

Allocation data Issues (Summary from Aug 28 email)

ANS	QUESTION	NOTES
NO	Is logbook used in the allocation analysis calculations?	
?	What adjustments are made to data, what do variables represent, how are allocations calculated?	Need thorough documentation of the analysis and the inputs
?	Is logbook > ALS a concern or an indicator of important data problems?	Hoping for more from Steve
?	unclassified landings	Declines in effect over time; known problem with GAJ
?	species ID issues	Best example is gag vs black.
?	Monroe County - Atlantic vs. Gulf stat areas	SEDAR recommendations for A 17 species, lots of new ground for Comprehensive
?	Weight units and conversions - how reported, how stored in database, and which field used in analysis	Concern is mainly gutted vs whole. SEDAR has not always supported ALS conversion factors. KG vs LB too.
?	Changes in ALS values between most recent and the june 29 versions	
Done	Black Sea bass - Hatteras split	believe done, need to document
?	Landings N of South Atlantic - Are VA landings in ALS?	Assessments address all landings of the stock. May need to extend our range.
?	MRFSS weight observations are unreliable and occasionally missing. Use an average?	high PSE is one thing, but some cells have no observations.
?	Discrepancies with MRFSS. Rounding errors??	Red grouper over 1990-2007 is 638,000 fish. Annual differences seem greater than rounding. Perhaps due to missing some modes?

For the future, I suggest that when providing data summaries you provide an accompanying write-up of what you did so that there is no confusion and those who made the request can verify that they got what they expected. It is important to know what is combined, what is split, the original source and when it is obtained etc. You may even want to do that in the beginning and run it by the requester before getting deep into the job to avoid extra work.

At this point, the info at hand should be enough for the committee to decide if it accepts the general approach, but care should be taken to make sure it is clear the actual %'s may vary in the end once all the persnickety details are addressed. As much as I hate to say it, we may need some type of working group to get through it all. Just as we do not leave all the SEDAR data decisions to one person, we should not leave all these decisions to just staff.

Red Grouper MRFSS Comparison
WEIGHT

MRFSS-ALLOC			
MRFSS	ALLOC		
Total	TOT	DIFF	%
14191	1042	13149	12.62
11404	10732	672	0.06
59702	22450	37252	1.66
123699	43879	79820	1.82
57122	38139	18983	0.50
26894	2406	24488	10.18
114890	96757	18133	0.19
115099	97756	17343	0.18
161878	137022	24856	0.18
102679	72238	30441	0.42
98750	60978	37772	0.62
122338	81044	41294	0.51
186542	125903	60639	0.48
132211	95151	37060	0.39
241315	184666	56649	0.31
208660	158642	50018	0.32
483127	457242	25885	0.06
610366	546158	64208	0.12
2870867	2232207	638660	0.29

Is it missing modes in the allocation results?

The allocation analysis lumps together some MRFSS modes, but in doing so be careful not to omit the other associated modes. For instance, the allocation analysis does not report any pounds for 'MRFSS.Private' in 1990, but MRFSS reports 13,000 in 'Man Made'. This makes me think the modes other than 'Private/Rental' and 'Charter' or 'Party/Charter' may not be incorporated. I think the allocation distinction is 'for-hire' vs private activities, so both 'man made' and 'shore' should be counted in the 'MRFSS.Private'.

The big issues with ALS are addressed in SEDAR 12 red grouper - this is from the intro to the comm. DW section:

The landings history issues related to the boundary between the Gulf of Mexico and U.S. South Atlantic management units, the amount of red grouper included landings recorded as unclassified grouper and when the fishery shifted from landing fish whole to landing gutted fish.