

Communicating results

Sarah Kruse (facilitator, rapporteur), Diana Evans, David Fluharty, Gordon Kruse, Patricia Livingston, and Skip McKinnell

Who is the intended audience and who will use the information?

The intended audience currently includes stakeholders, scientists and managers. Is there a need to expand this list? The first PICES report was published only in English. This means there is little or no public communication with organizations in Asian member countries. Should this situation be changed and if so, by whom?

For the reports to be more directly linked to management in Alaska, they need to include recommendations. Should the report consider trends and drivers in different regions of the North Pacific? What can be learned from trends in other regions – synthesis or comparison? What is the best way to prioritize information and put forward key information to NPFMC? Perhaps what is required is an attractive executive summary that is broadly distributed to the general public.

How do we communicate with the public (i.e., products and tools)?

Is TV the only medium? Although the executive summary is intended for NPFMC, it may translate more easily into an interview, news article, or report. It may be possible to use current communications groups (e.g., Alaska Sea Grant) to translate the summary into a newsworthy report. Other considerations include the expansion of the NMFS website or finding other places where an ecosystem management section might be interesting (e.g., teachers and high school students).

The *Ecosystem Considerations* appendix includes an Ecosystem Assessment section (the take-home message) but it is not clear how to communicate this. Could the bulk of the existing report be reduced by including the details on the website? The hard copy version is currently not working.

It might be useful to consider having two versions of *Ecosystem Considerations*: a full version for stock assessment and a shorter one for NPFMC.

The annual *Marine Science in Alaska* Symposium is very useful as a way to work with and communicate with others. There might be an opportunity to have a routine PICES oral presentation as a part of the symposium.

How do we create a user guide to indicators?

There are two issues – the need to define indicators generically and then to define specific indicators. Describe the resonance of the indicator to get a sense of its value. Resonant indicators reflect properties of systems other than their own internal variation.

How do we learn from and work with others?

Cooperating with organizations that share common interests may be important to understand their experience in communicating indicators. It may also be important to understand what trends are shared commonly among the regions. The group recommended a symposium be convened for countries and groups working with ecosystem approaches to management which could be both domestic and international.

What is the process of utilizing the document or information?

Reporting frequency was discussed, as was the need to reach a stage where NPFMC uses the report and its information. One suggestion was to maintain the information on the web, updating as new data become available, similar to a living ecosystem status report. Could there be a checklist that each stock assessment must address? The actively updated reports could provide information such as “what is the risk that a regime shift is coming?” It will be important to understand what proportion of variability (be it biomass or recruitment) comes from regime shift and from inter-annual variability. This will provide guidance on which temporal scales to focus attention.