



**Social Science Planning Committee**

**Thursday, March 28, 2019  
1:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. (HST)**

**Western Pacific Fishery Management Council  
1164 Bishop Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813**

**Draft Report**

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Craig Severance, chair, welcomed participants and guided introductions.

Present in person were Craig Severance, Kirsten Leong, Justin Hospital, Adam Ayers, and Michelle McGregor. Council staff present were Marlowe Sabater and Thomas Remington.

Attending the meeting via teleconference were Judy Amesbury, Noelani Puniwai, and Debra Cabrera.

**2. Approval of Agenda**

Severance noted that Ayers added an item to Other Business.

Motion to approve agenda. Moved by Amesbury, seconded by Leong. Motion passed.

**3. Annual/Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation Report Module Preparation**

Hospital presented on the preparation for the annual SAFE report socioeconomics module in preparation for Plan Team meetings in early May 2019. Within these modules, Leong has largely drafted the background information (people who fish, relevant communities, cost of fishing, etc.). Updates for the 2018 report include the non-commercial module getting revamped as well as focus on MRIP/charter fishing. Additionally, economics data will be improved; trends in pounds sold and revenues for MUS will ideally be reported. The report, however, is not meant to be universally comprehensive. Each year, the author should see if anything is new, and append that to the previous year's draft.

The issue of numbers not lining up last year was primarily due to differences in the species list, data streams, and/or gear organization. There still seems to be confusion in this aspect of data organization for the socioeconomics module. Council staff met with Stefanie Dukes, who noted that WPacFIN did a data freeze on March 15<sup>th</sup> of this year. She is having trouble with the economics module because one of the data managers has been processing data using a different species list.

One possibility mentioned was that the Ongoing Research section could report surveys that are being completed at the time of publication, etc., for different fisheries in the W. Pacific region. The SSPC believes that such a table would be helpful, and that the most recent data available alongside a projection of upcoming research tasks would both be good to display.

Hospital also presented a data portal that displayed the amount of data/data availability for commercial and non-commercial data between regions (CFEAI-RFEAI).

The SSPC reached consensus on including the tables emphasizing the age of data into the socioeconomic module of the annual SAFE report(s), alongside the schedule of forthcoming data collection(s).

#### **4. Review structure and process for considering Social Economic Ecological and Management (SEEM) information in setting ACLs**

Hospital shared a document on an M\* process that he had been developing since the previous year. The SSPC has been looking to improve the SEEM process so as to make it more consistent with respect to management uncertainty. In past SEEM analyses on regional fisheries (like deep 7 bottomfish), ACLs have been reduced, but the question persists if they are reducing below the threshold already created by the P\* analysis.

There has been some redundancy between P\* and SEEM in the past, allowing the analyses to act as a buffer for the ACL. Council staff noted that the SSPC has only been considering management uncertainties between ACL and ABC, whereas P\* can cover those measures as well; managers need to be careful in double-counting sources of uncertainty in this way. A clear mechanism is needed as to what reason managers would want to increase/reduce a particular quota for a stock in the midst of a SEEM process. This has been difficult in the past because the right people aren't in the room, or there is a lack of certainty in drawing connections between environmental considerations and fishery performance.

Hospital proposed M\* independent of P\* as an additional consideration when setting the final ACL. There is some overlap between the two parameters, as they do generate reported/unreported catch ratios. These processes are highly standardized and can be applied to different sorts of fisheries.

As long as the SEEM process stands to be improved and actions are taken towards that, responsibilities associated with this issue will begin to be fulfilled. The SSPC agreed to work on the draft framework and think about enforcement, the different dimensions to compliance, and perhaps other dimensions might be nested within these processes. The subjective nature of this type of scoring emphasizes why this process needs to be done in a group setting.

A SEEM meeting will be convened for Kona crab before June, and a subsequent process for territory bottomfish. Staff assured that there will be territory folks present for WPSAR, and that they would continue to make efforts to have folks present for SEEM and P\* processes moving forward.

## **5. Options to establish carry over provision in setting ACLs**

Council staff presented a quick update on the options to establish a carry-over provision for the implementation of ACLs. Options had been considered previously (e.g. in the Deep 7 Bottomfish fishery), but the current ACL was deemed high enough so as to not provide enough incentive to the fishermen if only 50-70% of the new ACL would be caught annually. At the same time, NMFS has had several working groups to discuss the application of carry-over and phase-in provision for federal fisheries. The working group (including Council staff) is done with a draft report, which will be presented to the CCC meeting in May 2019. NMFS will likely ask the committees and SSCs from the different regions to review this technical memorandum. The SSPC should wait until we get a hold of this guidance document and look at what it offers in terms of guidance prior to moving forward in other ways.

## **6. Discussion and Recommendations**

- **Refine the framework of the SEEM process, especially with regard to better describing the “Enforcement” and “Monitoring” dimensions of the management uncertainty with more robust ideas on how the “Social” and “Economic” dimensions might be consistently implemented. (Working group: Ayers, Hospital, Severance, and Leong).**
- **Convene a SEEM process meeting for the 2018 Benchmark Kona crab stock assessment before the June 2019 Council meeting, and ensure that at least one social scientist is a part of the SEEM working group.**

## **7. Other Business**

Ayers presented on oral surveys to be conducted with Council staff looking at different spikes in protected species interactions. The general idea was to interview the fishers, then within a year be able to feed the info back to them in the form of protected species outcomes in a report. Instead of assuming people’s behavior, these surveys can get into actual drivers for the people’s behavior. Ideally, this would be a solution-oriented process not focused on placing blame.

The idea was to better understand some of the common issues of fisheries management from the social science angle. The next objective is to collapse information gleaned from staff at PIFSC and PIRO down into scientific questions that can be implemented into management. There is no information, for instance, on the demographics of the fishing crews. Talking to industry-folks to get a better idea of the profile of crew demographics in an informal and preliminary fashion may be good to do preceding the surveys.

An issue of note included discretion; whoever is doing collection needs to be careful with how they ask the question such that they aren’t “leading” the respondents to certain desirable answers.

It was noted that this survey may involve a more sensitive issue considering protected species (and the swordfish fishery closure), as this survey would inherently include longliners involved in the shallow-set fishery. The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.