

**North Pacific Fishery Management Council**  
**C3 Crab 10 year review**  
**June 10, 2016**

With the addition of the SSC's suggested improvements listed below, (minus bullets 2,4, & 7) the Council accepts the 10 year review as complete and final.

The 10-year review document, in its current form, would be more useful with the following adjustments in presentation:

- Extend the Summary and Conclusion section, which identifies the pieces of evidence for (or against) achieving each implicit program objective, to highlight major questions that remain unanswered, performance indicators whose status is currently unknown, and data/information deficiencies that preclude assessing whether program objectives have been met. Extending the Summary and Conclusion section in such a way could serve as a useful starting point for initiating more in-depth analyses of particular items of concern.
- ~~Conduct additional analysis to establish whether differences in ex-vessel prices among share types (e.g., Table 9-10) persist after controlling for the vessels and processors involved, etc.~~
- In the SIA, major shifts in the geography of quota are driven by CDQ groups with business addresses in Anchorage or Wasilla. Since this benefit is clearly linked to the CDQ region, this should be distinguished from non-CDQ owned quota in presentation of this information.
- ~~The SSC is excited to see the AFSC's new market profiles, and looks forward to reviewing them in a future meeting, but this document is probably not the best venue for them.~~
- The document would be enhanced by a discussion of what was learned in the process of designing and implementing the data collection for monitoring and evaluating the crab rationalization program, and how it led to discontinuities that limit its current value.
- The community engagement indices in Appendix B could be enhanced by further decomposing the observed trends into different components. For example, are the observed trends in community engagement due to community-specific factors that affect engagement in all fisheries, or are the observed trends specific to engagement in the crab fisheries? Extending the analysis to include engagement in other fisheries and/or using some form of shift-share analysis to further decompose the trends could be useful in this regard.
- ~~Appendix A stands alone from the main document, and would be more relevant if both sections drew on the data presented between them to provide greater context for change. The SSC felt the SIA lacked a full assessment of impacts beyond quantitative shifts in vessels, quota, quota holders, for example, but recognizes that ethnographic fieldwork is the only way to responsibly characterize impacts.~~
- Qualifying words such as “only” should be removed from the community-by-community summaries. For example, statements such as “there are only two vessels” or “only 4 crew jobs” are not contextualized for the role those small numbers represent, and that the losses of those may adversely affect communities.

Additionally, the Council Chair, Executive Director, and Chairman of the SSC will work together to develop a proposal to establish a Social Science Plan Team and to outline the scope of its work. Their proposal would be brought back to the Council for its review and consideration.