

Notes on the stock prioritization discussion at October Council meeting:

Primary concerns raised by Council members were:

- 1- Does the table of assessment frequency accurately represent what was recommended to the Council when it “conditionally approved” the new assessment schedule?
 - a. Answer (after reviewing that evening following the break): Yes. It differs from the Joint Teams recommendations on assessment frequency coming from their January special Plan Team meeting, but it is consistent with the SSC’s recommendations to the Council in February 2017.
- 2- Request to Plan Team representatives present (Armstrong, Ianelli, Stram) to provide the Council some discussion of how the Council may continue to endorse their conditional acceptance of this schedule absent the requested analyses and how best to ensure that the efficiencies gained in this new process will not allow for straying from sound science to inform management.
 - a. Answer (following day): In first year of new cycle, still sufficient time to begin to address the Council’s concerns and intend to discuss moving forward on these fronts at the November Plan Team meeting.

Three analyses requested by the Council:

- 1- Cost/benefit framework be developed for use at the end of the 4-year cycle to see if there were any costs/benefits associated with moving to this new cycle. Here we indicated that this could be developed starting now and would thus be in place in time for the backwards review at year 4.
- 2- Evaluation of the necessity of increasing the buffer between OFL and ABC under a less frequent assessment cycle. Here we indicated that this evaluation has not been sufficiently thought through yet in how we would evaluate this. We will begin the discussion of this at the Plan Team meeting.
- 3- Risk analysis for GOA flatfish stocks under the new assessment cycle. Here we indicated that this was difficult in the first year of this cycle due to staffing and relative workloads.

For all three we suggested the Plan Teams begin (at November Plan Team meeting) to discuss how best to move forward with all three and which agency should take the lead in developing the discussion papers and analysis.