Peer Review of Strategic application of an Atlantis Ecosystem Model for Gulf Shrimp

# Roles

## Meeting Facilitator

Matt Freeman (Gulf Council)

## Review Panel

CIE Reviewers: Drs. Vidette McGregor, Daniel Howell, and Ken Drinkwater

Regional Reviewers: Drs. Luiz Barbieri, Joshua Kilborn, Dave Chagaris

## Project Team

PIs & Co-PIs: Drs Michelle Masi (SEFSC/SERO), Cameron Ainsworth (USF), Isaac Kaplan (NWFSC), Howard Townsend (OST), S. Sagarese (SEFSC), C. Kelble (AOML) and , Mandy Karnauskas (SEFSC)

Modeling Team: Dr. Cameron Ainsworth (USF), Dr. Holly Perryman (USF/IMR), Rebecca Scott (USF)

## Other Attendees

SEFSC and SERO personnel, interested public

# Rules

The NMFS Office of Science and Technology is responsible for strengthening its agency’s science quality assurance in accordance with the mandate of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) that conservation and management measures be based on the best scientific information available. The U.S. Ocean Action Plan states that “The Administration supports the use of peer-reviewed science in resource management decisions” to establish “Standard review procedures and guidelines [to] increase the efficient use of the best available scientific information for management considerations” in response to recommendations by the U.S. Commission to Ocean Policy. The CIE process satisfies peer review standards as specified in the MSA provision National Standard 2 guidelines. These guidelines specify that peer review is an important factor in the determination of best scientific information available, and the selection of reviewers must adhere to peer review standards such as high qualifications, independence, and strict conflict of interest standards. (From: <https://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/science-quality-assurance/cie-peer-reviews/index>).

**Review panel and reports:** CIE Reviewers on the review panel are expected to generate individual peer review reports and an overall group summary report based on the documents received prior to this meeting and presentations given during this meeting. Regional reviewers on the panel are expected to provide comments on the model, and are invited to also submit individual peer review reports and contribute to the overall summary report. The peer review reports should address each Term of Reference and specific revisions needed to achieve Objectives 1-4 outlined in the Terms of Reference.

**Presentations and Question & Answer slots**: With these expectations on the review panel, the panel is given priority for questions to and discussions with the Project Team. After each presentation, time has been allocated for these questions and discussions. Other attendees are asked to hold questions and points of discussion until the end of each day of the Peer Review. A public comment period has been designated each day for this purpose.

**Deliberations and report initiation:** The final day of the review will be set aside for the Review Panel and Project Team to have final discussions and for the Review Panel to deliberate and begin report writing. During the deliberation and report writing, the Project Team and Other Attendees will leave the meeting. The Project Team should remain available in case additional questions arise. When suggesting specific revisions, reviewers should be cognizant of computing requirements of this model framework (i.e. simulation times of 1+ days), so the Project Team will have limited ability to conduct model simulations to answer immediate questions.