

GROUND FISH ADVISORY SUBPANEL REPORT ON TRACKING AND MONITORING  
FOR TRAWL RATIONALIZATION PROGRAM

The Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) heard a presentation from Dr. Steve Freese on the tracking and monitoring proposals being developed by the committee and discussed the proposed program which has been developed to date.

We also heard extensively from Brian Mose, a British Columbia trawler, about the Canadian experience in development of their IQ system and in particular, their experience with respect to monitoring. His valuable insight is appreciated.

The GAP makes the following recommendations and general comments regarding monitoring:

**1. Monitoring:** The industry recognizes and supports that 100 percent monitoring is necessary for a successful ITQ program.

**2. Objective:** There will be many benefits in addition to accurate monitoring and accounts resulting from the Monitoring Program. Real time information on total catch gives us a new level of accuracy in scientific information used by management and stock assessment authors, as well as the fishing industry.

A data base of accurate place, time and species of catch will give fishermen the tools to change fishing behavior. Some anticipated results are a lowering of non-directed catch, increased efficiency of catch, as well as more accurate information concerning the location of areas of preferred habit of species. Thorough and accurate monitoring is essential to reaching most Objectives of the Trawl Rationalization Program.

The GAP recommends the following Objective be added to the Monitoring Objectives:

*“To provide catch and scientific data which will facilitate reaching the Goals and Objectives of the Trawl Rationalization Program.”*

**3. Data Processing and Flow:** Accurate and timely data collection is of little utility if it gets bogged down in the processing system. Information/data flow must move smoothly and expeditiously through the system if it is to be useable by industry to form a business plan and prosecute a fishery. This will require the states to interface seamlessly with the data collection system.

The system developed by the states and Federal Government is just as important as the collection of catch data.

**4. Industry Participation:** The document reflects the concerns of management and not those of the industry.

The GAP wishes to impress on the Council the need to include the fishing industry in the process of developing the Monitoring Program. The devil being in the details, industry is particularly

interested in the rules which will implement the program. They are the ones who will be affected at the field level.

**5. Free Market Solutions:** Competition in administration, monitoring, data collection and processing is important if costs are to be reduced. This may require the farming out of activities such as monitoring, both at sea and ashore, data processing and reporting. This may change the role of fisheries managers but could result in cost savings as well as increased efficiencies. Industry will be more willing to bear these costs knowing there is competition in the process.

**6. Processor Production Reports.** Lastly the GAP questions the requirement of mandatory processor production reports. It is unclear what the need for this is and what information would be reported that would be informative beyond the observer data collected at the dock regarding amounts and types of species landed. It is possible that the additional information being requested in the production report is likely proprietary.

PFMC  
3/12/08