

GROUND FISH MANAGEMENT TEAM REPORT ON
TRAWL RATIONALIZATION TRAILING ACTIONS

The Groundfish Management Team (GMT) had a presentation and discussion with the authors of the Initial Draft White Paper: Electronic Monitoring and Performance Standards ([Agenda Item F.6.a, Attachment 2](#)). The GMT had limited time for discussion and writing and only offer limited feedback at this time.

The paper provides a good overview of performance standards and how they compare to other regulatory approaches. Yet we do not think this is a matter of using performance standards or not, which is the way some discussions seem to go. An electronic monitoring (EM) program would involve several design elements and there would likely be a mixture of performance standards and other approaches from element to element. A structured program development approach where goals are made more specific and then looked at for how well they can be achieved and measured (for example with performance standards vs. prescriptive regulations) would be helpful for structuring discussions. Jim Seger (Council staff) had such an approach in the presentation he gave to the team. As noted in the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) report ([Agenda Item F.6.b, WDFW Report](#)), the term “performance standard” can mean different things to different people. Even in our brief discussion, differences in terminology popped up.

We had some discussion about the proposed composition of the work groups. The GMT suggests that the composition of these groups will be dependent on decisions that the Council makes. For example, if the Council chooses to consider all individual fishing quota (IFQ) sectors to use EM technology, then it would be worthwhile to have representatives from all IFQ sectors as well as an observer provider representative involved. If the work groups include hardware providers, the GMT sees benefit in having more than one. The proposed calendar is similarly dependent on what the Council decides.

PFMC
06/21/13