

NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON
WEST COAST FRAMEWORK FOR BEST SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION AVAILABLE

Response to C.4.a Supplemental STT Report 1

- STT notes: *“There are many examples of substantial review processes that are conducted for escapement estimation methods that take place each year.”*
- NMFS response:
 - NMFS requests examples and details. Identifying, documenting and evaluating the adequacy of external review processes would help complete the framework. Details of such reviews have not yet been available.
 - Inclusion of some of these details in the final framework would be desirable, but not all of this evaluation will be concluded by the final submission of the framework.
- STT notes: *“Additionally, estimation and review is performed under very short time frames so as to make the escapement estimates available for stock assessments and fishery planning during the winter/early spring time frame. It is unclear how the SSC could perform a review of escapement estimation methods given the nature of escapement estimation and the annual management schedule.”*
- NMFS response:
 - NMFS does not suggest that the SSC take on annual review of escapement estimates and agrees that doing so would require changing management schedules and document delivery timelines. Such a recommendation is beyond the scope of this framework.
 - However, if there were to be an SSC or more extensive external review, it could be after the fact (or out-of-cycle) to improve the methods for future use. Alternatively, an initial review of methods could be followed by review only when methods change, or even verification of the extent and suitability of external agency reviews.

Response to C.4.a, Supplemental SSC Report 1

- SSC notes: *“Questions were previously raised by the SSC regarding the review and updating of the reference points used in salmon status determinations and about the process for initiating reviews of the processes and models providing inputs to annual salmon management, such as the forecasts used to inform catch specifications. NMFS has yet to fully resolve these matters and will continue collaborative efforts to better document processes as the framework is refined leading up to the March/April Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) meetings.”*

- NMFS response:
 - NOAA Fisheries anticipates that this is one area where the documentation process will extend beyond the finalization of the framework in collaboration with relevant partners.
 - *“Provide fuller documentation of the stock status determination process for CPS.”*
 - NMFS response: We understand this to refer to the process for determining whether CPS are subject to overfishing or not is not documented. This will be addressed in the next version.
 - *“Be consistent and clear in documenting the role of the SSC in the stock status determination process for each of the FMPs. The SSC notes that no role is described for the SSC or Council in status determinations for CPS or groundfish and suggests that the final draft framework should add roles or describe why no roles are assigned.”*
 - NMFS response: Actions differ across FMPs because of the nature of how information is developed and varied review processes, therefore roles will not be consistent across FMPs. This will be clarified in the next version.
 - NMFS response: NMFS notes that the SSC has an critical role in advising the Council on BSIA. Further, we presume that those products they determine to be BSIA will have the information necessary for status determination.
 - *“In the arbitration process documentation, clarify the definition of science providers and be specific about the role of the SSC versus other “science providers.””*
 - NMFS response: “Other science providers” refers to those outside of NMFS who provide scientific information. We understand that SSC provides science reviews, and does not routinely provide science products. This will be clarified in the next version.