## Opening remarks & agenda review

**Meeting objectives:**

Canadian Chair Paul Ryall welcomed participants and reviewed the agenda and background. He noted efforts underway to appoint the Steering Committee for the Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) process and discussion at this session would cover how to move forward and clarification of objectives. The expectation is to have a work plan in about 2 months that addresses responsibilities, resources and priorities that take into account Canada's deepening budget challenges.

U.S. Chair Frank Lockhart provided an update on US participants on the MSE steering committee, they would be named for the Steering Committee shortly – however if interest within the meeting participants exists, they were invited to contact him. He also pointed out that similar to Canada the US is also facing budget constraints. Although no decreases are expected, the availability of resources will influence what can be done in relation to Pacific Whiting.

Dan Waldeck, US JMC member, reiterated that it is important for the process to clearly document what is being done and why, to demonstrate what this work entails.

Frank Lockhart updated the status of current US JMC Committee appointments:

- Phil Anderson and Frank Lockhart terms expire in October, 2013 whereas
- Steve Joner and Dan Waldeck have 2 more years remaining.

The US internal processes will be used to nominate personnel for reappointments or identify new members to the JMC

In regards to the US members to the MSE Steering Committee these will be announced in coming weeks.

Lockhart notified the JMC that current US AP member Travis Hunter had resigned from the AP

Paul Ryall noted from Canada there are currently 2 vacancies on the Canadian AP panel. (Dave Dawson, Canadian AP chair reported that the Canadian industry will provide to DFO a list of nominees following the Canadian Groundfish Trawl Advisory Committee (GTAC) deliberations scheduled for June).

## Adoption of Minutes from March meeting:

Draft minutes from the March meeting were distributed to participants for review and comment.

**ACTION:** Corrections/edits comments to the March 2013 summary minutes are to be sent to kevin.duffy@noaa.gov by June 7.

# Review draft Terms of Reference

**JMC Draft Terms of Reference**

Paul Ryall: confirmed that based on the advice/consultation with the Parties respective State and External Affairs departments the start date for the treaty sharing arrangement initial nine-year period will be June 25, 2008. The sharing arrangement remains in effect unless the Parties agree in writing to adjust the sharing arrangement as set out in the treaty.

**SRG Draft Terms of Reference**

Paul Ryall noted that in discussion around setting the 2013 TAC, questions arose about whether the SRG should set a minimum harvest level or whether that's the job of the JMC, at that time it was suggested that the JMC to revisit the SRG terms of reference point #15 at this meeting.

**Discussion**

- #15 of the current SRG terms of reference states the SRG will seek a consensus position with the JTC on the recommended annual potential yield;
- It felt by members of the JMC that the SRG should provide advice and describe the risks and uncertainties of various harvest levels, but setting and agreeing on a harvest level amount is a JMC role.
- The view of the SRG was that its roles may include setting a maximum harvest yield or recommend an annual positional yield.
- It was pointed out that other Treaties require that the scientific bodies provide advice on the range of yield, and it was the role of the management body makes the decision.
- Reference was made to the International Pacific Halibut Commission where the approach has shifted from providing a single point estimate to describing risk under different scenarios. (Consistent with Paragraph 1 (e) – providing advice on impacts).
- Consensus agreement was reached on a clarification of the role of the SRG and JTC in that they were to provide advice on a range of potential yield. The advice should still identify an upper bound, not just a range, to ensure conservation issues are addressed.
- Furthermore it was agreed that the JMC can and should set bounds for the range to be provided.
- JTC members indicated that the JMC guidance on the advice would be appreciated on what range they should provide.
- It was recognized that the SRG struggled with #15 of the TOR within their meeting. Clearly it was Item 2 (c) in the agreement refers to providing written technical review and scientific advice on yield that lead to the wording of #15.

- It was stated by the SRG participants that advice provided was driven by the stock assessment in terms of the current health of the stock and how that supports the harvest policy and the treaty. The criterion used was the agreements reference to the F-40 re harvest policy.
- It was felt it was more realistic for the SRG to seek consensus on a range vs. a single number.
- Some remaining questions about timing and approach described in TOR, but proposed Interpretation of TOR is that it's the default harvest policy as set out in the treaty , unless parties agree otherwise.

**ACTION: Agreed to revise #15 in the SRG Terms of Reference to state: "*The SRG will seek a consensus position with the JTC on advice on annual potential yield, as projected by the stock assessment and consistent with Article III of the Agreement.*"**

## Agency funding – independent industry participants

Frank Lockhart noted there were past contracting challenges, which he hoped to have resolved by the summer. He does not anticipate additional nominees from the AP but the process is open. Indications are that both Trevor Branch and Sean Cox are still interested and would be beneficial to the JTC process. The intent is to use the same list from last year and he does not expect a repeat of the contracting challenges this year. The US budget is expected to remain stable.

**Discussion**

- AP reps emphasized that securing funds to generate the best scientific advice was a priority. There is a clear need for qualified personnel to be involved. This funding issue should be reviewed in the context of broader treaty implementation costs.
- Both the US and Canada face internal contracting constraints (for the US the key challenge is paying for contractors' time, not travel costs). Frank Lockhart will advise the AP when his budget issues are resolved.

## Work plan and candidate scenarios: 2013/14 Pacific Hake MSE

JTC members gave a presentation describing the MSE cycle, management procedures, and objectives for the MSE work plan. The intent is to target specific things, not try to do everything, while recognizing that different strategies will benefit different parties and that practical limitations will dictate 2013-14 JTC activities. SRG recommendations include considering alternative operating models, different catch caps, and projections with different base cases than the 2012 assessments. A proposed scenario matrix for 2013 MSE included analysis of fixed/time varying selectivity, with or without catch caps.

The proposed schedule would start with further discussion with the MSE Steering Committee to develop the work plan, then beginning work on the MSE after August and reviewing progress in October to see what could be completed by the February SRG meeting. It was felt it would be useful to start thinking

early about the end-game for this work, including further work for 2014 and beyond (e.g. , other SRG recommendations, defining objectives, spatial models, and how to use MSE results in management).

**Discussion**

- **MSC requirements** will inform this work.
    - Clarification is needed re what outcomes MSC wants to see from the MSE (re Article 3-1 – overall impacts on stock, risks of over-fishing).
    - The next MSC round is expected to lead to more objectives.
- **Annual vs. biennial surveys:** US surveys would ideally be done annually, but resources are an issue.
    - The joint hake/sardine survey will likely continue annually, but the utility of doing a joint survey should be assessed first to ensure it's the right way to go.
    - Reluctance re annual vs. biannual survey also relates to the need to do other research.
    - No plans for a 2014 survey (staffing issues) at this time. It would be useful to consider alternative surveys to improve understanding of the stock (e.g. age 1 index).
    - There is a need to assess impacts on yield in relation to an annual vs. biannual survey before deciding; also whom benefit & other factors like variability.
    - There will be a survey this year, but decisions about 2014 must be made long before March (i.e. early communication if the recommendation is to do an annual survey).
    - AP recommended annual surveys. Concern that inadequate resources were being allocated to management, commensurate with the fishery's value and the known annual variability in assessment/status of the stock
    - It was asked if the use of a Parties (government) vessels the only way to do the survey or are there more cost effective alternatives?
    - JTC didn't plan to test annual/biannual this year, but agreed to do so after participants identified it as a priority.

**MSE work plan:** Key points of discussion were

- It can't all be done this year.
- The JTC desire is to spend time to ensure they develop the right tool for the job and then use it to get results to guide further decisions.
- SRG recommended changes to the stock assessment model
- Need to clarify changes to the 2013 stock assessment and longer term work, also clarify MSC deliverables.
- Many of the questions are for the future, not this year. What is needed for this cycle?
- **MSC deliverables:** It will be important to provide something demonstrating progress to MSC.
    - 3 things that can be given to the MSC are: 1) Appendix the 2013 stock assessment; 2) Document outlining plans to move forward with the MSE; and 3) Surveillance audit and recertification site visit to provide to team (or progress report).
    - JTC can provide a progress report to MSC in fall of 2013 demonstrating progress on MSE.
    - Based on his experience in sablefish it was felt that Sean Cox could help define MSC requirements,.
    - It should be made clear to the certification team that a strong process and team (JMC MSE steering committee) have been established and are in place working on the issues.
    - Progress to date was presented and accepted by the SRG in March. The JTC advice was subject to peer review and is available to all, plus there is the MSC progress report. Uncertainties include challenges re the new treaty, etc going forward. It should be made clear that it's a big project.
    - MSC conditions are vaguely worded.
    - This work should be broader and more meaningful than meeting MSC requirements. The issue of annual/biennial surveys transcends MSC, with broad implications for industry infrastructure and there is a need to know if TAC is sustainable.
- **Steering committee:** Participants already identified. The committee can help answer questions.
    - AP wants more discussion about the Steering Committee, about where the JMC sees industry participating in the process, how it works and who sets priorities.
    - Industry felt they should be engaged up front in the MSE process.

- Paul Ryall: the industry reiterated the industry engagement includes this meeting, then discussion of the Steering Committee provides a work plan (short-term and longer-term (3 years) work plan. It was suggested that a JMC teleconference be held for that and a subsequent discussion at the JMC annual meeting in March 2014.
- Frank Lockhart: Industry must drive some of the basic goals/objectives – e.g. do you want lower catch in one year in exchange for higher future catch? It also requires input from the US Tribes. It will address conservation concerns, so are there other questions.
- JTC hopes for input from the Steering Committee by July to develop a work plan to be delivered by Feb. 2014.
- AP comment: It was good to hear emphasis on an industry-driven process and to have the MSE address the question of an annual survey.

*Lunch*

**MSE Discussion, continued**

- **MSE work plan priorities:**
  - Questions include harvest strategy & biology (e.g. what age classes to target in the fishery) and whether there are tools like utilized by the IPHC's to address those questions.
  - Questions for the initial limited MSE work for 2013 should be separated from the long-term planning document to be developed by the Steering Committee to guide the JTC.
  - Research priorities should be identified at the annual JMC March meeting.
  - JTC proposed analyzing part of the proposed 2013 matrix for annual/biennial question.
  - Discussion re annual/biennial surveys: The AP requested a clear JMC statement that it's a priority. JMC noted budget implications. Other questions include what are the tradeoffs.
  - JTC: Addressing the credibility of the tool is important. Some questions can be addressed outside the MSE, though you can't separate time varying selectivity from the annual/biennial question. The main work & first priority is to develop an operational model that synthesizes the hake population, and then test it. Until the MSE is robust, it's no use in management (e.g. informing re Article 3). Once there is a credible tool, the JMC can begin to consider the results it produces. If we can get time variance selectivity to work, it will be evolved enough to be useful.
  - Catch caps: Needed for 2014 or a future project? It's of high interest to JTC and not a big time constraint. (Catch cap differs from constant cap strategy.)

  - AP advised discussing these questions with industry, given socioeconomic implications beyond biology.
  - AP questions whether MSE budget is realistic, in comparison to the IPHC efforts. Lockhart said current budget/contracting challenges may be resolved.

- **JTC: Strong guidance heard that development of a robust working model is a priority for 2013, along with the annual/biennial survey question.**
  - JTC won't address the other SRG recommendations (# 2, 3 and 6) in the short term.
  - Catch caps: Need more industry input re socioeconomic factors, this is to be addressed at a later date.
  - Lockhart: It will be useful to have documented priorities to support the 2014 budget discussions.

**MSE Steering Committee – role and next steps:**

- Frank Lockhart indicated that the intent is to establish a group which the JTC can consult as this work is developed.
  - JTC provides a report for March meeting, which provides feedback on further priorities.
  - Mid-summer conference call proposed for progress update. Ryall and Lockhart will set up call and invite others interested.
  - Also envision ongoing discussion with the Steering Committee over summer.
  - JTC will draft a working plan, circulate it to the working group, and share via email with others for comment, with a conference call at the end to ensure everyone agrees.
  - In June, the MSE steering Committee will discuss plans or work to be produced for the March 2014 meeting (operating model development, then annual survey)

**AP input – next steps:**

- How to address earlier questions about JMC input?
  - Development of metrics and objectives will take time and will happen in a parallel process
  - AP should meet to develop their questions and then discuss with JTC in an iterative process.
  - Questions are not for this year, but should be ready for the March meeting.
  - Also hope to talk about survey design

    - AP chairs should decide timing of meeting

**ACTION:** Add a day to the January/(winter) JTC meeting to discuss longer-term AP questions about the MSE (metrics, objectives, questions about survey design, etc).

- Q/A: Lockhart: It's clear that JMC wants both parties to explore the annual survey question but there are budget implications, so it's not a done deal.

## Agreement process issues

**Terms of AP-nominated members:**

- The agreement left the terms open. The proposed approach is annual appointments, consistent with standard government contracting terms.
    - AP: Wording is wrong: the JMC nominates to the parties from a list of recommendations provided by AP.
    - Endeavour to seek 3-year commitments from candidates to assure continuity, especially for the MSE.

**Other issues:**

1. Process for JMC recommendations on research priorities:

- The planned AP – JTC meeting will foster that.
- The agreement envisions the SRG working on issues after the JTC delivers the stock assessment but there is currently no way to provide direction in advance of the March meeting.
    - Propose a JMC conference call after the assessment is received to identify any issues that need to go to the JTC before the SRG meeting.

**ACTION:** JMC to set up a conference call once the stock assessment is provided to receive a briefing and identify potential questions for further advice from the SRG or JTC.

    - Discussion: JMC can ask the JTC or SRG to work on identified issues. JTC prefers a unified process for identifying requests vs. receiving individual requests.
    - Discussion: If the conference call is a JMC meeting, it should be open to public. Lockhart and Ryall to discuss best approach.

2. Timing of MSE/process meetings:

- Should the meeting to launch the next year's process be held in late September/October instead of May?

- Suggestion: Prefer adding another day to the March meeting.
- It was pointed out that a May meeting allows time to digest process issues that arise in March meeting.

3 AP paper:

- If consensus is not possible, parties will present separate written papers outlining their respective positions to the JMC. The AP at the March meeting agreed to submit the respective position papers to the JMC. The Canadian AP provided to the JMC. The Chair US AP indicated they would not be submitting a written position paper.

## Public comment

None

## Next meeting Date and Location

- Next meeting will be the MSE working group, likely by phone or email.
  - US will identify their MSE Steering Committee members shortly.

**ACTION:** Lockhart and Ryall to discuss MSE working group meeting details.

## Review action points

Participants reviewed action items, noting the following additional comments:

- Action items re proposed meetings
- Ryall and Lockhart to work on issues identified; both parties need to discuss budget internally and how to use MSE info to inform those discussions.
  - AP: The importance of this treaty warrants that the parties find a modest pot of discretionary funding to support implementation.
- JTC should provide an initial list of questions for long-term work; AP to develop advice before March.
- Adoption of the revised SRG Terms of Reference approved.
- Correction/edits to March minutes to be shared with Duffy by June 7.

**ACTION:** Email members once Website is updated (currently missing reference to AP & documents.)

*Adjourned: 2:20 pm*

# Appendix 1: Meeting participants

| *Canada* | *United States* |
|---|---|
| **Joint Management Committee** | |
| Paul Ryall | Frank Lockhart |
| Bruce Turris | Dan Waldeck |
| Barron Carswell | Steve Joner |
| | |
| **Joint Technical Committee** | |
| Nathan Taylor, DFO Science | Alan Hicks, NMFS NWFSC |
| | |
| **Science Review Group** | |
| Greg Workman, DFO Science | |
| Mike Buston | |
| | |
| **Advisory Panel** | |
| Dave Dawson | Joe Bersch |
| Don McLeod | Richard Carroll |
| Shannon Mann | Mike Hyde |
| | Brent Paine |
| | Mike Okoniewski |
| | |
| **Others** | |
| Barry Ackerman, DFO FM Pacific | Ryan Couch, NOAA Counsel |
| Neil Davis, DFO FM Pacific | |
| | |
| Dawn Steele, Note taker | |