COASTAL PELAGIC SPECIES MANAGEMENT TEAM REPORT ON INIATIVE 4:
ECOSYSTEM AND CLIMATE INFORMATION-PROGRESS REPORT

The Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team (CPSMT) in general supports the processes as described by the Ecosystem Workgroup (EWG) report on the Ecosystem and Climate Information Initiative regarding species selection and criteria, risk evaluation, and the proposed timeline for Council review and implementation. However, there were several sections in the report that were not clear and the CPSMT recommends appropriate revisions as follows.

In Appendix A - "Selection Criteria for Choosing Species/Stocks/Groups to Receive Ecosystem and Climate Information", under the Ecological Considerations and Social and Economic Considerations criteria, the High/Medium/Low categories are assigned corresponding likelihoods ranging from very high to low. A fuller explanation of what these likelihoods refer to and perhaps what they are based on, with the metrics used to determine each likelihood category, would be helpful.

In Appendix B - "Applying Selection Criteria to Sample Species/Stocks/Groups", for the criteria Scientific, Ecological, and Social and Economic Considerations, describing that the High/Medium/Low levels represent the degree to which the species/stock/group fit each criterion would clarify the tables. For sardine and albacore under the Scientific Considerations table, "High but Mixed" is used; this term should be defined as well. In addition, the rationale for sardine classification under Scientific Considerations appears to be cut off in mid-sentence, and the species name for Japanese sardine should be corrected to *Sardinops melanostictus*.

In Appendix C, Table C-1 - risk classification rubric, the "Level 1: Above or better than normal" row was added to the North Pacific Fishery Management Council's (NPFMC) risk classification table per Council direction. In the NPFMC, the risk table is used to qualitatively evaluate a range of concerns for three types of considerations (Scientific, Ecological, and Social and Economic) against known information that is not modeled analytically in the stock assessment. Clarification is requested on how a Level 1 determination differs from "Level 2: Normal" in relation to providing additional insight into risk in the decision making process outside of formal stock assessment-related considerations. Specifically, the CPSMT would like to see more detail in the rubric on what factors for any given species would lead to a risk classification that would be used to consider increasing harvest allowances under Level 1 classification.

The CPSMT also sees benefit in further discussing this initiative with the EWG between the September 2023 and the March 2024 Council meeting. A focus of this future meeting would be the CPS ecosystem and climate information on-ramps used in harvest setting, as depicted in the schematic for a potential process in Figure 2 of the EWG report. Additional topics could include risk classification (Appendix C), other possible ways to use ecosystem and climate information, potential workshop topics, and workload and scheduling issues. These topics could also be taken up as part of the proposed workshops that may be jointly supported by the Council and The Nature Conservancy.