

## ECOSYSTEM WORKGROUP SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON THE ECOSYSTEM AND CLIMATE INFORMATION INITIATIVE

The Ecosystem Workgroup (EWG)'s previous report ([Agenda Item H.2.a, Supplemental REVISED EWG Report 1](#)) for this agenda item provided recommendations and suggested next steps for the Ecosystem and Climate Information Initiative (Initiative 4). After further discussion of Initiative 4 at the March 2024 meeting, the EWG provides the below modifications to the previous recommendations, and requests that the Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) prioritize EWG and any additional relevant Council Advisory Body (AB) time to partner on these following activities to advance Initiative 4:

1. Work with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to further explore development of a methodological framework for risk tables and apply it to groundfish using the pathways described in the [November 2023 Scientific and Statistical Committee \(SSC\) Ecosystem-Based Management and Groundfish Subcommittees \(SSC-EBM/GFSC\) report](#);
2. Work with NMFS to broaden the application of risk tables to fishery management plans (FMPs) other than groundfish. Specifically, risk tables could be developed for salmon as recommended by the Habitat Committee (HC) and SSC ([Agenda Item H.3.a, Supplemental HC Report 1](#), [Agenda Item H.2.a, Supplemental HC Report](#), H.1.b [Supplemental SSC Report 1](#)) and for Coastal Pelagic Species (CPS) if recommended by the CPS Management Team or CPS Advisory Subpanel, as time allows;
3. Meet with the SSC-EBM Chair to refine the scope of topics and FMPs for the review with the SSC-EBM and relevant SSC FMP subcommittees prior to the proposed meeting, including improvements to and expansions of risk tables (H.1.b, [Supplemental SCC Report 1](#)).

The EWG still supports its previous recommendations 1 and 2 ([Agenda Item H.2.a, EWG Supplemental REVISED EWG Report 1](#)), and encourages development of a retrospective analysis for review on how the risk table framework could affect ABC advice from example groundfish stock assessments. In addition, after further discussion, the EWG has expanded the focus of recommendation 2 (listed above) to include both coastal pelagic species (included in the previous recommendation) and salmon, based on advisory body comments received at this meeting (H.1.b, [Supplemental SCC Report 1](#) and [Supplemental HC Report 1](#)). During review of other AB reports, the EWG agreed that while a process is necessary for developing risk tables for data-limited species or groups of species, we modified recommendation 3 to highlight the importance of first fully developing and reviewing the content and process for the existing pilot risk tables.

The EWG greatly appreciated the in-person meeting with designated representatives from the Groundfish Advisory Panel/Groundfish Management Team as it provided valuable advice on the risk table process and potential applications to groundfish management.

Lastly, the EWG offers a suggestion for The Nature Conservancy consideration in the development of a workshop that could focus on identifying pathways for incorporating on-the-water observations from fishermen and other sources of ecosystem information into the risk table approach.

PFMC  
03/09/24