



Social Science Planning Team

REPORT

May 7- May 9, 2019

Hilton Hotel, Fireweed Room, Anchorage, AK

The Social Science Planning Team (SSPT) met for its annual in-person meeting. The group discussed the Data Gap Analysis, Economic Data Reports, the use of qualitative information in the fisheries management, and new and underrepresented research relevant to the North Pacific, as well as receiving an update on the Fishery Ecosystem Plan action modules. Full meeting agenda, reference documents, and all public comments submitted for considerations are included on the electronic agenda:

<https://meetings.npfmc.org/Meeting/Details/746>

Members in attendance:

Sally Bibb (NMFS)
Courtney Carothers (University of Alaska Fairbanks)
Sam Cunningham (NPFMC)
Mike Downs (SSC; Northern Economics)
Mike Fey (AKFIN)
Jim Fall (ADF&G)

Elizabeth Figus (NPFMC)
Steve Kasperski, **Chair** (AFSC)
Seth Macinko (University of Rhode Island)
Sarah Marrinan, **Coordinator** (NPFMC)
Matt Reimer (SSC; University of Alaska Anchorage)
Marysia Szymkowiak (AFSC)

Others in attendance:

Lauren Divine (Aleut Community of St. Paul Island), Diana Evans (NPFMC), Shannon Gleason, NPFMC), Anna Henry (NPFMC), Scott Miller (NMFS), *Megan Peterson (Monterey Bay Aquarium and Ocean Conservancy), ±Joe Terry (Retired NMFS), *Julie Raymond-Yakoubian (Kawerak), ±Brian Garber-Yonts (AFSC)

± Presented to the SSPT

* Attended via teleconference

Contents

Introduction, objectives, and relationship between the Data Gap Analysis and the Economic Data Reports 2
Data Gap Analysis 2
Highlighting New or Underrepresented Research 5
Qualitative information in fisheries management 7
Economic Data Reports 8
Bering Sea Fishery Ecosystem Plan Update 10
Research gaps and SSPT priorities for filling priorities 11
Meeting wrap up and next steps 11

Introduction, objectives, and relationship between the Data Gap Analysis and the Economic Data Reports

Topic 1 on the agenda was introduction, objectives, and housekeeping. The SSPT opened its meeting with introductions of members present and welcomed new members Jim Fall (ADF&G) and Courtney Carothers (UAF).

Steve Kasperski reviewed the following objectives for the SSPT meeting:

- Discuss the draft data gap analysis (DGA) and create a plan for the next draft,
- Discuss Economic Data Report (EDR) discussion paper, the Council's April 2019 request to the SSPT, and the next steps for the SSPT regarding EDRs,
- Build social science (including economic) capacity in the Council staff, bodies, and processes, and
- Develop a shared understanding of social science and management issues, challenges, and potential solutions.

The SSPT discussed the relationship between the DGA and EDR program review the Council requested the SSPT undertake (**Topic 2 on the agenda**). The DGA is a big-picture, future-looking project focusing on identifying gaps in social, socio-cultural, and economic data needed to meet legal and policy requirements and to understand and analyze the direct and indirect impacts of Council actions. The SSPT reviewed a draft of the DGA (version 3 or v.3) at this meeting. The comments by SSPT members on the DGA prior to the SSPT meeting were grouped into three categories for further discussion: (1) easy fixes that do not require discussion by the SSPT to address, (2) proposed organizational revisions that require discussion by the SSPT, and (3) major revisions that require further SSPT discussion. More detail on the DGA and the SSPT review and recommendations are provided under Topic 3 below.

In April 2019, the Council requested that the SSPT review the EDR discussion paper and provide recommendations to the Council at its June 2019 meeting about which aspects of the review of the current EDRs are within the scope and capability of the SSPT to undertake. In addition, the Council requested that the SSPT develop a plan for conducting the review of current EDRs to include opportunities for public input during the review, the work products that would be needed from staff to conduct the review, and a projected timeline for the review. The SSPT also noted the Council's request to consider in the EDR review the goals of reducing duplicating, creating more consistency, and considering the effects of data aggregation. In weighing all of these goals, SSPT members noted the trade-offs in maintaining a consistent time series of data and the potential benefits of revising some elements of the EDRs.

The data collected through the four current EDRs are primarily economic in nature, but some data also are used in social impact assessments. Some of the data gaps identified in the DGA may be related to data that is or could be collected through EDRs, thus the coordination of these documents and timeline for efforts will be important. However, the EDRs are not the appropriate vehicle to collect all of the data gaps identified in the DGA. Other methods that could be used to collect data identified in the DGA include mail/web surveys, existing permit or other administrative forms, in-person surveys and fieldwork, and through expanding partnerships with other stakeholders or organizations. More detail on the DGA and the SSPT review and recommendations are provided under Topics 3 and 11 below.

Data Gap Analysis

The Data Gap Analysis (DGA) is a document conceived by the SSPT that highlights gaps in available social and economic data that are necessary to understand changes in net benefits and direct/indirect impacts of fishery management decisions in the North Pacific. This document is being developed to aid the SSPT in its mission of improving the quality and application of social science data that inform

management decision-making and program evaluation. The intent is to highlight (and later prioritize and seek ways to address) these data gaps so that the Council may better meet its own program objectives as well as the requirements defined in Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) and other legal requirements.

Joe Terry (NMFS retired) presented the current version of the Data Gap Analysis (DGA v.3) (**Topic 3 on the agenda**). To date this document has been authored by Joe Terry, Steve Kasperski and Marysia Szymkowiak, with feedback from the group. However, the intention is that SSPT members will all become co-authors of this document as members contribute -- especially to sections related to their areas of expertise.

The document presented to the group is organized into categories of producers, consumers, communities of place and practice, and external costs. This organization for the DGA was primarily driven by the standard framework to collect economic data needed to comply with requirements under EO 12866 to evaluate changes in net benefits to the Nation including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety, and other advantages; distributive impacts; and equity.

While it was acknowledged that this was a fairly broad and inclusive scope for social science data gaps, there was concern that focusing on the “net benefits” framework was using an economic lens to attempt to capture both economic and social data gaps. While the document makes the distinction that distributional impacts and equity issues should be included in the consideration of net benefits, this is not the way people always think about benefits and could understate their importance, especially the non-economic social impacts and distributional impacts of management actions. There was also concern voiced that this would encourage monetization of certain values that may be better explained through alternate measures. Some members felt that framing the issues from an economic point of view results in a document that is too narrow to capture some types of social data gaps.

Three solutions were discussed to address the challenge of document organization. The group could attempt to reorganize the document seeking a compromise framework that would allow for better incorporation of concepts from different disciplines. The group could consider a framework, such as in Breslow et al. (2016) that considers a broad conceptual framework like human well-being, of which economic dimensions are only one component. Key social data considerations like resource access and self-determination would be more central in this type of framework. Thirdly, the data gaps on non-economic social concepts could be decoupled from the existing document and addressed separately. Several members felt it may be difficult to disentangle some of the social data gaps from economic data gaps. Sometimes the same types of data may be used in different ways to address impacts from different angles. For example, vessel diversification data at the vessel-level versus tying that vessel to owner community and considering diversification as it relates to communities. The SSPT did not make a determination at this point but agreed to reinitiate this discussion on Thursday (Topic 11) once members had more time to consider these possibilities. Despite the many ways of structuring the DGA, one member reminded the group to focus on the end-goal of the DGA. That member felt that the focus should be on ensuring that the content within whatever organization is chosen is adequately cross-disciplinary and comprehensive so that the SSPT can use the DGA to begin addressing important data gaps.

SSPT members commented directly in the draft DGA document. Additional suggestions/discussion throughout the presentations included:

- Different types of introductions to the analysis. The introduction is currently focused around a selection of specific Magnuson-Stevens Act requirements; however, as described in the following section of the document there are many laws that pertain to the social science needed for monitoring and evaluation of fisheries in the North Pacific. An additional suggestion was to use the introduction as a way to frame some of the concepts that involve a broader scope (e.g. data and concepts of well-being) or to highlight some of the variations in economic and non-economic social science data gaps.

- Several people highlighted the need to develop an executive summary and/or summary for each section to highlight the data gaps in a more succinct, user-friendly way. This document is intended to cast a wide net, but as a next step, a concise list of data gaps could aid in the process of seeking to address them.
- Focus on the data gaps specifically versus research gaps. These concepts are clearly interrelated, and likely a discussion of research/ methodological gaps will be a next step.
- Members seemed to agree that the focus should be areas where the Council has authority and data gaps related to areas where the Council's authority could generate both direct and indirect impacts. For example, management decisions could affect the subsistence harvest of marine mammals.
- There was discussion, without clear consensus, about whether it would be advantageous to include a description of the data we do have.

The SSPT revisited the DGA discussion at the end of the meeting and spent some time discussing specific ways to frame the data categories that are used in the DGA (**Topic 11 on the agenda**). Discussion focused on the organization of draft DGA document reviewed the previous day and the framework that was more oriented toward economic analyses than non-economic social science analyses. This created challenges in efficiently integrating some non-economic social science data. It was recognized that economic and non-economic analyses often draw on a common set of data (e.g., multiple types of fishery engagement and dependency data) that can be viewed from different perspectives and usefully aggregated or disaggregated in different ways (e.g., the distribution of sectors across communities). However, there are also types of data that are more frequently if not exclusively used for one or the other types of analyses (e.g., measures of market concentration or indicators of well-being).

The discussion of the reorganization of the DGA focused on capturing the range of data gaps that exist for both economic and non-economic social science analyses, while minimizing redundancy. Out of that discussion came the following structure:

1. Commercial
2. Recreational
3. Subsistence
4. Fishing Communities
5. Unit of Analysis
 1. Individual/households
 2. Community and region
 3. Tribe
 4. Entity
 5. Nation

These categories are not intended to be mutually exclusive; they are intended for some overlap which could provide an opportunity to consider data gaps for similar topics in a different context.

To allow all SSPT members to effectively contribute to subsequent revision of the DGA, it was decided that as a first step following the meeting, the main contributors to DGA v.3 would recast that document, taking the existing information and reorganizing it into the new categories of presentation. Only after that reorganization was completed would the DGA be opened for interactive revisions by the entire SSPT. A

subgroup of SSPT members agreed to work on reorganizing this document prior to the November 2019 meeting.

Also discussed was the fact that revisions to the DGA will be an iterative process. It was agreed that the DGA should be updated every so often to help others identify what gaps remain and what new ones have been identified. The value of a new, holistic introduction that would more clearly lay out the economic and non-economic social science aspects of the undertaking was noted. This could usefully be framed around the idea of plural sets of values with respect to marine resources, the concept of well-being on a range of analytic levels, and/or the concept of social benefits, noting that at present economic data gaps are more clearly defined than social data gaps.

Further, it was noted that as individual SSPT members contribute data categories, data needs, and analytic perspectives to the reorganized document, it is possible that additional reorganization will prove useful, especially as both potential direct and indirect effects of Council actions are considered (e.g., impacts to support services or other fisheries).

No public testimony was given at this time (Topic 4 on the agenda).

Highlighting New or Underrepresented Research

Matt Reimer, Mike Downs, and Courtney Carothers presented on some of their recent research that is relevant to fisheries management (**Topic 5 on the agenda**).

Matt Reimer: Using network analysis to identify cross-fishery spillovers

Matt presented ongoing and published research he has been involved with surrounding the use of network analysis to identify cross-fishery spillovers in the North Pacific. Many fishermen in North Pacific fisheries participate in multiple fisheries. There has been past research that has shown that diversification mitigates risks, e.g. associated with policy, environmental shocks, etc. Another way of thinking about this is how do policy changes in a single fishery induce spillover effects into another fishery (in terms of increased participation in the latter after a policy change in the former)? And, how do we measure and summarize cross-fishery participation?

Network theory can be used to visualize where this cross-participation is taking place and serve as a baseline for where things are now and for thinking about how policy changes may affect shifts in fisheries down the road. A network consists of nodes (people or vessels) and edges or the connections between nodes (with potential directionality and weights assigned to those edges).

- In this approach a node is a fishery (size denotes number of participants), the edge connects two nodes if there is one shared participant, the weight of edge denotes number of shared participants
- Network theory provides statistics/metrics to look at networks over time.

Networks provide a good way to visualize fisheries and answer “what fisheries share the most participants” and “what groups of fisheries share participants”. Networks also help to summarize overall connectivity (system resilience). Find groups (or clusters) of fisheries that are more likely to share fishery participants, track migration of fishers between fisheries over time.

An example was presented on changes in participation after the implementation of the BSAI crab rationalization program for the Bering Sea red king crab fishery. This research indicates that the crab fisheries did not create a large spillover effect into other fisheries. It did result in huge consolidation of the fleet but many of those vessels dropped out of the system. The remaining vessel had a short adjustment period and then went back to their previous participation patterns with respect to the other fisheries that they participate in.

There are disadvantages to using network theory including that the data requirements are large, very computationally intensive, and visualization challenges. It is difficult to attribute causality to changes in the network. Past behavior does not necessarily represent future behavior after policy change. Network metrics do not necessarily have an easy interpretation within the context of fisheries and policy. Because of these factors, it is difficult to communicate results to decision makers. Resultant metrics are best presented as just the existence of spillover and large and small effects. However, this research does show that there are spillover effects, which in itself is important to convey.

Matt described some of his additional research which is an effort to develop local economic multipliers for Alaskan communities. This research uses landings data and fishery revenues based on permit holders and vessel owners and ALARI data to map how fishery revenue streams affect other industries within a community. This study will be going through the review process shortly.

Mike Downs: Mid-Atlantic Regional Council evaluation of the Surfclam/Ocean Quahog ITQ Program

Mike presented on the Mid-Atlantic Regional Council evaluation of the Surfclam/Ocean Quahog ITQ Program which he participated in. In this catch share program review, the analysts utilized engagement indices and local and regional quotients to track community participation over time. These indices are particularly useful when there are confidentiality issues in showing community participation information. The analysts developed questions to examine each component of the NMFS Guidance for conducting reviews of Catch Share Programs. Those questions were examined using time-series indicators and each section tried to draw some conclusions about how the program had done with respect to each topic area.

The analysis showed steep drop-offs in participation in some communities while increasing in others. This analysis was particularly interesting relative to catch share programs in the North Pacific because this program did not have community protection provisions.

Courtney Carothers: Review of literature that can inform the fisheries management process

Courtney provided a list of literature that focused on equity and access, well-being, indigenous stewardship, and advancing research approaches/ understanding of social sciences.

In addition, Courtney presented on a well-being framework that cross-disciplinary teams are increasingly utilizing to understand how humans conceive of their well-being (e.g., Breslow et al. 2016; Donkersloot et al. 2019). This framework provides another way of thinking about how to frame the data gap analysis, wherein economic dimensions are just one component of a larger social system important to understanding human well-being. Economics is the most utilized social science field in informing the fisheries management process right now, but scientific advances in anthropology and political science indicate the importance of including other components of human well-being in assessing fishery systems (e.g., cultural values and practices, family connections, place and livelihood attachments, institutions). These social and cultural dimensions are especially important for informing our understanding of how fishery policy changes may affect individuals and communities.

The literature presented also explored how to develop indicators to measure various components of well-being (e.g., Breslow et al. 2017). Indicators suites should mix objective and subjective measures and be developed with local stakeholder input. Social scientists are highlighting the need for equity and social justice indicators in the process as overarching themes that cross many of these dimensions of well-being. At the most basic level this would necessitate demographic information, which largely is not collected in the North Pacific fisheries.

Qualitative information in fisheries management

Marysia Szymkowiak led a discussion about qualitative information in the fisheries management process (**Topic 6 on the agenda**). She stated that it is important for the SSPT to be able to highlight the difference between anecdotal information versus systematically collected qualitative information; an issue that has come up before at the Council.

NMFS (AFSC and AKRO staff) was hoping to create a project for an Alaska Sea Grant Fellow to prepare a guidance document for how qualitative information could be better incorporated into the Council process, including a description of different methodologies, how this information can be robust, and how it could be applied in the process. However, a Sea Grant fellow was not placed with NMFS in this cycle for this task; therefore, the group will need to rethink the use for a project like this and how it may be accomplished if there is merit.

Members noted that in light of recent confusion in the Council process between the difference in scientific qualitative methodology and anecdotal information, they would still consider this effort useful. For instance, some information that gets characterized as anecdotal in an analysis is really local knowledge and could be better documented as such to be more transparent about the sampling methodology.

The scope of this effort and the resources for its completion were further discussed. Was it intended to be more abstract/ theoretical or applied specifically to analyses in the North Pacific? If specific to the North Pacific region, is this work meant to be general guidance on best practices or more of a step-by-step guide for analysts? Who would prepare this work and how would it be funded?

The SSPT hopes for this effort to be applied and specific to the North Pacific, but in order to get to a place where a more specific application of this guidance could be formed, a first stage of this effort could be to present on current literature and recent examples. This information is more readily available. Several members (Courtney Carothers, Mike Downs and Jim Fall) volunteered to form a sub-group to work on the first stage of this effort. An article by Charnley et al. (2017; see list of literature provided by Courtney) provides a good overview for understanding the best available social science and how it is used by the US Forest Service. This paper could be part of a presentation to the Council and paired with additional case studies.

More effort would be needed to translate that academic work into the practical. A second step would be preparing guidance for staff on best practices for conducting qualitative methods, how to appropriately use the resulting social science information, and how to evaluate and incorporate the best peer-reviewed literature. SSPT members noted that there is an analytical template that Council staff rely on to guide the preparation of analyses and ensure compliance with legal standards (a copy is now posted on the SSPT agenda). In addition, there are plans to prepare analyst guidance on a short-form Social Impact Assessment (SIA); perhaps this work could be tied together. However, the group was unsure how this second step would be accomplished in terms of who would do the work and where the funding would come from. Sea Grant has been an effective source for researchers/ analysts in the past and the scope of projects can be established more generally. However, the agency would not be able to apply again until November. A graduate student could be considered, although that may require access to greater (undefined) funding and a graduate student may not yet have the experience to be producing a “best-practices” tool kit for analysts.

Public testimony was received by Julie Raymond-Yakoubian (Kawarek) and Lauren Devine (Aleut Community of St. Paul Island) (Topic 7 of the agenda).

Next steps (note that these were reviewed and endorsed at the end of the meeting on May 9 under Topic 16)

1. A subgroup consisting of Courtney, Mike D., and Jim will together to develop a presentation on best practices for collecting and applying qualitative data, based in part on the Charnley et al. paper and a few case examples.
2. The full SSPT will receive this presentation in November.
3. At that time, the SSPT will request scheduling the presentation for a future SSC and Council meeting, perhaps in December 2019 or February 2020.
4. Regarding making a recommendation to seek funding to hire someone to review and develop staff guidance on evaluating and applying qualitative data, the SSPT decided to put this on hold until after the subgroup's presentation is available.

Economic Data Reports

The SSPT reviewed the Economic Data Reports (EDRs) discussion paper and discussed the SSPT's role in the forthcoming review and revisions of the EDR programs, as tasked in the Council's April 2019 motion (**Topic 8 and 9 on the agenda**).

Sally Bibb presented Issue 1 from the Council's motion regarding a regulatory amendment analysis of revisions to the specific EDR requirements, such as:

- revisions to the EDR auditing requirements;
- revisions to the EDR aggregation standards and blind formatting requirements;
- and the potential for revisions to, or removal of, the GOA trawl EDRs.

Scott Miller (NMFS Alaska Region) is the lead analyst on preparation of the Regulatory Impact Review (RIR) for Issue 1. This RIR will be presented to the Council for initial review at some time in the future. It does not require review by the SSPT prior to initial review by the Council.

Steve Kasperski presented Issue 2 from the Council's motion regarding the proposal of future revisions to the current EDR programs and the Council's tasking of the SSPT to "provide recommendations to the Council at its June 2019 meeting about which aspects of review of the current EDRs are within the scope and capability of the SSPT to undertake." Brian Garber-Yonts presented the EDR Discussion Paper to the SSPT. Mike Downs presented the SSC comments regarding the EDR Discussion Paper from the April 2019 meeting.

In general, the SSPT supports the idea of revisions to the current EDR programs. Economic and social data are critical for improving management and economic/social outcomes in North Pacific fisheries and for conducting periodic programmatic reviews (e.g., catch-share reviews) that comply with the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

The SSPT discussed the following items throughout the presentation of the EDR Discussion Paper:

- Economic and social data collections in the North Pacific federal fisheries do not appear to have very good coverage across fisheries/sectors, according to Figure 2 of the Discussion Paper, relative to other U.S. regions.
 - The Council's current motion does not consider expanding EDRs to other fisheries/sectors that are not included in the current EDR programs. However, the Council may wish to consider this in the future, as economic and social data can improve monitoring capabilities in these fisheries and how they are managed in the long run.
 - If the Council were to consider expanding EDRs across other fisheries and sectors, it could consider alternative sampling schemes (e.g., stratified random sampling) if there are concerns over increased burden to the industry.

- Consistency of data collection across very different fisheries will be challenging, particularly if data collection is eventually expanded to other fisheries that are not included in the current EDR programs.
 - While consistency across fisheries will help with comparisons across fisheries, it has the potential to make the EDRs confusing and irrelevant if there is considerable differences in fishing operations across fisheries.
 - To have consistency across fisheries, it might be necessary to have consistent “themes”—e.g., fixed costs, variables costs, crew, etc.—that are comparable across fisheries while allowing for questions and surveys to be specific (and relevant) to each fishery.
 - It is also important to consider consistency across time. Any revisions to the EDRs should consider the impact of breaking time series of variables already being collected by the EDRs.
- Revisions to the EDR programs should consider improving the information that we currently collect about crew and processing labor.
 - For example, future EDRs may want to consider using a crew identifier that is durable (remains the same for an individual) over time and across fisheries in order to learn about whether/how crew participate across fisheries and over time.
- Revisions to the EDR program should also consider who is required to fill out EDRs in the future—e.g., vessel owners, permit holders, quota-share holders, etc.
 - There was some concern that inactive vessels are not currently required to submit an EDR, even though there is still important information to report (e.g., quota leasing).

The SSPT agreed that it should be involved in the proposed revisions of the EDR programs, particularly as an advisory body and for providing a framework for how proposed EDR revisions could be constructed and evaluated. The SSPT also had the following recommendations for the next steps in the EDR revision process:

- The purpose and needs statements for each EDR program, and for any systematic economic and social data-collection program more generally, would need to be revised since the goals and needs of future economic data collections are not necessarily the same as when each EDR program was initiated. A clear purpose and needs statement will be critical moving forward to ensure that the EDRs are collecting the right information without imposing unnecessary burden on the industry.
- Issue 2 of the Council’s motion regarding EDR revisions should be bifurcated into: 1) issues that are straightforward and can be addressed in the short term; and 2) issues that require a data-collection framework and can only be addressed in the long term.
 - Short-term issues include: consideration of data being collected by the current EDRs that are duplicative of data being collected in other data collection programs; identification of best practices for collecting economic data and providing examples from other Council regions (e.g., Economic Data Collection staff from the Northwest Fisheries Science Center) and other non-fisheries agencies (e.g., Bureau of Labor Statistics); consideration of the benefits and costs of standardizing EDRs; addressing SSC comments from the April 2019 meeting.
 - Long-term issues include developing a framework for a systematic economic and social data collection program that meets the purpose and needs of the Council (e.g., see the generic statistical business process model presented in Figure 1 of the EDR Discussion paper).

- The SSPT agreed that it should provide guidance in the development of a framework for future economic and social data collection; however, it was not possible to provide such guidance during the current meeting. The SSPT suggests conducting a workshop outside of the SSPT's regular meeting schedule in order to provide guidance on EDR revisions in a timely manner. The SSPT suggested a late-summer meeting could be possible for several of the SSPT members.

No public testimony was received at this time (Topic 10 on the agenda).

Bering Sea Fishery Ecosystem Plan Update

Elizabeth Figus gave a presentation on the background and status of the Bering Sea FEP and in particular the Action Modules associated with the FEP (**Topic 14 on the agenda**). The FEP was adopted by the Council in 2018 and is available on the Council's website. The FEP is meant to operationalize ecosystem-based fishery management (EBFM) for incorporation into NPFMC processes. The FEP is a policy guidance tool for the NPFMC and is a "non-actionable" document. However, as part of the FEP effort, Action Modules have been created/envisioned. The Action Modules are meant to inform the Council process, but not be action forcing.

The FEP met May 6th and 7th, 2019 and in the future, Council staff will try to schedule SSPT and FEP meetings to foster crossflow of information between these two efforts. While the FEP team conceptualized five Action Modules, the Council has selected to make two operational at this time: one focused on effects of climate change and one focused on protocols for Local Knowledge (LK), Traditional Knowledge (TK) and impacts of Council decisions on Subsistence Use. The FEP team discussed workplans and Action Module Task Force membership for these two Action Modules. The SSPT discussed the need to coordinate/relate these two modules with each other and the need for coordination between the SSPT and these Task Forces.

Membership on the Action Module Task Forces will be determined by the Council in either early or late fall (2019). The FEP team envisions that the Task Forces will be composed of 15 or fewer members and emphasized that membership should draw heavily on non-traditional membership relative to established Council committees and teams. Specifically, the FEP team envisioned 7-10 "non-traditional" members (broadly meaning non-agency personnel) and 1-5 traditional (agency) members. Diana Evans (NPFMC staff) indicated that there is limited funding (both in amount and temporal duration) to facilitate the participation of "non-traditional" members.

The SSPT had considerable discussion on the issue of membership on the Action Module Task Forces. In particular, the SSPT noted that questions of representativeness will be of particular importance to the range of communities throughout the Bering Sea region. Are all communities represented? Some communities or community representatives are more visible/involved to date than others. The SSPT suggested that additional outreach (beyond the normal newsletter approach) is encouraged in terms of soliciting potential members of the Action Module Task Force members. There was a discussion of devoting the available support funds to individuals that have not to date participated, but advantages and disadvantages of such an approach were recognized and the SSPT did not reach a conclusion on this point. The SSPT suggested adding "indigenous scholars" to the itemized list of potential Task Force members produced by the FEP team. At the same time, the SSPT noted that "TK" and "subsistence" are not synonymous with "indigenous." In general, the SSPT recommended that membership be as inclusive as possible.

Council staff have produced a draft workplan for LK, TK, and Subsistence Action Module (to date) in consultation with stakeholders. Part A focuses on LK and TK whereas Part B focuses on subsistence ("understanding impacts of Council decisions on subsistence use").

The SSPT recommended consistent use of titles describing the Action Modules. The SSPT also discussed meanings of "subsistence" and "subsistence data." The Appendix on "best practices" is likely to be useful/informative as the SSPT continues to work on the data gap analysis.

The SSPT received public testimony from Lauren Divine (Aleut Community of St. Paul Island) (Topic 15 on the agenda).

Research gaps and SSPT priorities for filling priorities

The SSPT had a short discussion about research gaps (**Topic 12 on the agenda**). As the SSPT aims to inform the use of best available social science in the Council process, an understanding of both potential gaps in social science data as well as gaps in social science will be important to highlight. The SSPT came to consensus during discussion of Topics 3 and 11 to focus on the DGA (Data Gap Analysis) first before tackling the Research Gap Analysis (RGA), rather than attempting to do both the DGA and the RGA at once. The SSPT discussed key differences between data gaps and research gaps. Data gaps were defined as specific data elements that need to be collected. Research gaps were defined as using information or data to apply to management question(s). It was noted that some research gaps exist because of existing data gaps and many of the same questions apply to analyzing both topics. SSPT members agreed that efforts currently underway toward analyzing data gaps will likely accomplish much of the groundwork for a future research gap analysis. The SSPT plans to take up an RGA as or after the DGA nears completion.

No public testimony was received at this time (Topic 13 on the agenda).

Meeting wrap up and next steps

The SSPT reiterated the next steps for the main projects discussed (**Topic 16 on the agenda**). The current authors of the Data Gaps Analysis will incorporate comments and edits to date, restructure the analysis to fit the new proposed organization, and try to make a new version of the document available to the group by late June. At that point, SSPT members should all contribute knowledge about gaps relative to their expertise.

In terms of next steps for revisions to the EDR, the SSPT agrees it would like to have a role in the framing of these potential revisions moving forward. This task seems to fit within our mandate and has potential to respond to the Data Gap Analysis. In order to provide that guidance, the SSPT would like to have an EDR-focused day long technical workshop. Conducting a workshop outside of our typical two-meeting format appears within the SSPT's purview but it is unclear whether it would be funded by the Council. Sarah will look into the possibility of a funded workshop and report back to SSPT members. If possible, members discussed a late-summer time frame. In preparation for a workshop, staff (who have yet to be tasked) could seek to address the SSC previous comments from the April 2019 meeting and do some of the legwork in planning for such a workshop and preparing ideas for the SSPT workshop to consider. If a workshop is not feasible, the SSPT discussed that there may not be a contingency plan. It was noted that the Council would likely wish to move forward before the next May SSPT meeting, the next time the group is scheduled to meet in-person.

There are no additional steps needed for the discussion on new and underrepresented research. A google drive folder has been started for members to share literature between the meetings that may be of special interest to the group. Members are encouraged to share relevant literature and notify the group when papers are added.

With regards to qualitative information in fisheries management, the SSPT is considering a two-step process to informing on and promoting qualitative methods in the Council process. The first step is for the subgroup of Courtney Carothers, Mike Downs and Jim Fall to organize some of the existing literature and consolidate relevant examples of the use of qualitative information in fisheries management and other applied examples. This group will present to the SSPT at the November interim teleconference. The hope is for these members to present to the SSC, AP, and Council at an upcoming Council meeting. Sarah Marrinan will follow up with the SSPT about whether it would be possible to include this on the December or February Council meeting agenda. The second step of the process would be for better

incorporation of qualitative methods into the Council analytical documents. At this stage the SSPT does not have a path forward on this task.

The SSPT is supportive of the FEP Team recommendation to have a standing agenda item for reviewing the BS FEP progress at each SSPT meeting, and the SSPT is open to providing updates/check-ins at the FEP Team meetings as needed. The SSPT recommends a member of the SSPT attend FEP Team meetings when possible. There is likely to be overlap in subsistence sections of SSPT data gap analysis; the 'lead authors' of that section may want to interact with the FEP Team regularly/attend meetings of the FEP Team. The call for nominations for the FEP Task Forces will go out following the June Council meeting; the SSPT members are encouraged to spread the word. Additionally, the SSPT would like to receive an update on FEP Task Force membership at the November SSPT interim conference call.