

SEDAR – SouthEast Data, Assessment, and Review

Steering Committee Minutes

May 21, 2004

Conference Call

1. Introductions

The meeting convened at 10:00 am.

Steering Committee Members in Attendance:

Roy Crabtree, SERO RA
Nancy Thompson, SEFSC
Wayne Swingle, GMFMC
David Cupka, SAFMC
Bob Mahood, SAFMC
Bobbi Walker, GMFMC
Graciella Garcia-Moliner (for Miguel Rolon, CFMC)
Vince O'Shea, ASMFC

Other Attendees:

John Carmichael, SEDAR
Jerry Scott, SEFSC
Rick Leard, GMFMC
Gregg Waugh, SAFMC

Audience:

Joe Kimmel @ SERO
George Geiger @ SERO
Steve Branstetter @ SERO

2. Review of Agenda

3. SEDAR 4 King Mackerel

A. Process in light of SAFMC SSC rejection

- Joint FMP, so no action can be taken on new assessment information
- SAFMC SSC pointed out a number of failures, largely in documentation and justification for decisions, failure to follow Data Workshop recommendations, and lack of consideration for alternative hypotheses and analyses.
- GMFMC SSC has not reviewed – scheduled for September.
- Varied discussion of how to proceed, perhaps joint SAFMC & GMFMC SSC meeting, perhaps begin planning for new assessment.

SUPPORTED RECOMMENDATION: Following GMFMC SSC review of SEDAR 4 at September 2004 meeting, review SSC recommendations and consider convening joint meeting of GMFMC and SAFMC assessment committees (GMFMC FAP and SAFMC BASC) to discuss any differences, develop a clear list of issues to address when the assessment is reconsidered, develop clear guidance on what is necessary to resolve assessment problems.

B. Potential issues with SEDAR 4 Review Workshop

- Role of Council SSC: Perception that SSC members in the minority at a Review Panel may be more persuasive at the SSC review, or may bring up issues at the SSC but not the Review that ultimately contribute to an SSC rejecting an assessment. There was significant discussion on the pro's and con's of SSC participation at review panels and the role of SSC members who serve on review panels at SSC meetings when the assessment is reviewed.

No action was taken to modify the role of SSC members at review panels or limit their role at SSC meetings.

- Appointment of SERO staff: Could be perceived as violation of independence of review and separation of management and science. Wording in SEDAR Guidelines is not clear, does not specifically prohibit RO staff.

- SUPPORTED RECOMMENDATION: Council and SERO are ineligible to serve as review panelists.

4. Timing of CIE appointments

- CIE members have gotten short notice of workshops, leaving inadequate preparation time. The SEDAR coordinator will work with SEFSC staff to expedite these appointments.

5. Improving SEDAR process

- Some aspects of SEDAR are not clearly described. Examples include the confusion noted above regarding SERO participation at review panels and ongoing debate over who is responsible for writing SEDAR assessment reports. It is recommended that efforts continue to strengthen process guidelines and allow the Steering Committee to focus more on procedures and expectations and less on specific issues and oversight.

- SUPPORTED RECOMMENDATION: Convene an informal Operations Committee to help resolve procedural issues and assist in establishing realistic timelines. The Committee will be composed of representatives from offices with lead responsibility for assessment production: John Carmichael, SEDAR Coordinator; Jerry Scott, SEFSC Miami; Mike Prager, SEFSC Beaufort; a representative from FL FMRI, with Bob Muller suggested.

6. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 pm.