International Consultations on the Establishment of the
South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation

Assessment Simulation Task Team
Lima, 6 – 9 April 2010

ASTT-01

Draft agenda
(Including remarks made by Andrew Penney)

Tuesday 6 April	Opening of the meeting Terms of reference Agenda for the meeting Assigning of rapporteurs Overview of existing stock assessment models Results of Chilean model
Wednesday 7 April	Results of Peruvian model Results of ICA model Results of Russian model
Thursday 8 April	Comparison results of various models with theoretical population Discussion strength and weaknesses of various models Choice of standard method for JMSG Data and other input parameters for standard model
Friday 9 April	Biological reference points for generating outputs Specification of outputs standard model Projection methods Time frame for real assessment, including exchange of input data Report

Remarks made by Andrew Penney:

The overall purpose of the meeting is to review results of jack assessment trials and select assessment methodologies and approaches to conduct assessment using real data (Report of SWG 8).

This requires the following aspects to be considered:

1. Overviews of the existing stock assessment models used in South Pacific jack mackerel stock assessments: model types and software; data inputs used; other key model inputs and assumptions; model specifications (base case and sensitivities); types of outputs produced; assessment result using the simulated data.
    a. The Chilean assessment.
    b. The Peruvian assessment.
    c. The ICA assessment.
    d. The Russian assessment.
2. Discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of these modeling approaches, focusing on comparison of results of assessments conducted on the simulated data using the different models.
3. Identification of the general requirements and characteristics for assessment models for South Pacific jack mackerel and selection of appropriate candidate assessment models that meet these requirements.
4. For the proposed candidate assessment approaches, discussion and identification of:
    a. Data inputs required (e.g. fisheries data, biological data, abundance indices).
    b. Specification of other input parameters and ranges e.g. (recruit relationships, M, growth relationships, CVs on inputs, priors on inputs to Bayesian models).
5. Specification of the parameters of a base-case, plus ranges to be explored in alternative sensitivity runs around this base case, for the proposed assessment approaches.
6. Discussion and proposal of biological reference points to be used in generating outputs of trends in relation to these reference points (e.g. B0, BMSY, FMSY, SB40)
7. Discussion and specification of the outputs which should be produced using each assessment approach:
    a. Historical trends in key stock and biological parameters (e.g. biomass, spawner-biomass, catch, effort, recruitment, size-frequency, M, F, F by Cohort and Age)
    b. Historical trends in ratios of above parameters to proposed reference points (e.g. B/B0, B/B_{MSY}, F/F_{MSY}, Spawner-Biomass Ratio).
8. Discussion of projections to be conducted using each assessment approach:
    a. Projection methods and models to be used;
    b. Projection model specifications (e.g. inputs, assumptions, variable specification).
    c. Projection results to be produced (e.g. trends in B, SB, Catch, F, Recruitment, B/B_{MSY}, F/F_{MSY}, Spawner-Biomass Ratio) and probabilities around these projections.
9. Discussion and agreement on preparation and exchange of input data and abundance indices required by the proposed assessment approaches.
10. Timetable and process for inter-sessional exchange and review of data, of assessment results (including independent expert review), and for preparation of final assessment papers for discussion at SPRFMO.