

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MEMBERSHIP ON RESEARCH TRACK WORKING GROUP FOR
RED HAKE***

(v. 5/28/2019)

Name:

Address:

Email address:

Phone number:

Today's date:

Fill in the focus species or topic of this Research Track: RED HAKE

Selection Criterion #1: Independence (Members of the Research Track WG cannot peer review their own work, and in that sense must have independence.)

Question #1(a). Do you, or will you, serve as a member of another group (e.g., working group, committee, or council) that will peer review the work coming out of this Research Track WG, or make fishery management recommendations based on that work?

Question #1(b). If you answered "yes" to #1(a), please provide additional details here regarding a.) the name of the other group, b.) your role in that group, and c.) types of recommendations that group will make that are based on the work coming out of this Research Track WG.

Selection Criterion #2: Expertise and Education (Members of the Research Track WG must have technical expertise and knowledge required to make meaningful contributions to the research topic or stock assessment, specifically to the science Terms of Reference – see Attachment A.)

Question #2. Describe your areas of expertise, training, and background that relate to carrying out a fishery stock assessment or related analyses for the stock(s) or topics under consideration by the Research Track WG.

*Please note that the number of participants on the Research Track WG is limited and appropriate qualifications do not guarantee you a position as a decision-making member of the WG. Composition and balance of the Research Track WG will also be considered. Public participation in the WG meeting and discussion is still permitted.

Attachment A. Specific Terms of Reference that may be under evaluation by the Research Track Working Group. *Please note that the following Terms of Reference are only a DRAFT and are subject to change.*

1. Review and summarize all relevant literature on the existing stock structure of red hake in the northwest Atlantic.
2. Identify and evaluate any new and/or existing data relevant to the stock structure of red hake including but not limited to the specie's life history (i.e. spawning, distribution, abundance, growth, maturity and natural mortality) morphometrics, genetics.
3. Recommend the most likely biological stock structure among a set of alternatives from TOR2. Consider the current management unit as null hypothesis.
4. Explore the existing assessment model framework based on TOR 3 to apply in a subsequent management track. Propose alternative stock assessment modeling framework to be explored, developed and monitored for peer review in future management track.
5. Identify gaps in the existing research with respect to red hake stock structure. Develop a prioritized list of research recommendations to address these gaps. Comment on the feasibility and time horizon of the proposed research recommendations.