Annex 2: Terms of Reference for the Peer Review

Terms of Reference for the Peer Review

Level 1 and Level 2 Essential Fish Habitat Models for the
Main Hawaiian Islands Uku (*Aprion virescens*)

External Independent Peer Review under the Western Pacific Stock Assessment Review framework: Level 1 and Level 2 Essential Fish Habitat Models for the Main Hawaiian Islands Uku (*Aprion virescens*).

For questions 1-7 and their subcomponents, reviewers shall provide a "yes" or "no" answer and will not provide an answer of "maybe". Only if necessary, caveats may be provided to these yes or no answers, but when provided they must be as specific as possible to provide direction and clarification to NMFS.

1. Of the data considered for inclusion in the EFH model, were final decisions on inclusion/exclusion of particular data appropriate, justified, and well-documented?

2. Are the data properly applied and appropriate for this species and habitat?

3. Are the models used reliable, properly applied, adequate, and appropriate for the species, habitat, and available data?

4. Are decision points and input parameters reasonably chosen?

5. Are primary sources of uncertainty documented and presented?

6. Are model assumptions reasonably satisfied?

7. Are the final results scientifically sound, particularly delineating EFH boundaries?

8. Can the results be used to address management goals stated in the relevant FEP or other documents provided to the review panel? If any results of these models should not be applied for management purposes with or without minor short-term further analyses (in other words, if any responses to any parts of questions 1-7 are "no"), indicate:

    Which results should not be applied and describe why, and

    Which alternative set of existing EFH definitions should be used to inform uku EFH instead and describe why.

9. As needed, suggest recommendations for future improvements and research priorities. Indicate whether each recommendation should be addressed in the short/immediate term (2 months), mid-term (3-5 years) and long-term (5-10 years). Also indicate whether each recommendation is high priority (likely most affecting results and/or interpretation), mid priority, or low priority.

10. Draft a report (individual reports from each of the panel members and an additional Summary Report from Chair) addressing the above TOR questions.