

Suggestions for how to write executive summaries under the current process:

- Use the standard subheadings, which are:
 - Changes from previous assessment
 - Spawning biomass and stock status trends
 - Tier determination/Plan Team discussion and resulting ABCs and OFLs
 - Status determination
 - Ecosystem considerations (this one is optional)
- Do not change the order of the subheadings
- Make sure that items of information are addressed under the appropriate subheading
- For new data listed under “Changes from previous assessment,” distinguish between those items that have an impact on reference points or specifications from those that are presented for information only (alternatively, the latter items may be omitted entirely)
- Under “Spawning biomass and stock status trends,” be sure to mention something about spawning biomass if the stock is managed under Tiers 1-3
 - Discussion of recruitment strengths under this subheading is also useful for stocks managed under Tiers 1-3, as it helps to explain the described trends
- If assessment authors change their estimates of reference points or specifications so that they differ from the values in the chapter that the Team was provided, summary writers should include a comment to that effect in the Google Docs draft of the Intro
- In general, but especially for “off-year” assessments, the amount of text should be roughly proportional to the amount of new information or degree of controversy in the assessment (as opposed to, e.g., making the amount of text proportional to the particular summary writer’s personal interest in the particular stock)
- The fact that a sentence may have been important in some previous year’s summary does not mean that it must be retained for all time (e.g., if a stock was split from a complex, this fact probably does not need to be mentioned once the first year of split management scrolls off the top of the summary table).
- For off-year assessments of stocks managed under Tier 3, make sure to distinguish between the *assessment* model and the *projection* model (e.g., do not say, “The model was re-run...”)

Suggestions for improving the process:

- Change the “Spawning biomass and stock status trends” subheading by deleting the word “status,” so as not to confuse this subheading with the “Status determination” subheading
- Consider requiring that draft summaries be prepared *before* the meeting, using the assumption that the Team will accept all of the authors’ recommendations, then revise each summary real-time, as necessary, when the respective assessment is presented and discussed (one possible benefit: if a critical piece of information is missing from the chapter, this might be caught ahead of time, and the author could be asked for this information while he or she is present, rather than trying to track down authors after they think that they are completely finished and have left for the weekend or are otherwise out of e-mail contact)
- Given that, with the exception of EBS pollock, it is rare for an author or the Team to recommend an ABC other than the maximum permissible level, consider adding a piece of generic text to the start of the “Summaries of Stock Status” section stating that recommended ABCs correspond to the maximum permissible levels unless otherwise specified, and omit references to the maximum permissible level in the species summaries (except for those rare cases where the author or Team recommends something different)