







Data Quality Scores:

The SAP plan describes methods for weighting data quality that were based on the data quality ranking from the fish stock climate vulnerability analysis (Morrison et al. 2015) with an additional category of complete data as described below:

0 = No Data. No information to base an attribute score on. Very little is known about the stock or related stocks and there is no basis for forming an expert opinion (please use judiciously).

1 = General Knowledge from Expert Judgment. The attribute score reflects the expert judgment of the reviewer and is based on their general knowledge of the stock, or other related stocks, and their relative role in the ecosystem.

2 = Limited Data. The score is based on data which has a higher degree of uncertainty. The data used to score the attribute may be based on related or similar stocks or species, come from outside the study area, or the reliability of the source may be limited.

3 = Adequate Data. The score is based on data which have been observed, modeled or empirically measured for the stock in question and comes from a reputable source.

4 = Complete Data. The score is based on very complete data which have been observed, modeled, or empirically measured for the stock in question and are unlikely to be greatly improved or modified with more research or analysis.

Since the primary focus of this discussion paper is to identify methods for estimating Target Frequency, none of the data quality scores were utilized in this exercise.

Species Importance Data:

Scientists from the AFSCs Marine Ecology and Stock Assessment (MESA) program and NOAA Fisheries headquarters developed a google form for use in gathering relevant information for the Species Importance Scoring (SIS):

<https://docs.google.com/a/noaa.gov/spreadsheets/d/1W0NM6BHVX9TsI9XIy8cW8llaoHvxiJt5negEEakDWd4/edit?usp=sharing>

The form was prefilled with a limited amount of available information from the national Species Information System to create the stock profiles for assessment prioritization (and several other things like climate vulnerability and the stock specific ecosystem considerations, Table 3). The amount of pre-filled information varied depending on the stock. For example, the data that was available from the climate vulnerability analysis profiles for stocks in the Bering Sea were entered into the forms. Each stock author was responsible for checking pre-filled data and filling in the remaining information for their assigned stock(s) using two URL links to their assigned forms (Part 1 and Part 2). Part 1 consisted of sections with questions regarding stock status, biological parameters, and economics, while Part 2 had sections on distribution and biology, early life history, movement, habitat, prey, predators, and the ecosystem. Both





























