

TIQ INDEPENDENT EXPERTS PANEL REPORT TO THE COUNCIL ON
TRAWL INDIVIDUAL QUOTAS

The Independent Experts Panel (IEP) met to review the results of the Council scoping process on a dedicated access privilege system (individual quotas) for the groundfish trawl fishery. The objective identified for the panel's meeting was:

to determine whether there are major policy options and potential impacts that the Council should be considering in addressing the problem statement and stated goals and objectives, that have not surfaced during preliminary scoping by various Council committees or during the public scoping process.

The panel found the list of options that have come forward during public scoping to be complete with the following notes:

- If IFQs are area specific, the Council may wish to specify area specific accumulation caps.
- Substantial concerns identified by local communities may best be addressed by some combination of options such as a Canadian-like Groundfish Development Quota system,^{1/} issuing or allowing community organizations to acquire quota shares, and other such measures. In considering the importance of including options that address community concerns the Council should note that planning horizons and scope of effects of concern to communities are to some degree different from and broader than those of the fishing and buyer/processor sectors.

The panel also reviewed the goals and objectives for the IFQ program and identified the following concern:

Clearly stated, concise measurable objectives are needed to

- improve the analysts ability to provide relevant information focused on the issues of greatest concern to the Council,
- make the most efficient use of analyst time, and
- enhance post-implementation evaluation of program performance and the collection of data needed to support that evaluation.

To that end, the panel suggests that the Council consider the following recrafted goals and objectives. Note that in this recrafted version of the draft list, a distinction has been made between objectives that relate to the purpose for considering the program and objectives that relate to impacts

1/ Under the Canadian system, 10% of the IFQ is held back and issued to vessel/processor joint venture cooperatives on the basis of proposals judged, in part, on the basis of benefits provided to local fishing communities. This 10% allows the leveraging of much larger shares to the benefit of local communities. For example, a cooperative might dedicate all of its IFQ to landings in a particular community in order to gain access to some portion of the additional 10% available through the CDQ program.

the Council wants to be aware of and avoid in developing the program. This later type of objective the panel suggests be recategorized as a “constraint or guiding principle.”

Goals:

1. Increase regional and national net benefits including improvements in economic, social, environmental and fishery management objectives.

This goal subsumes the previous very general goal of “providing for a well managed system” and other broad goals including:

- Provide for a viable and efficient groundfish fishery*
- Increase net benefits that arise from the fishery*
- Provide for a fair and equitable distribution of fishery benefits*
- Provide for a safe fishery*

Most of these more specific goals are reflected in Magnuson-Stevens Act national standards and other guiding legislation and executive orders. More specific interpretation and statement of this goal is also provided through the associated objectives. Improved conditions should be considered to include conditions for harvesters, processors, crew, support industries and communities (i.e. all of those with a stake in the industry) as well as the nation as a whole (improved net social benefits).

2. Achieve capacity rationalization through market forces and create an environment for decision making that can rapidly and efficiently adjust to changing conditions.

This goal is intended to address both private and public decision making.

Objectives

- 1 Provide for a viable, profitable and efficient groundfish fishery (previously Goal 2, with addition of the word of “profitable”)
- 2 Minimize negative ecological impact ~~while taking the available harvest.~~(previously Obj 2) *(The panel’s perspective is that the clause “while taking the available harvest” can be assumed.)*
3. Reduce discard mortality ~~bycatch and discard.~~ (previously Obj 3)
(Under the M-S Act bycatch is discarded catch so the terms are redundant. Additionally, through this recommended change in wording the panel is suggesting that perhaps the issue of greatest concern is discards that die rather than total discards)
4. ~~Encourage sustainable fishing practices.~~(previously Obj 4)
This objective seemed vague and is addressed under mandates of the Magnuson Stevens Act and other law.
5. Promote individual accountability - responsibility for catch (landed catch and ~~bycatch~~ discards). (previously Obj 6)
6. ~~Provide~~ Increase certainty/stability for business ~~economic~~ planning (previously Obj 9)
7. ~~Provide~~ Increase operational flexibility. (previously Obj 10)
8. Minimize adverse effects from IFQs on fishing communities to the extent practical. (previously Obj 11)

9. ~~Promote economic and employment benefits through the seafood catching, processing, and distribution elements of the industry.~~ (previously Obj 12)
Remove as an objective and address as narrative under the goal.

Constraints and Guiding Principles

1. Taking into account the biological structure of the stocks including such factors as populations and genetics (expansion of Obj 1)
2. Taking into account the needs to ensure that the total OYs and ABC for the trawl and all other sectors are not exceeded (expansion of Obj 1).
3. Accounting for total groundfish mortality. (previously Obj 5)
4. Avoiding provisions where the primary intent is a change in marketing power balance between harvesting and processing sectors. (previously Obj 7)
5. Avoiding excessive quota concentration. (previously Obj 8)
6. Providing efficient and effective monitoring and enforcement. (previously Obj 13)
7. Designing a responsive review evaluation and modification mechanism. (previously Obj 14)

During its meeting the panel also identified some communication protocols for interacting with and advising the analytical team working on this project.