

EBFM: Public Outreach MSE Steering Committee Recommendations

**Andrew Applegate
(EBFM Plan Coordinator)**

**MSE Steering Committee
March 30, 2021**



Workshop Objectives

- Phase III-A: MSE Steering Committee recommendations for workshop objectives
 - **Build greater understanding of EBFM as a tool to assess and manage fisheries (education)**
 - **Identify potential opportunities and concerns that different stakeholders see in EBFM (EBFM objectives and performance metrics)**
 - What opportunities do you see to use EBFM to improve existing assessment and management systems?
 - What do we stand to lose in shifting towards an EBFM approach?
 - **Give opportunity to stakeholders to define next steps, building a willingness to continue participation in the process (future engagement)**

Phase III

Stakeholder Engagement

- Phase III-A: MSE Steering Committee recommendations
 - Public Outreach Workshops
 - Hire science communicator to develop workshop materials
 - Document, pamphlets, video, presentations, news releases, webinar, social media etc.
 - Design materials to be used in small and large format information workshops
 - Match up presentations with stakeholders expected at workshops
 - Use visually rich orientation presentations, create visual material. A visual storybook may be very effective
 - Develop Tangible Worked Example(s)

The MSE SC understands its role is to provide the recommendations below to guide Council-hired contractors, a science communicator and an outreach facilitator.

The MSE SC fundamentally believes that a successful EBFM design requires a co-development from all interested stakeholders.

This outreach phase should be part of an iterative, participatory process that gives stakeholders a voice rather than seeks to persuade towards a specific outcome. This principle of co-development influences our recommendations for a science communicator as well as workshop design. The following objectives should guide the outreach efforts:

- Build greater understanding of EBFM as a tool to assess and manage fisheries
- Identify potential opportunities and concerns that different stakeholders see in EBFM
 - What opportunities do you see to use EBFM to improve existing assessment and management systems?
 - What do we stand to lose in shifting towards an EBFM approach?
- Give opportunity to stakeholders to define next steps, building a willingness to continue participation in the process.

Cross-cutting issues

We recommend that the Council articulate a vision about why it is pursuing EBFM approaches prior to going out to the public in these workshops. The products used in the public information workshops should draw from this vision as well as the description of considerations in the eFEP document.


The MSE SC also recommends that the publicly digestible EBFM document and the public outreach present consistent messages about EBFM in all forums.

We anticipate that concerns will be raised during these initial workshops that are difficult to answer in this conceptual stage, such as specific implications on permits, choke stocks and other sensitive issues. We recommend that this outreach process acknowledge those concerns and help stakeholders see how those issues would be addressed in future stages of a process.

The eFEP is a toolbox for discussion of potential application of EBFM concepts and its strength is in the underlying science. The MSE SC identified some core approaches or themes in the eFEP that will be helpful to discuss with stakeholders to get their input:

- Communication in this outreach phase should focus on the opportunities EBFM may present and its potential application, rather than specific management issues.
- The core eFEP concept includes a catch framework that sets an overall ecosystem cap on removals as well as setting allowable limits for stock complexes rather than individual stocks. These catch limits and targets will recognize the trophic interactions between species.
- Although complex, this approach could be simpler for managers and allow more flexibility for fishermen to retain the species that they catch.
- The approach has the potential to be responsive to changes in the ecosystem and support the resilience of fisheries in a changing ecosystem.
- EBFM can be a more flexible and adaptive approach than the current fishery management practice.
- All management actions have tradeoffs, and there are things an ecosystem plan may not/can not address. It will not alleviate the need to prevent depletion of stocks due to fishing or the need to rebuild depleted stocks. It also does not totally take away from the potential for a 'choke' stock to restrict fishing for other species.
- The outreach should emphasize how EBFM contrasts with today, using simple examples - energetic based vs single species, i.e. parts of the approach that are fundamentally different

One way to convey the content listed above is through a worked example. We envision the



The MSE SC recommends that the public information workshops could be conducted in different formats such as those outlined below to address different kinds of stakeholders and also recommends that a facilitator be used to manage and promote effective dialogue.

- Smaller meetings with stakeholders who are leaders in their field (e.g., commercial fishermen and ENGOs)
- Larger meetings open to the public to address questions from a broader interest group, including:
 - Commercial fisherman
 - ENGOs and conservation groups
 - Research community
 - Other fisheries

Initial workshops should focus on education about EBFM. This can be achieved through carefully selected examples (e.g., drawing from eFEP and tangible worked examples), being careful that the examples are not conveyed as forgone conclusions or the only possibilities. The examples could introduce possible objectives and metrics, possible EBFM management actions, and the tradeoffs and contrasts with existing management approaches (e.g., strengths and weaknesses).

With an improved understanding of EBFM, subsequent workshops could solicit objectives and metrics of interest in the New England region. Furthermore, feedback on concerns and challenges to implementing EBFM should be welcomed. It will be helpful to ask what is currently not working well that EBFM might address, but also steer away from outcomes that cannot be tested or are better addressed through other types of management procedures, for example how sectors are governed.

Phase III

Stakeholder Engagement Strategy

- Workshop gateway – web deployment and mailings
 - EBFM communication tools
- Partnering
 - GMRI, UMass Dartmouth, State agencies, Sea Grant, Industry associations
- Social media engagement
- Effective workshop format and facilitation

Phase III

Challenges

- Develop simulations and evaluate management procedures
 - Objectives and tradeoffs
- Show how eFEP catch management approach and appropriate management procedures comply with the law
 - Preventing overfishing, preventing overfished stocks
- Discuss jurisdictional and permitting approaches



Phase III

Stakeholder Engagement

- Phase III-B: Management Strategy Evaluation
 - Develop objectives
 - Identify performance metrics
 - Identify potential management procedures, harvest control rules
 - Evaluate relative performance against a simulated system with known characteristics against stated objectives

