



---

## Update on actions arising from the 9<sup>th</sup> Session of the IPHC Scientific Advisory Board (SRB09)

PREPARED BY: IPHC SECRETARIAT (22 MAY 2017)

---

### PURPOSE

To provide the Scientific Advisory Board (SRB) with an opportunity to consider the progress made during the intersessional period, on the recommendations arising from the SRB09.

### BACKGROUND

At the SRB09, the members recommended a series of actions to be taken by the IPHC Secretariat staff, as detailed in the SRB09 meeting report available from the IPHC website, and as provided in [Appendix A](#).

### DISCUSSION

During the 10<sup>th</sup> Session of the SRB (SRB10), attempts will be made to ensure that any recommendations for action are carefully constructed so that each contains the following elements:

- 1) a specific action to be undertaken (deliverable);
- 2) clear responsibility for the action to be undertaken (such as the IPHC Staff or MSAB officers);
- 3) a desired time frame for delivery of the action (such as by the next session of the MSAB or by some other specified date).

### RECOMMENDATION/S

That the SRB:

- 1) **NOTE** paper IPHC-2017-SRB10-03, which provided the SRB with an opportunity to consider the progress made during the inter-sessional period, in relation to the consolidated list of recommendations arising from the previous SRB meeting (SRB09).
- 2) **AGREE** to consider and revise the actions as necessary, and to combine them with any new actions arising from SRB10.

### APPENDICES

**Appendix A:** [Update on actions arising from the 9<sup>th</sup> Session of the IPHC Scientific Review Board \(SRB09\)](#)

## APPENDIX A

Update on actions arising from the 9<sup>th</sup> Session of the IPHC Scientific Review Board (SRB09)

Action No.	Description	Update
SRB09.01	<b><i>Geostatistical approach to survey indices</i></b> To minimize confusion with past methods, we propose a standard naming convention for the new “Geostat Approach” and the previous “Empirical Approach.”	<b>Completed:</b> Instead adopted the term “space-time modelling”, as we felt this was easier to understand for industry.
SRB09.02	<b><i>Recommendations for the GeoStat approach</i></b> 1. NOAA’s Auke Bay Lab (ABL) longline survey data should continue to be applied to help with edge effects for deeper depth areas; 2. The Commission should put a high priority on staff publishing the GeoStat approach in a peer-reviewed journal because it will be an important contribution to both the statistical and the fisheries literature.	<b>In Progress:</b> 1. Longline survey used to help index deeper water density in Areas 2C, 3A and 3B. 2. Write-up for publication is in progress.
SRB09.03	<b><i>Survey timing adjustment</i></b> We recommend simplifying the timing adjustment by using the area-specific harvest rates in the computation rather than the estimated area-specific harvest rates.	<b>Completed:</b> Adopted recommendation in 2016.
SRB09.04	<b><i>Survey timing adjustment</i></b> We also request that, in the future IPHC provide detailed mathematical specifications for models and analyses that we are expected to comment on.	<b>Ongoing:</b> Agreed.
SRB09.05	<b><i>Stock assessment overview</i></b> <i>We also recommend clarifying the assumptions about observer coverage by gear type, in particular for the GOA trawl and longline gears.</i>	<b>Ongoing:</b> Will be included in size-limit evaluation in 2017.
SRB09.06	Including the NMFS trawl survey data in the spatial model may show the relative paucity of juveniles and pre-recruits in the region and may help with some alternative hypotheses on movement dynamics.	<b>Ongoing:</b> Continued development of the spatial model for MSE use, including these data.

Action No.	Description	Update
SRB09.07	<p><b>Management strategy work</b></p> <p>We suggest examining the SPR rates due to bycatch in a sensitivity context; e.g., what would a blue-line SPR be under zero by-catch, current level, and double the anticipated by-catch.</p>	<p><b>In Progress:</b> The Blue Line has been eliminated and <i>status quo</i> SPR-based harvest policy has replaced it. These sensitivities are planned for this year's evaluation of fishing intensity.</p>
SRB09.08	<p><b>Current and planned harvest policy developments</b></p> <p>We recommend that the EBIO calculation be phased out as it was made clear that the estimates may be misleading and alternatives can be developed (e.g., the implied SPR rate from recent years).</p>	<p><b>Completed:</b> EBio is no longer used and a <i>status quo</i> SPR-based harvest policy is in place as a hand rail." Evaluation of SPR values is planned for 2017.</p>
SRB09.09	<p>We also recommend that other measures of fishing intensity be explored.</p>	<p><b>In Progress:</b> Other measures of fishing intensity will be presented at SRB10.</p>
SRB09.10	<p><b>Biological Research</b></p> <p>We recommend that staff consider simulation studies to evaluate the effectiveness of different types of tagging programs and data requirements needed to address mortality estimates.</p>	<p><b>Completed:</b> A sample size analysis was performed to draw useful estimates of post-release mortalities in the directed fishery as assessed by tagging.</p>