



New England Fishery Management Council

50 WATER STREET | NEWBURYPORT, MASSACHUSETTS 01950 | PHONE 978 465 0492 | FAX 978 465 3116

John F. Quinn, J.D., Ph.D., *Chairman* | Thomas A. Nies, *Executive Director*

MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 8, 2019
TO: Groundfish Committee
FROM: Robin Frede and Jamie M. Cournane, PhD.
SUBJECT: **Follow-up on Amendment 23/Groundfish Monitoring draft alternatives**

Council staff provided this memo to summarize recent discussion on development of Amendment 23 (A23) draft alternatives, and to focus attention on questions the Groundfish Plan Development Team (PDT) has raised to the Groundfish Committee (Committee) in order to continue analysis and development of alternatives, in particular dockside monitoring (DSM) alternatives. The current version of the draft alternatives (dated September 10, 2018) is provided separately. Other documents related to A23 development, including summaries of PDT analyses, can be found on the A23 page of the Council website:

<https://www.nefmc.org/library/amendment-23>. Council staff are seeking further guidance in order to continue developing the draft alternatives.

Questions for the Committee re development of A23 draft alternatives

In a memo from the PDT to the Committee¹, the PDT outlined several questions it has for the Committee to help with further development of the draft alternatives. In particular, these questions focus on development of DSM alternatives. The PDT has outlined several different concepts for a DSM program based on different objectives², and requests clarification from the Committee on the intended objectives of a DSM program, which is a necessary first step to designing a DSM program.

Questions for the Committee re development of DSM:

1. What is the objective of a DSM program? Is it to ensure accurate reporting by dealers?
 - 1a. If so, is the Committee willing to consider a DSM program as a dealer responsibility?
2. Is the Committee's intent that the voluntary DSM program as an option for sectors to use in A23 would be in lieu of another requirement, or would grant some exemption or additional benefit to a sector adopting the voluntary DSM program?

¹ Memo from Groundfish PDT to the Groundfish Committee re progress on Amendment 23 (September 10, 2018) https://s3.amazonaws.com/nefmc.org/5_180910_GF-PDT-memo-to-GF-CMTE-re-progress-on-A23-with-attachments.pdf

² Ibid

Additional questions/considerations related to DSM program design:

- Should dealers be required to use certified scales and have monitors confirm the weights reported match the scale?
- Should the dockside monitor travel with certified scales and directly weigh catch?
- DSMs will need access to the dock, which might not belong to, or be controlled by, the vessel or dealer.
- DSMs need access and egress to vessels.
- DSMs need workspace at the dealer.
- Does a DSM program have any novel insurance requirements?

Additionally, the PDT has discussed a number of other details about DSM program development, including how DSM would be administered in smaller, remote ports, who would pay for DSM, and how DSM would align with existing reporting requirements. PDT discussion on these details of DSM program development can be found in the September 10, 2018 PDT memo as well as the Groundfish PDT Dockside Monitoring Discussion Paper.³ The PDT emphasizes, however, that the first step is to determine the goals and objectives of a DSM program, before analysis on the details of DSM program design can begin.

Groundfish Advisory Panel (GAP) discussion:

At its September 18, 2018 meeting, the GAP discussed some of these questions, including a discussion on the intended objectives of a DSM program, and also discussed the overlapping roles between DSM and enforcement. The GAP recommended to the Committee to develop alternatives for DSM that complement at-sea monitoring (e.g., observers/EM), as opposed to a stand-alone DSM program.⁴

Committee discussion:

At its September 18, 2018 meeting, the Committee had a discussion on whether DSM should be a stand-alone program or be part of a comprehensive monitoring program. The Committee also discussed the idea of DSM as a dealer responsibility, and discussed the objectives of a DSM program. Some Committee members stated they think that DSM is needed for landings verification and to ensure accurate dealer landings, while others said DSM combined with an at-sea monitoring component could improve monitoring and catch accounting. Some discussed the idea of DSM serving as a compliance tool. However, the Committee did not make any motions regarding development of DSM alternatives, and addressed some, but not all, of the questions from the PDT.⁵

³ Groundfish PDT Dockside Monitoring Discussion Paper, Version 2 (December 20, 2018)
https://s3.amazonaws.com/nefmc.org/181220_Dockside-Monitoring-Discussion-Paper_Groundfish-PDT_V2_with-appendices.pdf

⁴ See “Groundfish Advisory Panel Meeting Summary (September 18, 2018)”
https://s3.amazonaws.com/nefmc.org/180918_Groundfish-Advisory-Panel_meeting-summary_Final.pdf for a summary of the discussion.

⁵ See “Groundfish Committee Meeting Summary (September 18, 2018)”
https://s3.amazonaws.com/nefmc.org/180918_Groundfish-Committee_meeting_summary_Final.pdf for a summary of the discussion.

Status of A23 analyses

The PDT memo dated September 10, 2018 also included updates on additional A23 analyses:

Monitoring coverage levels:

At its September 18, 2018 meeting, the Committee received an update on a PDT analysis to analyze different fixed annual target coverage levels of sector trips with an approach to try to simulate levels of bias.⁶ This analysis is ongoing and evolving, and the PDT plans to include this analysis as part of the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) peer review of PDT A23 analyses.

Additional analyses - groundfish fishing activity west of 72 degrees 30 minutes west longitude:

The Committee also received an update on a PDT analysis to address a Committee request to analyze groundfish fishing activity west of 72 degrees 30 minutes west longitude to see if it would be appropriate to exempt vessels from at-sea monitoring and dockside monitoring (if implemented).⁷ Based on Committee discussion, the PDT will put this analysis on hold until the draft alternatives are developed further.⁸

⁶ Memo from Groundfish PDT to the Groundfish Committee re progress on Amendment 23 (September 10, 2018), Attachment #2 https://s3.amazonaws.com/nefmc.org/5_180910_GF-PDT-memo-to-GF-CMTE-re-progress-on-A23-with-attachments.pdf

⁷ Memo from Groundfish PDT to the Groundfish Committee re progress on Amendment 23 (September 10, 2018), Attachment #4 https://s3.amazonaws.com/nefmc.org/5_180910_GF-PDT-memo-to-GF-CMTE-re-progress-on-A23-with-attachments.pdf

⁸ See “Groundfish Committee Meeting Summary (September 18, 2018)” https://s3.amazonaws.com/nefmc.org/180918_Groundfish-Committee_meeting_summary_Final.pdf for a summary of the discussion.