

## GROUND FISH MANAGEMENT TEAM REPORT ON THE TRACKING AND MONITORING FOR TRAWL RATIONALIZATION PROGRAM

The Groundfish Management Team (GMT) reviewed and discussed Current Tracking and Monitoring Program Provisions (Agenda F.6.a, Attachment 1) and Draft Revisions to Tracking and Monitoring Program Alternatives (Agenda Item F.6.b). The team also attended the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel's discussion, which included a presentation on the British Columbia tracking and monitoring systems by Brian Mose.

The GMT recommends that the Council prioritize an analysis of a basic framework necessary to accomplish total catch accountability at the vessel level, which should be a primary objective of the tracking and monitoring effort. Major benefits of trawl rationalization (e.g., improved data on location of bycatch, the incentive to avoid bycatch, etc.) flow from the ability to collect information on discards and landings and then match it to each individual quota holder. The tools and components included in the alternatives provide a broad range of tracking and monitoring tools for analysis to accomplish this objective. However, a basic framework for total catch accountability at the vessel level should be the analysis priority. Once this framework is established, additional tools and systems can then be evaluated for what they would add to the program in terms of accuracy, speed, measuring program performance, and enforceability.

The team distilled the eight objectives in the draft alternatives into three themes: (1) conservation and management needs, (2) industry needs (accountability, business flexibility and certainty), and (3) enforceability. The core needs of all three themes are tied to accounting of total catch at the vessel level. Options not based on this concept may be of secondary importance.

Lastly, the team recognizes that cost is a major concern and understands that increases in speed and accuracy come with increases in cost. The team suggests that the foremost task in the analysis is to identify a level of speed and accuracy that achieves the full benefits of trawl rationalization as outlined above. Measures taken to decrease costs should be evaluated not just for losses in speed and accuracy, but also for what they subtract in terms of the loss in these benefits to management, industry, and enforcement.

### *British Columbia and Alaska*

The team believes that the Council would benefit from learning more about the British Columbia's trawl fishery "performance standard" model. Our understanding is this model starts with a performance standard (e.g., "total accounting of catch") and then uses iterative negotiation and evaluation processes between industry and government to explore the most flexible and effective methods for achieving the standard. The team also notes that Alaska has substantial experience with the tracking and monitoring of various rationalization systems and thinks the Council would benefit from more information on the design of the Alaskan tracking and monitoring systems.

GMT Recommendations:

1. Add an additional objective to the analysis: “To develop a program that provides for total catch accountability at the vessel level in order realize the full benefits of trawl rationalization.” This objective should be recognized as paramount to the success of the program.
2. Prioritize a basic framework necessary to accomplish total catch accountability at the vessel level. Secondary analyses could include additional tools and systems, as needed, to improve program performance.
3. Include end-to-end process diagrams and descriptions of the catch accounting systems used in British Columbia and Alaska.
4. Analyze and explore the “performance standard” approach used in the British Columbia.

PFMC  
3/13/08