

## Executive Director's Report

### CMSP Developments

Following the June Council meeting I attended the national Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning (CMSP) workshop in Washington, D.C. hosted by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and the National Ocean Council (NOC). The workshop was informative, and offered an opportunity to work with many of the key players involved in the CMSP process, and who will be developing the strategic action plans for implementing the nine objectives of the Executive Order, including CMSP. While some of our fundamental questions/concerns remain unanswered, I do believe that progress was made regarding the importance of having Council representation on the regional planning bodies, as well as highlighting the need for a meaningful consultation process with the RFMCs. In August I also had the opportunity to meet with Michael Weiss, CEQ, to further discuss the CMSP initiative and how the Councils can be meaningful and productive participants. We are still waiting to hear more regarding the composition of the regional planning bodies and next steps in this process.

Meanwhile, on August 18 a Federal Register notice solicited nominations to the Ocean Research Advisory Panel (ORAP), the committee providing senior advice to the National Ocean Research Leadership Council, which has in essence been subsumed by the NOC. In other words, the ORAP provides guidance and advice to the NOC. The FR notice is included under Agenda Item B-1(a), with a deadline of September 15. Regardless of the Council's potential role in the regional planning bodies, or the specific nature of the mandatory consultation with the RFMCs, I believe that RFMC (as well as Alaska/Arctic) representation on the ORAP could be an important, additional mechanism for coordinating with the NOC and the overall CMSP initiative. After consulting with Chairman Olson, I nominated myself for appointment to the ORAP. As I understand the process it will be several months before appointments are determined.

Last week, I attended the Fisheries Leadership and Sustainability Forum at Stanford University, along with other Council Executive Directors and Council members from around the U.S. The topic for this Forum was CMSP and the role of RFMCs in multi-sector spatial planning (a copy of that agenda is included under Agenda Item B-1(b)). The workshop was very interesting and informative and provided a great opportunity to consider ways in which the RFMCs can contribute to, and benefit from, the CMSP initiative.

### Meeting with Dr. Lubchenco

In August Dr. Lubchenco toured Alaska and met with many members of the fishing industry. She also set aside time to meet with myself and Chairman Olson to discuss national and

regional fisheries issues. Among the items we discussed were budgets, CMSP, Steller sea lion issues, and the Council's halibut catch sharing plan.

#### National SSC workshop

The Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council is hosting the fourth annual National SSC Workshop next week on October 4-6 at the Kingsmill Resort in Williamsburg, Virginia. The workshop will address issues related to the SSCs' role in reviewing social/economic analyses and incorporating ecosystem considerations in fisheries management. The agenda for that workshop, along with trigger questions for discussion, is included as Agenda Item B-1(c). SSC members from the North Pacific who will be attending are Pat Livingston, Gordon Kruse, Jim Murphy, and Lew Queirolo, along with staff members Jon McCracken and David Witherell.

#### International meetings

In late August/early September, Vice-Chair Dave Benson attended the North Pacific Ocean (NPO) Convention in Busan, Korea as a representative of our Council, and I attended the annual meeting of the U.S./Russia Intergovernmental Consultative Committee (ICC) in Monterey, California. In both of these forums we serve as members of the U.S. delegation and as advisors to the U.S. State Department. As such, I wanted to make you aware of these meetings, but will defer to the U.S. State Department on reporting the outcomes of these meetings.

#### Halibut stock assessment workshop

In June the Council instructed me to organize a workshop, in cooperation with the IPHC, to review the halibut migration models and stock assessment processes. Because of the necessity to have close coordination with the IPHC staff, I have been in contact with the IPHC Executive Director to discuss the timing and content of such a workshop, and it will not be possible to conduct this workshop until after the IPHC annual meeting in February. Therefore, it will likely be sometime in March 2012 that the workshop will be held. I am still working with Dr. Lehman to organize the workshop, but in our initial discussions he also requested that such a workshop include a discussion and review of halibut bycatch estimation procedures in the groundfish fisheries. I will have an update and more specifics to report to you in December.

#### New Website!

Thanks to the work of Maria Shawback, we recently launched our revised Council website. It is of course a work in progress but our goal is to make the website more user-friendly and intuitive, to expand the information we are able to provide through the website, and to support the goals of our Outreach Committee to provide a better portal for the public to our process. Please provide your comments to me, or to Maria directly, so that we can continue to improve the website.

### Update on public comment process

The Council asked me to consider developing a more formal policy for how we handle public comments, including consideration of deadlines for receiving comments and the potential for submission of comments electronically. We have done some research on this, and are developing a potential process for submission of public comment through a single email address and/or website portal (perhaps similar to the federal e-comment process), which could then be categorized and copied for the Council in time for their consideration of the agenda item. I will report back to you on this as we get a bit more clarity on exactly how this could work, and you can determine whether to proceed down this path.

### SOPPs

I promised you at the last meeting I would have a revised SOPPs for your review, but due to the press of other business, and the fact that we are coordinating our timing and format with the other Councils, I do not have it ready for your review at this time. I expect to have it by December so that we can submit it for NOAA review early next year.

### AP appointment

Chairman Olson appointed Mr. Ernie Weiss, of the Aleutians East Borough, to the Advisory Panel to fill the term recently vacated by Beth Stewart (through 2011). According to our SOPPs, this appointment needs to be confirmed by the Council, which could be done in Executive Session later this week.

### Events this week

I will defer to the flyer provided, but simply note that there are fun events scheduled every evening this week, through Saturday, and want to express appreciation to everyone who is working on, or sponsoring, these events to make our meeting in Unalaska/Dutch Harbor a success!

**Background**

Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA (16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.*) directs the Secretary of Commerce to allow, upon request, the incidental, but not intentional taking of marine mammals by U.S. citizens who engage in a military readiness activity if certain findings are made and regulations are issued.

Authorization may be granted for periods of five years or less if NMFS finds that the taking will have a negligible impact on the species or stock(s), and will not have an unmitigable adverse impact on the availability of the species or stock(s) for certain subsistence uses. In addition, NMFS must prescribe regulations that include permissible methods of taking and other means effecting the least practicable adverse impact on the species and its habitat, and on the availability of the species for subsistence uses, paying particular attention to rookeries, mating grounds, and areas of similar significance. The regulations also must include requirements pertaining to the monitoring and reporting of such taking.

Regulations governing the taking of marine mammals incidental to the U.S. Navy's operation of SURTASS LFA sonar were published on August 21, 2007 (72 FR 46846) and remain in effect through August 15, 2012. They are codified at 50 CFR part 216 subpart Q. These regulations include mitigation, monitoring, and reporting requirements for the incidental taking of marine mammals by the SURTASS LFA sonar system. For detailed information on this action, please refer to the August 21, 2007 Federal Register document and 50 CFR part 216 subpart Q.

**Summary of LOA Request**

NMFS received an application from the U.S. Navy for four LOAs, one covering the USNS VICTORIOUS (T-AGOS 19), one covering the USNS ABLE (T-AGOS 20), one covering the USNS EFFECTIVE (T-AGOS 21), and one covering the USNS IMPECCABLE (T-AGOS 23), under the regulations issued on August 21, 2007 (72 FR 46846). (Note: The R/V CORY CHOUEST has been retired and has been replaced by the USNS ABLE.) The Navy requested that these LOAs become effective on August 16, 2011. The application requested authorization, for a period not to exceed one year, to take, by harassment, marine mammals incidental to employment of the SURTASS LFA sonar system for training, testing and routine military operations on the aforementioned ships

in areas of the Pacific Ocean, as described in the 2007 regulations.

**Monitoring and Reporting**

In compliance with NMFS' 2007 SURTASS LFA sonar regulations, the Navy submitted an annual report (No. 3) for SURTASS LFA sonar operations during 2009–2010. The Navy also submitted a comprehensive report on SURTASS LFA sonar operations and the mitigation and monitoring activities conducted under the LOAs issued under its previous rule for the 2002 through 2007 period. A copy of these reports can be viewed and/or downloaded at: <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental.htm#applications>. Based on these reports, the Navy has conducted the specified activities in the manner described in the regulations and LOAs, and has implemented the required mitigation and monitoring measures. Additionally, marine mammal detections and behavioral observations suggest that the actual impacts of SURTASS LFA sonar operation and training fall within the scope and nature of those analyzed and anticipated by the regulations and LOAs.

In accordance with the current SURTASS LFA sonar regulations (50 CFR 216.186), the Navy has submitted classified quarterly mission reports. Under the first three LOA periods in the current rule, the Navy has not exceeded the take authorized by NMFS. Based on the submitted quarterly reports for the 2010 LOAs, NMFS does not expect the Navy to exceed authorized take (requested and authorized) based on the Navy's 2010 application. The annual report (No. 4) for the 2010–2011 LOAs is due on September 30, 2011. Upon receipt, NMFS will post this annual report at <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental.htm#applications>.

**Authorization**

NMFS has issued four LOAs to the U.S. Navy, authorizing the incidental harassment of marine mammals, incidental to operating the four SURTASS LFA sonar systems for training, testing and routine military operations. Issuance of these four LOAs is based on findings, described in the preamble to the final rule (72 FR 46846, August 21, 2007) and supported by information contained in the Navy's required reports on SURTASS LFA sonar, that the activities described under these four LOAs will have no more than a negligible impact on marine mammal stocks and will not have an unmitigable adverse impact on the availability of the affected marine mammal stocks for subsistence uses.

These LOAs remain valid through August 15, 2012, provided the Navy remains in conformance with the conditions of the regulations and the LOAs, and the mitigation, monitoring, and reporting requirements described in 50 CFR 216.184–216.186 (72 FR 46846, August 21, 2007) and in the LOAs are undertaken.

Dated: August 12, 2011.

James H. Lecky,  
Director, Office of Protected Resources,  
National Marine Fisheries Service.  
[FR Doc. 2011-21110 Filed 8-17-11; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 3510-22-P

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE****Department of the Navy****Nominations for Membership on the Ocean Research Advisory Panel**

**AGENCY:** Department of the Navy, DoD.  
**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Ocean Research Advisory Panel (ORAP) is soliciting nominations for new members.

**DATES:** Nominations should be submitted no later than September 15, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** Nominations should be submitted via e-mail to CDR Stephen D. Martin, U.S. Navy, at [stephen.d.martin@navy.mil](mailto:stephen.d.martin@navy.mil).

**Contact Information:** Office of Naval Research, 875 North Randolph Street Suite 1425, Attn: ONR Code 322B Room 1075, Arlington, VA 22203, telephone 703-696-4395.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dr. Charles L. Vincent, Office of Naval Research, 875 North Randolph Street Suite 1425, Arlington, VA 22203-1995, telephone 703-696-4120.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** ORAP is a statutorily mandated federal advisory committee that provides senior advice to the National Ocean Research Leadership Council (NORLC), the governing body of the National Oceanographic Partnership Program (NOPP). Under the National Ocean Policy, the National Ocean Council (NOC) Deputy-level Committee has assumed the responsibilities of the NORLC. ORAP provides independent advice and guidance to the NOC. The NOC routinely provides guidance and direction on the areas for which it seeks advice and recommendations from ORAP. ORAP also advises on selection of projects and allocation of funds for NOPP.

**Panel Member Duties and Responsibilities:** Members of the panel

represent the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, the Institute of Medicine, ocean industries, state governments, academia and others, including individuals who are eminent in the fields of marine science, marine policy, or related fields, including ocean resource management. Members are appointed annually and may serve a term of four years, and are not normally compensated except for travel expenses and per diem while away from their homes in performance of services for the panel.

The panel meets for at least one two-day public meeting per year, but possibly meets three times per year, on dates agreeable by the panel members; attendance at meetings is expected. Intercessional activities not involving formal decisions or recommendations may be carried out electronically, and the panel may establish sub-panels composed of less than full membership to carry out panel duties.

**Nominations:** Any interested person or organization may nominate qualified individuals (including one's self) for membership on the panel. Nominated individuals should have extended expertise and experience in the field of ocean science and/or ocean resource management. Nominations should be identified by name, occupation, position, address, telephone number, e-mail address, and a brief paragraph describing their qualifications in the context of the ORAP Charter, that can be found on-line at (<http://www.nopp.org/committees/orap/>), and ability to represent a stakeholder group. Nominations should also include a résumé or curriculum vitae.

**Process and Deadline for Submitting Nominations:** Submit nominations via e-mail to CDR Stephen Martin ([stephen.d.martin@navy.mil](mailto:stephen.d.martin@navy.mil)) no later than September 15, 2011. ORAP nomination committees under the direction of the National Ocean Council will evaluate the nominees identified by respondents to this Federal Register notice and down-select to a short-list of available candidates (150% of the available open positions for consideration). These selected candidates will be required to fill-out the "Confidential Financial Disclosure Report" OGE form 450. This confidential form will allow Government officials to determine whether there is a statutory conflict between a person's public responsibilities and private interests and activities, or the appearance of a lack of impartiality, as defined by federal regulation. The form and additional guidance may be viewed at:

([http://www.usoge.gov/forms/oge450\\_pdf/oge450\\_automated.pdf](http://www.usoge.gov/forms/oge450_pdf/oge450_automated.pdf)).

In accordance with section 7903 of title 10, United States Code, the short-list of candidates will then be submitted for approval by the Secretaries of the Navy and Defense who are the appointing officials for their consideration. At this time, six openings are envisioned on the Panel and the final set of nominees will seek to balance a range of geographic and sector representation and experience. Applicants must be U.S. citizens. Successful nominees must provide detailed information required to evaluate potential conflicts of interest. Typically the time required to achieve the final appointments to the Panel is 10–12 months. Members of the Panel serve as Special Government Employees who volunteer their time but whose travel costs for Panel business is provided by the Government. ORAP is a Federal Advisory Committee and operates under the principles of open and transparent development of advice to the government.

The selection of new panel members will be based on the nominee's qualifications to provide senior advice to the NOC; the availability of the potential panel member to fully participate in the panel meetings; absence of any conflict of interest or appearance of lack of impartiality, and lack of bias; the candidates' areas of expertise and professional qualifications; and achieving an overall balance of different perspectives, geographic representation, and expertise on the panel.

Dated: August 11, 2011.

J. M. Beal

*Lieutenant Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

(FR Doc. 2011-21116 Filed 8-17-11; 8:45 am)

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-P

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### Notice of Proposed Information Collection Requests

**AGENCY:** Department of Education.

**ACTION:** Comment Request.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Education (the Department), in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) (44 U.S.C 3506(c)(2)(A)), provides the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and continuing collection of information. This helps the Department assess the impact of its information collection requirements and minimize

the reporting burden on the public and helps the public understand the Department's information collection requirements and provide the requested data in the desired format. The Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Privacy, Information and Records Management Services, Office of Management, invites comments on the proposed information collection requests as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

**DATES:** Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before October 17, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be submitted electronically to [FAFSA.Comments@ed.gov](mailto:FAFSA.Comments@ed.gov). We ask that you copy them to [ICDocketMgr@ed.gov](mailto:ICDocketMgr@ed.gov) or mail to U.S. Department of Education, UCP Building, 1830 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20202-4357. Please note that written comments received in response to this notice will be considered public records.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) requires that Federal agencies provide interested parties an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. The Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Privacy, Information and Records Management Services, Office of Management, publishes this notice containing proposed information collection requests at the beginning of the Departmental review of the information collection. The Department of Education is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) Is the collection necessary to the proper functions of the Department; (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner; (3) is the estimate of burden accurate; (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology.

Dated: August 12, 2011.

Darrin A. King,

*Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Privacy, Information and Records Management Services.*

As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice requests comments on the 2012–2013 versions of the forms used by individuals applying for Federal student aid including the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) and the Student Aid Report (SAR).

# FISHERIES

Leadership & Sustainability

# FORUM

## COASTAL & MARINE SPATIAL PLANNING AND THE ROLE OF REGIONAL FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCILS IN MULTI-SECTOR SPATIAL PLANNING

Vidalakis Room at the Schwab Residential Center  
Stanford University  
September 20-23, 2011

### GOALS & LEARNING OBJECTIVES

- Clarify challenges and opportunities in the current management framework to facilitate a greater understanding of the impetus behind coastal and marine spatial planning (CMSP);
- Enhance awareness of the scientific and governance principles, characteristics and goals of CMSP;
- Explore how the fisheries sector and in particular, the Regional Fisheries Management Councils can contribute to and benefit from CMSP; and
- Identify current management tools and means by which fishery managers may engage constructively in multi-sector spatial planning with or without a formal framework for CMSP.

### AGENDA

#### TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

6:00 – 9:00 pm      **Meet & Greet Dinner Reception**  
*Stanford Guest House*

#### WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2011

8:00 – 9:00 am      **Breakfast & Networking**  
*Vidalakis Room at the Schwab Residential Center, Stanford University*

9:00 – 9:45 am      **Introductions**

9:45 – 10:45 am      **Ecosystem & Policy Context for CMSP**  
*Speakers: Larry Crowder (Science Director, Center for Ocean Solutions) & Linwood Pendleton (Director of Ocean and Coastal Policy, Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions at Duke University)*  
Objective: Explore the ecological, political and governance challenges driving the movement towards coastal and marine spatial planning.

- 10:45 – 11:00 am      **Break**
- 11:00 – 12:00 pm      **Scientific Principles & Governance Framework for CMSP**  
*Speakers: Melissa Foley (Early Career Science Fellow, Center for Ocean Solutions) & Erin Prahler (Early Career Policy Fellow, Center for Ocean Solutions)*  
**Objective:** Examine the characteristics, goals and principles of coastal and marine spatial planning from a scientific and governance perspective.
- 12:00 – 1:00 pm      **Lunch**
- 1:00 – 2:30 pm      **Case Study (Part 1)**  
*Facilitators: Fisheries Forum Staff*  
*Participants will be assigned a group and location for the break out session with instructions for the task.*  
**Objective:** Refine fishery management objectives, identify spatial considerations and assess the potential impacts of non-fishing activities on fisheries.
- 2:30 – 2:45 pm      **Break**
- 2:45 – 4:30 pm      **Information & Data Needs for CMSP**  
*Speakers: Daniel Dunn (Research Associate, Marine Geospatial Ecology Lab at Nicholas School of the Environment, Duke University), Kevin St. Martin (Geographer, Rutgers University), John Weber (Managing Director, Northeast Regional Ocean Council), Dave Beutel (Aquaculture & Fisheries Coordinator, Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council)*  
**Objective:** Investigate the types of information and data that fishery managers can provide to help inform spatial management and engage constructively in multi-sector decision-making processes.
- 4:30 – 5:30 pm      **Data Portals & Decision Support Tools**  
*Speakers: Erin Prahler (Early Career Policy Fellow, Center for Ocean Solutions) & Melissa Foley (Early Career Science Fellow, Center for Ocean Solutions)*  
**Objective:** Explore the role of data portals and decision support tools and how they may be used to visualize proposed and existing ocean uses to inform and support spatial management decisions by Councils and other ocean users.
- 6:00 – 9:00 pm      **Cocktail and Dinner Reception**  
*Stanford Faculty Club*

**THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2011**

- 8:00 – 9:00 am      **Breakfast & Networking**  
*Vidalakis Room at the Schwab Residential Center, Stanford University*
- 9:00 – 9:15 am      **Introduction & Recap of Day One**

- 9:15 – 10:15 am      **Management Tools to Support Multi-Sector Spatial Planning**  
*Speakers: Meghan Jeans (Program Director, Fisheries Leadership & Sustainability Forum) and Karen Abrams (Senior Policy Analyst, Office of Habitat Conservation at NOAA Fisheries)*  
 Objective: Survey existing management tools and the opportunities that may offer regional fishery management councils an opportunity to provide input into spatial planning and permitting decisions for other ocean uses.
- 10:15 – 10:30 am      **Break**
- 10:30 – 12:30 pm      **Defining What It Means To Be A Leader**  
*Speaker: Don Wells (Leadership Consultant, Don Wells Consulting)*  
 Objective: Explore the core characteristic and skills necessary for effective leadership and examine the differences between leadership and management.
- 12:30 – 1:30 pm      **Lunch**
- 1:30 – 3:30 pm      **Case Study Breakout (Part 2)**  
*Facilitators: Fisheries Forum Staff*  
*After an introduction and instructions, participants will reconvene with their assigned group from Part 1.*  
 Objective: Evaluate strategies for council engagement in multi-sector spatial planning and decision-making for non-fishing ocean uses.
- 3:30 – 3:45 pm      **Break**
- 3:45 – 4:15 pm      **Discussion: Case Study Report Back**  
*Facilitators: Kimberly Gordon & Meghan Jeans*
- 4:15 – 5:00 pm      **Discussion: How do we use what we learned?**  
*Facilitators: Whitney Tome & Meghan Jeans*
- 5:00 – 5:30 pm      **Forum Wrap-Up & Evaluations**
- 6:00 – 9:00 pm      **Cocktail and Dinner Reception**  
*Spalti Ristorante, 417 California Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94306*

**FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2011**

- 6:00 – 6:30 am      **Breakfast**  
*Stanford Guest House*
- 6:30 am      **Field trip shuttle departure**  
*Please meet in front of the Stanford Guest House at 6:15 am.*
- 8:00 – 2:00 pm      **Field trip to the Farallon Islands**  
*Return shuttle will stop at SFO airport and the Stanford Guest House*

**2011 National SSC Workshop  
Kingsmill Conference Center, Williamsburg, VA  
Agenda**

<b>Day 1</b>	<b>4-Oct</b>	<b>Time:</b>	<b>Speaker/Leader</b>
		830	Welcome and Introductions [Dr. John Boreman]
Plenary		845	Keynote Speaker Dr. Tony Smith
		945	Round Robin NPFMC
		1000	WPFMC
		1015	PFMC
		1030	Break
		1100	GMFMC
		1115	CFMC
		1130	SAFMC
		1145	MAFMC
		1200	NEFMC
		1215	NMFS
		1230	Lunch
		1330	Keynote Speaker Dr. Lee Anderson
		1415	Broader Context & Tradeoffs Plenary Discussion, TQ set 1
		1515	Break
		1530	IEA & Frameworks Speaker Dr. Brian Wells
		1615	Plenary Discussion, TQ set 2
		1730	Adjourn

**Day 2 5-Oct BREAKOUT GROUPS**  
(Each topic in breakouts to have an overview talk, followed by structured discussions, trigger questions and Q&A leading to specific recommendations)

	<b>830</b>	<b>Ecosystem Breakout Group</b>
	850	OFL-ACL continuum: System MSY Talk by Pat Livingston/Martin Dorn Breakout Discussion, Eco TQ Set 1      Leader: Dave Witherell
	1030	Break
	1100	Forage Discussion Talk by Jason Link/Rick Methot
	1120	Breakout Discussion, Eco TQ Set 2      Leader: Churchill Grimes
	1200	Lunch
	1300	Breakout Discussion, Eco TQ Set 2      Leader: Churchill Grimes
	1430	Break
	1500	Goals and Objectives Talk by Bob Skillman/Selina Heppell
	1520	Breakout Discussion, Eco TQ Set 3      Leader: Sean Powers
Plenary	1630	Reconvene in Plenary, Discuss Breakouts
	1700	Adjourn
	1800	Group Dinner
	<b>830</b>	<b>Social Sciences Breakout Group</b>
	850	Role of social science in SSC Leader: Craig Severance Breakout Discussion, SS TQ Set 1      Eric Thunberg
	1030	Break
	1100	Catch shares      Leader: Mark Holliday
	1120	Breakout Discussion, SS TQ Set 2      Sherry Larkin
	1200	Lunch
	1300	Procedural / Data Issues Leader: Dan Georgianna
	1320	Breakout Discussion, SS TQ Set 3      Cindy Thomson
	1430	Break

1500 Recommendations Leader: Bonnie McCay  
Plenary 1630 Reconvene in Plenary, Discuss Breakouts  
1700 Adjourn  
1800 Group Dinner

**Day 3 6-Oct 830 Continued Reporting on Breakout**  
Plenary 930 Revisit Day 1 Discussion  
Frameworks, Broader Context, Tradeoffs  
Plenary Discussion, TQ set 3  
1030 Break  
1100 Plenary Discussion, TQ set 3  
1200 Lunch  
1300 Specific Recommendations for the CCC  
Plenary Discussion, TQ set 4  
Consolidate summaries, consensus, notes  
Assign reporting/follow up action items  
1530 Adjourn  
Steering Committee Meets to Wrap Up

### **Ecosystem TOR**

1. Review each Council's SSC ecosystem-based fishery management approaches, with general overviews loosely touching on the following topics (as appropriate for each region; i.e. the "round robin", 1st day, joint with socio-economics session).
  - a. An ecosystem perspective from each SSC to provide a general overview
  - b. A socioeconomic perspective from each SSC on current practice and challenges
  - c. How each SSC interacts with their Councils in policy development
2. Evaluate how each SSC is incorporating ecosystem considerations into the full OFL-OY-ACL continuum, particularly relative to quantifying scientific uncertainty?
  - a. Evaluate how system-level OYs could be used by each SSC in this process
3. Evaluate how to account for forage species in setting ABCs/ACLs, including technical definition of "forage species"?
4. Evaluate how each SSC is helping their Councils to establish EBFM goals and objectives, cognizant of and constrained by the best available science, as looking to the future?
5. Describe what are the frameworks (procedures, standing advisory bodies, TOR, etc.) for incorporating ecosystem considerations into management
  - a. Evaluate how broader, contextual efforts inform and get utilized in the Council SSC advisory process, including items such as IEAs, CMSPs, annual state of the ecosystem reports, ecosystem status reports, and similar information? (joint with socio-economics session)
6. Evaluate how to evaluate tradeoffs across fisheries, stocks, fleets and even other ocean-use sectors (joint with socio-economics session)?
  - a. Evaluate how system-level OYs could be used by each SSC to facilitate EBFM (joint with socio-economics session).

### **Social Science TOR**

1. Review each Council's SSC fishery management approaches, with general overviews loosely touching on the following topics (as appropriate for each region; i.e. the "round robin", 1st day, joint with ecosystem session).
  - a. An ecosystem perspective from each SSC to provide a general overview
  - b. A socioeconomic perspective from each SSC on current practice and challenges
  - c. How each SSC interacts with their Councils in policy development
2. Evaluate the role of social science analysis in SSCs generally, as well as the contributions social scientists can make as SSC members.
3. Evaluate the role of SSC social scientists in supporting Council deliberations on catch shares.
4. Explore issues regarding data and procedures for socioeconomic analysis in SSC work, e.g. peer review, terms of reference for subcommittees, etc.
5. Describe what are the frameworks (procedures, standing advisory bodies, TOR, etc.) for incorporating socioeconomic considerations into management.
6. Evaluate how to evaluate tradeoffs across fisheries, stocks, fleets and even other ocean-use sectors (joint with ecosystems session).
7. Develop recommendations for the integration of social science in SSC procedures.

# TRIGGER QUESTIONS

## Plenary Set 1

- i. How could system-level OYs could be used by each SSC to facilitate EBFM?
- ii. What facets of an ecosystem perspective regarding what would be needed, what's desired, and what's feasible to establish a framework for evaluating trade-offs?
- iii. How do socioeconomic factors play into OY, in principle or in practice?
- iv. How are trade-offs of all kinds (ecological, economic, social) captured in OY?
- v. How can risk analysis be used to help Council decision-making (link to ABCs)?
- vi. How do/could ecosystem assessments capture human behavior within the ecosystem?

## Plenary Set 2

- i. How do broader, contextual efforts inform and get utilized in the Council SSC advisory process, including items such as IEAs, CMSPs, annual state of the ecosystem reports, ecosystem status reports, and similar information?
- ii. How to identify and use the best institutional structures, protocols and procedures for doing so?
- iii. What are the best practices in broader, resource management frameworks?

## Plenary Set 3

- i. What are the best practices for frameworks to evaluate trade-offs?
- ii. What is the most important thing we need to nail down for the OFL-ACL continuum?
- iii. What is the biggest challenge facing SSCs nationwide?
- iv. Are there any lessons learned from data-rich situations that could inform data-poor situations?
- v. Are there any lessons and simpler methodologies from data-poor situations that could inform data-rich situations?

## Plenary Set 4

- i. What are the main recommendations from this workshop worth passing onto the CCC?
- ii. What topics should be covered at the next National SSC Workshop?
- iii. What other planning do we need to do for the next National SSC Workshop?

## Ecosystem Considerations

### Ecosys Set 1

- i. How are system-level OYs calculated?
- ii. How have system-level OYs been used by SSCs?
- iii. What ecosystem considerations are being considered in the OFL-ACL continuum? Apart from predation (covered specifically later), what about the following? Protected and Endangered Species; Fisheries Sustainability; Biodiversity; Habitat; Coastal Zone Management & Nutrients; HABS; Trophic balance; Systemic Considerations; Climate Effects; Invasive Species; Toxic Deposition; Offshore Energy Systems; Navigation Routes; Relativity & Interactions Among Drivers; Cumulative Impacts; and, Systemic Resilience
- iv. How are ecosystem considerations being considered in the OFL-ACL continuum?
- v. How is uncertainty associated with such ecosystem considerations being considered?
- vi. What models, data or information is needed to begin to consider these issues more directly?

### Ecosys Set 2

- i. Is there a generic basis for defining forage species?
- ii. How does each SSC evaluate forage stocks in incoming SA information?
- iii. How does each SSC evaluate forage stocks in the context of OFL-ACLs?
- iv. How does each SSC account for "adequate" food for commercial, protected, other species?
- v. What models, data or information is needed to begin to consider forage more directly?

### Ecosys Set 3

- i. How are SSCs helping their Councils to establish EBFM goals and objectives?
- ii. Are there overarching principles that can be agreed upon to guide the process?
- iii. What is the best way to provide technically feasible advice statements without prescribing policy to the Council?
- iv. Are there best practices of goals and objectives that could form a standardized listing?
- v. Are there best practices of goals and objectives that have been known to work elsewhere?

### Social Science

#### SS Set 1: General discussion of social science in SSCs

- i. What is the role of Social Science in an SSC context?
- ii. How does social science information directly inform OFL/ACL/ACT discussions?
- iii. How does social science information directly inform goals and objective setting discussions?

#### SS Set 2: Catch shares focus session

#### SS Set 3: practical and procedural issues in social science and SSCs

- i. What industry information could be useful to SSCs?
- ii. What community information could be useful to SSCs?
- iii. How best to measure such information and distill into advice for SSCs?
- iv. What data or models are needed or lacking?
- v. TORs and review of socioeconomic data/analysis
- vi. Resources to do analyses: data, models, and people



September 21, 2011

**INFO MEMO FOR NORTH PACIFIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT  
COUNCIL**

**FROM:** OES/OMC – Nicole M. Ricci

**SUBJECT:** Update on International Fisheries Meetings and Negotiations of  
Regional Interest

**Central Arctic Ocean:**

Due to the warming of the Arctic Ocean, it is anticipated that the range and distribution of some sub-Arctic fish stocks will extend or move into more northerly areas. At present no international agreement exists to manage fishing in the central Arctic Ocean. Vessels from any nation could begin fishing in the high seas portion of this area in the foreseeable future. Public Law 110-243 calls on the United States to initiate discussions with other relevant governments to address this situation. Recently, Senators Murkowski and Begich wrote to Secretary Clinton urging the Department to secure an international agreement that would prohibit high seas fisheries in this area until a multilateral regime is in place for managing such fisheries properly.

The Department has been actively pursuing these directives. In June 2010, Bill Gibbons-Fly, Director of the Office of Marine Conservation, attended a Ministerial level meeting in Oslo, Norway on high-seas Arctic fisheries. As a result of that meeting the United States hosted a meeting of Arctic fisheries scientific experts from the five coastal States (United States, Canada, Russian Federation, Norway and Greenland) in June 2011 in Anchorage, AK. A number of scientists from all five countries participated. The workshop focused on fish, invertebrate and marine mammal stocks, the ecosystems that support them, and the effects of climate variability and change on those species and systems. The purpose of the meeting was to review sustainability of existing subsistence harvests and commercial fisheries, particularly those in coastal areas and in sub-Arctic seas, and how climate change may affect those fisheries. The scientists identified gaps in scientific knowledge and

opportunities for collaboration in the area as well as the immediate need to begin conducting baseline studies as some changes in these ecosystems are already taking place. Strategies to meet these needs were presented as follows: implementation of formal exchange programs for scientists among the five coastal States; a workshop to design and facilitate the development of pan-Arctic baseline ecosystem surveys and to address data management needs and dissemination; and a workshop on modeling and forecasting.

**Intergovernmental Consultative Committee (ICC):**

The ICC was established under the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Union of Soviet Republic on Mutual Fisheries Relations of May 31, 1988, as amended. The obligations of the former Soviet Union under this agreement have devolved on the Russian Federation. The ICC is responsible for maintaining a mutually beneficial and equitable fisheries relationship through (1) cooperative scientific research and exchanges; (2) reciprocal allocation of surplus fish resources in the respective national 200-mile Exclusive Economic Zones, consistent with each nation's laws and regulations; (3) cooperation in the establishment of fishery joint ventures; (4) general consultations on fisheries matters of mutual concern; and (5) cooperation to address illegal or unregulated fishing activities on the high seas of the North Pacific Ocean and Bering Sea. The Agreement expires on December 31, 2013. The ICC is also the forum in which the United States and Russia have been negotiating the Maritime Boundary Line (MBL) Agreement. Both countries have signed the MBL Agreement, but only the United States has ratified it. The ICC meets alternately in the United States and Russia on an annual basis usually around the first week in September.

The 22<sup>nd</sup> ICC took place on September 5 – 9, 2011 in Monterey, CA at the Monterey Institute for International Studies. This year the discussions within ICC were conducted through three meetings: enforcement, science, and plenary. Ms. Nicole Ricci, Department of State, served as Head of Delegation for the enforcement meeting. The primary focus of this meeting was to negotiate the text of a bilateral agreement between the Parties concerning interaction and cooperation in detecting, determining, and eliminating illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing (IUU fishing). Addressing IUU fishing is a Department and U.S. priority and the Bering Sea and North Pacific have been particularly plagued with illegal harvest and transshipment of IUU product. This comprehensive agreement involves multiple departments and agencies within the U.S. and Russian governments and targets IUU fishing at sea, IUU product throughout the supply chain, and allows for evidence and information sharing which could be used in prosecution. As such it focuses on at sea

operations, case investigations, and prosecution in accordance with each Parties national laws.

The science meeting continued to review the potential and design for a joint research program in the Bering Sea to better understand and manage shared resources. The science meeting was chaired by Ms. Pat Livingston of the NMFS Alaska Fisheries Science Center in Seattle, Washington. In addition to examining the potential for a joint research program, scientists exchanged information on seabird bycatch and recovery efforts, status of marine mammals in the area and status of pollock stocks.

Department of State Deputy Assistant Secretary for Oceans Mr. Dave Balton served as Head of Delegation for the plenary meeting that covered issues of multilateral fisheries interest, cooperation in Arctic fisheries and joint enforcement operations along the Maritime Boundary Line. Members of the delegation included representatives from the U.S. Coast Guard, NOAA, Department of State and the Bering Sea Fisheries Advisory Body.

### **Convention on the Conservation and Management of Pollock Resources in the Central Bering Sea**

This Convention regarding pollock on the high seas portion of the Bering Sea became effective on December 8, 1995. The Signatory Parties are the People's Republic of China, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Poland, the Russian Federation, and the United States of America. The Convention Area is a circular pocket in the center of the Bering Sea beyond 200 nautical miles of the two bordering coastal States, the United States and Russia. The shape of the Convention Area is the basis for the Convention's nickname: the Donut Hole Convention. The objective of the Convention is to establish an international regime for the conservation, management and optimum utilization of pollock resources in the Convention Area; to restore and maintain pollock resources in the Bering Sea at levels which permit maximum sustainable yield; and to cooperate in the gathering and examining of factual information concerning pollock and other living marine resources in the Bering Sea. If the Parties agree to expand the scope of the conferences, the Donut Hole can also provide a forum in which to consider the establishment of conservation and management measures for other living marine resources in the Convention Area.

Among the main functions of the Annual Conference of the Parties to the Donut Hole Convention is to establish the allowable harvest level for pollock in the Convention Area. Despite the adoption of measures to promote the objectives of the Convention, the pollock resources have not yet rebounded to the level (1.67 million tons or more of pollock resources) that would trigger an establishment of an Annual Harvest Level

as defined by the terms of the Convention. As such, the Parties have agreed, by consensus, to continue a moratorium on pollock fishing in the Convention Area until abundance of pollock increases. Each annual Conference, since 1995, has resulted in this consensus decision. In 2009, due to the continually low pollock biomass and the commitment from each Party to maintain the moratorium, the Parties agreed to hold the conferences by virtual means, through electronic communication, until the pollock resources in the Convention Area are at or near the level needed to trigger the establishment of an Annual Harvest Level. This decision was primarily made to reduce the financial and time constraints associated with international travel for the annual Conference.

The first virtual Conference was hosted by the United States in 2010. Japan is hosting this year's Conference. The Scientific Committee met virtually from August 22 until September 14. The biomass numbers were not found to have increased to a level to allow the Parties to set an Annual Harvest Level. The plenary portion of the Conference is currently being held from September 22 through October 5, 2011. Any U.S. citizen who would like to participate in this virtual process is welcomed to request accreditation to the U.S. delegation through the State Department representative to the Council, Nicole Ricci.

#### **North Pacific Fisheries Management Commission**

The five coastal States, the United States of America, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Japan, the People's Republic of China and Canada, along with the fishing entity Taiwan (participating as Chinese Taipei) have been negotiating a multilateral Convention to conserve and manage high seas fish stocks in the North Pacific. Negotiations concluded in March 2011. Upon entry into force, the Convention will establish a new regional fisheries management organization (RFMO), the North Pacific Fisheries Commission (NPFC), with the mandate to adopt and implement conservation and management measures for currently unregulated non-highly migratory fish stocks in the high seas of the North Pacific Ocean. The text calls for a science-based and precautionary approach to management of fisheries resources, as well as for a strong monitoring, control, and surveillance regime. The Convention text also allows for the meaningful participation of Taiwan as a fishing entity in the new RFMO.

The States and Chinese Taipei have adopted interim measures for the protection of vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs) in the North Pacific Ocean, including a protocol for exploratory fishing. The protocol requires scientific assessments of the existence of VMEs and whether fishing activity will cause significant adverse impact to VMEs. Assessments are subject to regional review before authorizing new

fisheries in the area. The conclusion of these negotiations advances U.S. objectives and policy priorities, including a strong enabling framework for the development of effective fisheries and bycatch conservation and management measures, the protection of vulnerable marine habitats, use of modern compliance and monitoring tools and ensuring that fishing entities can participate in and be legally bound to the regime. The Convention is expected to be open for signature in late 2011 or early 2012 and will enter into force 180 days from receipt by the Depositary (Korea) of the fourth instrument of ratification.

Preparatory conferences to establish rules of procedure and financial regulations are ongoing. David Balton, Department of State Deputy Assistant Secretary, chaired negotiations on the Convention text. The U.S. delegation included representatives of the Department of State, NOAA, and the U.S. Coast Guard, as well as from industry, environmental NGOs, Congressional staff and the North Pacific Fishery Management Council.

#### **United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) Sustainable Fisheries Negotiations**

The UNGA Sustainable Fisheries Resolution addresses the full suite of issues facing international fisheries. The Resolution itself is broken down into thirteen chapters focused around particular themes, including: achieving sustainable fisheries; illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing; monitoring, control, and surveillance and compliance and enforcement; fishing overcapacity; large-scale pelagic drift-net fishing; fisheries by-catch and discards, subregional and regional cooperation, responsible fisheries in the marine ecosystem; and capacity building. The informal consultations on the draft resolution of sustainable fisheries are convened as a 2-part meeting. The United States is represented at these negotiations by the Department of State, Ms. Nicole Ricci (Office of Marine Conservation), who serves as Head of the Delegation, and by NOAA and NOAA fisheries technical expertise.

The Resolution calls upon States to adopt and implement fisheries management policies in accordance with the UN Fish Stocks Agreement and other international instruments and other modern principles of international fisheries, including strengthening port and flag State measures on IUU fishing, reducing bycatch and discards from fishing vessels, and reducing capacity in global fleets. In recent years some States have used the Resolution as a vehicle to move important issues to the front burner of RFMO agendas and to adopt political commitments on particular issues. For example, through the initiative of a few States, this resolution has been the center of international debate on the impacts of destructive fishing practices on vulnerable marine ecosystems, such as cold water corals, hydrothermal vents, and sponge fields. In 2006 and 2009 the Resolution contained a series of detailed actions

to be taken by States, RFMOs, and the Food and Agriculture Organization to protect VMEs and sustainably manage deep-sea fish stocks. The UNGA, which consists of 193 countries, has adopted the sustainable fisheries resolution by consensus for the last decade.

The first part of this year's informal consultations was convened from September 13 through September 14 at the United Nations in New York. There was also a workshop on September 15th and 16th to discuss implementation by States and RFMOs of the Resolution's provisions on regulating bottom fishing, protecting VMEs and ensuring the long-term sustainability of deep sea fish stocks. The second round of negotiations is scheduled for November will include a review by the General Assembly members of State and RFMO implementation of the Resolutions' bottom fishing provisions. The U.S. Government is hosting conference calls to provide stakeholders the opportunity to make recommendations on the U.S. position for the negotiations and for the review. If stakeholders are interested in participating and are not already on the distribution list, please contact Ms. Nicole Ricci at the Department of State.