

SEDAR Data Best Practices Standing Panel: Webinar Summary

March 22, 2017 from ~1-2:15pm (EST)

Attendees

- Panel members: Donna Bellais, Karyl Brewster-Geisz, Gary Fitzhugh, Jeff Kipp, Marcel Reichert, Steve Turner, Erik Williams
- Staff: Julia Byrd, John Carmichael, Julie Neer
- Other attendees: Erika Burgess, Rusty Hudson, Damon Morris

Housekeeping/Updates

- SEDAR Data Best Practice Standing Panel 2016 Annual Report has been posted to the SEDAR website and all 2015 Data Best Practice workshop participants and interested parties were notified of its availability; Panel (especially Chair Calay) thanked for their work on report
- Panel reminded that the Stock ID & Meristics Procedural Workshop planned for 2017 has been postponed indefinitely due in large part to budgetary issues; Cooperators were also interested in having the SEDAR Steering Committee continue discussions on the process for defining stock units and the roles of science and management groups within that process; Stock ID for upcoming 2018 Gulf of Mexico (GoM) / South Atlantic (SA) Scamp and Atlantic Cobia assessments will be handled through the Research Track process
- Panel updated on progress of the Research Track / Operational Assessment approach; SEDAR Steering Committee approved use of the Research Track for the 2018 GoM/SA Scamp and Atlantic Cobia assessments at their Fall 2016 meeting; SEDAR staff and SEFSC personnel have been working to develop guidelines for the Research Track process that will be presented to the SEDAR Steering Committee for consideration at their Spring 2017 meeting
- SEDAR Steering Committee spring meeting: Friday, May 5 from 9am-12pm (EST) via webinar; webinar registration will be available on the SEDAR website once the date gets closer

SEDAR Data Best Practices Feedback Update

- Panel received the following meeting materials summarizing Data Best Practice feedback
 - Excerpt from SEDAR 50 Data Workshop (DW) Report compiling Data Best Practice feedback received by SEDAR 50 DW Panelists
 - Updated Data Issue Inventory – updated based on feedback received to date
 - Data Best Practice Feedback Summary – document summarizing all Data Best Practice feedback received to date; provides more detail than Data Issue Inventory
 - GoM and SA Blueline Tilefish Management History documents to provide examples for the ‘Management History Template’ issue
- Panel walked through the Data Best Practice Feedback Summary document; questions and key points from the group’s discussion are highlighted below; the Feedback Summary document is provided at the end of the webinar summary
- Data Process Timeline:
 - Panel members had questions about how the Data Stage will work under Research Track and Operational Assessments; in preliminary stages of developing guidelines for this new approach, so details on how the Data Stage will work are still being developed

- Panel member noted that other working groups (WG) may be interested in having working paper ‘timeline’ similar to the Indices WG (e.g. Indices WG members provide a presentation at the start of the DW with details on methodology for preliminary index development and the working paper isn’t provided until post-DW); was noted this may especially be true as the number of participants providing data for an analysis grows; SEDAR Coordinators noted it is important to provide sufficient information in advance or at least at the beginning of DW for Panel members to be able to make informed decisions; Panel members for some projects have noted concerns when working papers are not provided in advance of DW; may need to revisit this subject after the Data Stage for the Research Track process is further developed
- Life History Data Standardization & Metadata: Panel member noted that it will be important to notify the people who didn’t provide data in recommended format, so when they submit data for future assessments this will not be an issue again
- Age Determination:
 - Group currently working to update the GSMFC Ageing Manual and efforts are underway to expand that manual to the Atlantic coast; manual includes information on age determination; Standing Panel could potentially consider citing the updated Age Manual as ‘Data Best Practice’
 - In addition to updating/developing the manual, there are also efforts to develop reference collections and training sets to assist life history personnel
 - J. Kipp is involved in the efforts to bring the ageing manual to the Atlantic coast; group is meeting for last time next week and he will bring up the possibility of framing the manual for possible use as ‘Data Best Practice’; hope to have manual complete by the end of 2017
- TIP sample sizes: Panel members asked for clarification on this issue - believe issue is that the number of sample sizes used to develop length comps may sometimes not match the number of samples collected – not that the samples sizes differ between the TIP and other databases; this would provide an opportunity to provide an explanation for discrepancies in samples sizes used for length comps vs. sample sizes from data collections; Panel member noted this may not be an issue in the GoM
- Panel members noted that as Data Best Practices issues are identified through DW reports, it would be very useful if DW Panelists could provide specific recommendations and/or feedback on how the identified issue should be approached; the more specific the information provided, the more useful it will likely be
- Panel confirmed the updated Data Issue Inventory document can be posted to the SEDAR website

Data Issue Prioritization & Approach

- Panel felt that it may be better to hold off prioritizing the next issues to address until Data Best Practice feedback is received from additional projects (SEDAR 48 & SEDAR 51), more details are known about the Data Stage under the Research Track/Operational assessment approach, and the SEDAR Steering Committee provides more insight on the Stock ID Process

- Panel briefly discussed criteria to help prioritize issues and identified the following potential criteria
 - Consider if the issue is identified by DW panelists from multiple projects, regions and/or Cooperators
 - Consider potential impact of the issue on assessment; does it have the potential to cause delays and/or stop an assessment from being completed?
 - Consider whether or not issue has potential to impact multiple assessments
 - Consider if issue was identified during the original 2015 Data BP workshop, but wasn't addressed and has subsequently been identified as a priority by DW Panel
 - Consider what information is available to potentially address the issue
- Panel member noted there were still a number of topics in the Data Issue Inventory where Data BP recommendations have not yet been developed; will be important to prioritize which of these issues should be tackled next; SEDAR will develop survey for Panel members to rank these issues as high, medium, low priority; results will be provided before the Panel's next webinar to help inform discussions
- Panel member noted it may be helpful to consider using working groups to develop preliminary Data BP recommendations for the Standing Panel to consider; this will help ensure that the topical data 'experts' are involved in developing recommendations and will help the Panel work through the remaining issues more efficiently
- Due to the budgetary climate, SEDAR staff noted that Data BP work would likely need to be conducted via webinar or conference call as there will likely not be funding available to support in-person Data BP workshops in the near future
- SEDAR Coordinators noted it would be helpful to have Panel feedback on the preferred Management History template on the next webinar; Panel members were asked to consult with individuals in their lab (especially those that develop FD indices and/or bycatch estimation) to help determine which template is preferred; see GoM and SA Blueline Tilefish Management Histories for example templates

ACTION ITEMS:

• **JULIA:**

- Share meeting summary with Panel for review
- Post updated Data Issue Inventory and finalized meeting summary to SEDAR website
- Develop survey to help prioritize topics in the Data Issue Inventory where Data BP recommendation have not yet been developed

• **ALL PANEL MEMBERS:**

- Review topics in the Data Issue Inventory where recommendations have not been developed; begin to think about potential information that could be available to address remaining issues
- Consult individuals within your lab or who you regularly work with on SEDAR projects to help determine preferred management history template

Next Meeting

- **Next Standing Panel webinar will be in July 2017;** this will allow time for additional Data BP feedback from on-going benchmark assessments and more guidance on Stock ID process and Research Track; this timing should also allow for more information to be available about the topics and timing for the joint GoM and SA SSC meeting
- Julia will send doodle poll in the upcoming months to select date/time for next webinar

Additional materials provided:

- Excerpt from SEDAR 50 Data Workshop (DW) Report compiling Data Best Practice feedback received by SEDAR 50 DW Panelists
- Updated Data Issue Inventory – updated based on SEDAR 50 DW report feedback and additional feedback provided to SEDAR Coordinators; new language in red font to easily identify

FEEDBACK/ISSUES WITH CURRENT DATA BEST PRACTICES

- **Data Process Timeline / Data Deadlines**
 - Stock ID
 - Stock ID decision timing not followed for SEDAR 50 (Atlantic Blueline Tilefish); discussions started in June 2016 but final Stock ID decision not made until Dec 2016; delay in this decision caused timeline to be severely compressed and caused some deadlines to be missed
 - Stock ID decision timing also not followed for SEDAR 51 (Gulf of Mexico Gray Snapper); people who weren't involved in the stock ID discussions did not agree with the decision made and this held up the process and caused some deadlines to be missed
 - SEDAR 50 Indices WG recommendation: stagger deadlines for final working papers and draft DW report section; per Best Practice, the Indices WG does not provide working papers until after the DW; would like working paper deadline to be in advance of draft DW report section deadline
 - Is there a need to clarify who data needs to be submitted to for the deadlines outlined in this Timeline (e.g. does raw data just need to be provided to those who are doing subsequent analyses or do others - analyst/compiler/WG leaders - also want the data) or can this be decided on a project level?
 - As FYI – SEFSC analytical teams and SEDAR are working to develop DRAFT Research Track guidelines for SEDAR Steering Committee review at their Spring 2017 meeting; preliminary discussions indicate Data Best Practices Timeline may require revision to adapt to Research Track approach
- **Stock Boundary Issue**
 - There have been issues with the Stock ID decision process in both SEDAR 50 and SEDAR 51; may need to revisit Data Best Practice recommendations on this topic, but will need further guidance from the SEDAR Steering Committee before Standing Panel can address
 - As FYI - at March 2017 SAFMC meeting, Council staff directed to work with GMFMC, SEFSC, SERO, and MRIP to convene a joint SA and GoM SSC meeting which would consider unit stock definitions as applied in management and assessment, with the goal of identifying stocks that require further stock ID evaluations and stocks that have adequate and acceptable definitions to address management and assessment needs; meeting would also address regional MRIP issues (see more details under 'Data quality in the MRFSS/MRIP Datasets')

- **Life History Data Standardization & Metadata**
 - SEDAR 50 DW: all Life History data providers did not submit data in standardized format; not issue with Best Practice recommendation – just that it was not followed by all data providers
- **Data quality in the MRFSS / MRIP Datasets**
 - SEDAR 50 DW: Recreational WG identified an outlier data point in discard estimates in one year; they recommended following the best practice (provide all background information, CV's, etc. on outlier point; do not recommend changing the data - leave that up to the digression of the AW Panel); members of the Analytical Team thought the Recreational WG was the more appropriate group to recommend changes to outlier data points; ultimately the DW Panel's consensus was to change the outlier data point using a three year average
 - SEDAR 50 Recreational WG noted additional clarification was needed for reconciling MRIP data outliers
 - There currently seem to be differing opinions on who is the most appropriate group to reconcile MRIP data outliers (data providers vs. AW Panel)
 - As FYI - at March 2017 SAFMC meeting, Council staff directed to work with GMFMC, SEFSC, SERO, and MRIP to convene a joint SA and GoM SSC meeting which would address regional MRIP issues, such as excessive catch estimate uncertainty and challenges of developing estimates for rare occurrence species; meeting would also discuss Stock ID (see more details under 'Stock Boundary Issue')
- **Uncertainty Estimates for Commercial Landings**
 - SEDAR 50 Commercial WG supported holding a workshop to further develop 'Uncertainty Estimates for Commercial Landings' best practices; this workshop was first recommended during the SEDAR Data Best Practice June 2015 workshop
- **Management History Template**
 - In fall 2016, SEDAR Coordinators became aware that different Excel management history templates were being used for SEDAR projects (see example Blueline Tilefish management history templates for the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico)
 - Data BP initially recommended a Excel template that contained two worksheets summarizing commercial and federal regulations (see South Atlantic BLT for example); different template was developed and used for SEDAR data limited assessment projects that contains multiple worksheets organized by topic (gears, spatial closures, possession limits, size limits, etc. – see Gulf of Mexico BLT for example)
 - May need further discussion on preferred management template and if preferred template differs regionally or per assessment type (e.g. data limited vs. single species) – so that SEDAR Coordinators can provide preferred template for assessments

FEEDBACK ON NEW ISSUES FOR DATA BEST PRACTICE CONSIDERATION

- SEDAR 50 Life History WG recommendation: Develop and recommend use of methods to provide growth parameter and natural mortality estimates in cases where no reliable data are available (see 'Growth & Natural Mortality without Age Data' in updated draft Data Issue Inventory for additional information)

- SEDAR 50 Life History WG recommendation: supported developing 'Age Determination' best practices as described in the Data Issue Inventory; this topic was added to the Data Issue Inventory by the Data BP Standing Panel in September 2016
- SEDAR Coordinator potential topic for consideration: develop best practice for TIP length sample sizes to be reviewed by state agency representatives (or others? - similar to how ACCSP works with state agency representatives when compiling South Atlantic landings); this would potentially provide an opportunity to compare sample size numbers used in length comps with sample size numbers from data collection; if numbers aren't similar, would provide an opportunity for explanation for discrepancy; issue brought up to SEDAR Coordinator by fishermen and state agency representatives; added to Data Issue Inventory (see 'TIP Sample Size' in updated draft inventory) in March 2017

DRAFT