 - reviewing the current harvest policy, including SRB feedback on this topic.
- **Action #9:** Keith to work with the MSAB to identify an appropriate set of dates for the next meeting by August 31.

Acronyms

DFO	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
IPHC	International Pacific Halibut Commission
MSAB	Management Strategy Advisory Board
MSE	management strategy evaluation
PAG	Processors Advisory Group
PSC	prohibited species catch
SRB	Scientific Review Board
ToR	terms of reference