North Pacific Fishery Management Council
C7 Halibut Abundance Based PSC Motion
April 9, 2017

The Council requests the working group include the following modifications in an expanded discussion paper:

- Consider alternative approaches for addressing the coastwide halibut stock status (i.e. 30:20 control rule for spawning biomass from the IPHC assessment),
- Consider alternative approaches to account for recruitment (i.e. number of low recruitment events, average recruitment over a period of years),
- Consider replacing O32 survey catch with IPHC setline survey catch as an index,
- Provide additional analysis on inter-annual stability in PSC limits as described in the SSC minutes.

In the development of halibut abundance indices, the Council seeks to better understand the characteristics and applicability of each of the proposed component indices that comprise the strawmen ABMs. Incorporating the above modifications as appropriate, the Council directs the working group to:

- Describe the extent to which the indices represent the segment of the population they are assumed to represent (in terms of life history, quality and frequency of data collection) and what is actually encountered by the fisheries,
- Describe the extent each index meets each working group principle,
- Analyze strawman ABMs using an 'all else equal' approach as specified by the SSC.

Given the aforementioned direction and modifications, the SSC's recommendations, and working group principles outlined in the discussion paper, the Council requests the working group develop additional ABM alternatives for consideration as appropriate.

The Council directs the working group to remove the Gulf of Alaska from further consideration of an abundance based approach to PSC limits in this analytical package.

The Council acknowledges and supports the SSC comments suggesting development of a framework for evaluating ABM alternatives; however, prior to tasking development of a complex computer simulation model or other framework, the Council intends to undertake an iterative process of understanding the strengths and weaknesses of each of the component indices as they relate to informing ABM development. This process would be followed by development of ABM alternatives, and development of a computer simulation or other framework to evaluate the ABM alternatives.