

## **Observer Report**

**SEDAR 25 Assessment Workshop – June 21<sup>st</sup> – 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2011**

**Tom Burgess, SAFMC Council Representative**

The workshop started on days one and two with public comment. Several of the fishery observers made comments. One fishery observer expressed concerns about only using two indices of abundance rather than the seven or eight that came out of the data workshop to evaluate the stock. Another comment was in relation to the terms of reference from the data workshop that never get addressed, which is a map that shows where effort is occurring throughout the range. This would show significant changes in fisheries due to regulations over time. One final comment was about the headboat information carrying too much weight in the assessment.

The workshop started with a review of the data and changes to the data since the data workshop. Two models were considered for each species in this assessment; the Beaufort assessment model and a production model. Overviews were given on both models that detailed the inputs, parameters, and preliminary decisions made to get the models running. For the production model the panelists had some changes that they wanted the modeler to address and plug into the model.

Most of the workshop time was spent trying to get a base model established that had a good fit between the model and the data. Whether it was the black sea bass modeler or the golden tilefish modeler, the assessment decisions were handled in the same manner. The modeler would bring up the issue to the panel and open it up for discussion. The modeler (or one of the panelists) would start the deliberation with possible ideas on how to approach and address the issue at hand. Discussions went back and forth between the panelists as they discussed their thoughts and

concerns. The panel seemed to work well together to develop direction and a consensus on an approach.

If the modeler had done some exploratory work on anything, he explained the issue, how he attempted to fix it, and then the results. Then he opened it up for discussion by the panel as previously stated. The panelists continued to work well together throughout the workshop. All ideas, thoughts, and concerns were welcomed and discussed for merit. Sometimes more than one approach was attempted to address an issue, for example to see what worked best and also to have justification for the reviewers on why they chose a certain approach to a situation.

The fisheries observers were called upon throughout the workshop for information if there were any questions on the data or their fishery.

Overall, the panelists worked to get the best possible fit between the model and the data. When they felt they had done all they could in this area, the work moved to the weighting of the indices. Again more of the same open discussion on how to get the best possible fit. Time started to run out before this part of the assessment could be completed.

While we were all still gathered together, Kari asked if there was anything anybody would like to bring up before the workshop ended. Model uncertainties were brought up and how we were going to address them in the model. The panel discussed the techniques and tools that could be used to determine the model uncertainty. The project schedule was also discussed in relation to the workload and the progress made so far.