

Biannual progress review of implementation of NOAA Fisheries Electronic Technologies Policy

Alaska Region Progress Report 9/21/15

Number of FMPs with defined fishery-dependent data collection monitoring goals:

All 6 of our FMPs address fishery-dependent data collection (see Table 1):

- 1 FMP (Arctic): No commercial fishing for target species is authorized in the Arctic Management Area. Thus no fishery-dependent data measures are currently in place but would be developed in the future if fishing was authorized.
- 3 FMPs (Salmon, Crab, Scallops): Each FMP delegates management authority of these fisheries to the State of Alaska under section 306 of the MSA, including delegation of data collection. In both salmon and crab fisheries there is electronic reporting of industry reports being implemented by Alaska Department of Fish and Game.
- 2 FMPs (Groundfish in BSAI & Groundfish in GOA) – both FMPs have sections that describe data collection and monitoring and use of improved technology to increase data quality.

Number of FMPs reviewed to identify fisheries where the adoption of additional electronic technologies would be appropriate for achieving data needs:

- In 4 of our FMPs (Arctic, salmon, crab, scallops) these metrics are not applicable (see Table 1).
- 2 FMPs (Groundfish in BSAI & Groundfish in GOA) have been reviewed where adoption of additional ET would be appropriate (see Table 2).

For fisheries where additional electronic technologies are identified as appropriate, the number of FMPs with electronic technologies incorporated into fishery-dependent data collection programs.

In 2 FMPs, 22 ‘fisheries’ have been evaluated to identify fisheries where adoption of ET would be appropriate (see Table 2):

- Electronic Reporting:
 - 22 fisheries (see green cells in Table 2) have mandatory Electronic Reporting already in place;
 - 15 fisheries have been identified where additional ER might be suitable;
 - 9 of these 15 fisheries (see yellow cells in Table 2) are currently being addressed through initiatives in the Alaska EM/ER implementation plan¹
- EM:
 - 4 fisheries (see green cells in Table 2) have mandatory video for compliance monitoring along with other electronic monitoring tools (e.g. motion compensated flow scales);
 - 10 fisheries have been identified where additional EM could be appropriate;
 - 3 of the 10 fisheries (see yellow cells in Table 2) currently have Cooperative Research underway by the Council’s EM Workgroup² to develop & implement a video monitoring program for catch estimation. These small-boat fisheries are currently the highest priority, but the EM workgroup will prioritize which fisheries would be addressed next.

¹ <http://alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/sustainablefisheries/em/akremerimplementationplan.pdf>

² <http://www.npfmc.org/observer-program/>

Table 1. Information on the fishery-dependent data collection monitoring goals each Fishery Management Plan (FMP) in Alaska.

Region and Council	Name of Fishery Management Plan (FMP)	Does the FMP have defined data collection goals?	FMP sections addressing fishery-dependent data collection monitoring goals.	Brief description of the data collection methods.	Have fisheries been reviewed to identify where ET would be appropriate?	Identify the fisheries where ET has been incorporated and the type of ET (ie VMS, elogs, electronic reporting, video, flow scales, etc)
Alaska - NPFMC	Arctic Fish Resources	Not applicable	Section 3.18 of the FMP describes the reason why there are currently no data collection methods in place (http://www.npfmc.org/wp-content/PDFdocuments/fmp/Arctic/ArcticFMP.pdf)	No commercial fishing for target species is authorized in the Arctic Management Area, and thus no fishery dependent data measures are currently in place. In the future, if fishing is authorized in the Arctic monitoring measures may be required.	Not applicable	Not applicable
Alaska - NPFMC	Alaska Salmon	Yes – delegated to State	Chapter 5 of the FMP describes monitoring and reporting conducted by Alaska Dept of Fish and Game (ADF&G) (http://www.npfmc.org/wp-content/PDFdocuments/fmp/Salmon/SalmonFMPfinal1212.pdf).	The FMP delegates management authority of the salmon fisheries to the State of Alaska, including data collection through industry reports.	Not applicable – delegated to the State of Alaska	The State of Alaska is implementing mandatory electronic reporting in salmon fisheries in the Interagency electronic Reporting System, or eLandings.
Alaska - NPFMC	Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands King and Tanner Crabs	Yes – delegated to State	Section 8.3 of the BSAI Crab FMP describes the management measures delegated to the state including reporting requirements (http://www.npfmc.org/wp-content/PDFdocuments/fmp/CrabFMPOct11.pdf).	The FMP delegates management measures to the State of Alaska, including management measures for record keeping and reporting (industry “fish ticket” reports).	Not applicable – delegated to the State of Alaska	All of the rationalized crab fisheries have mandatory electronic reporting of landing reports and IFQ reports in the Interagency electronic Reporting System, or eLandings.
Alaska - NPFMC	Alaska Scallop	Yes – delegated to State	Section 3.2 of the Scallop FMP describes the management measures delegated to the state including reporting requirements (http://www.npfmc.org/wp-content/PDFdocuments/fmp/Scallop/ScallopFMP2006.pdf).	The FMP delegates management authority of the scallop fishery to the State of Alaska, including management measures for record keeping and reporting (industry “fish ticket” reports).	Not applicable – delegated to the State of Alaska	
Alaska - NPFMC	Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands	Yes	Sections of FMP (http://www.npfmc.org/wp-content/PDFdocuments/fmp/BSAI/BSAIfmp613.pdf): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.2.1: Improve Data Quality, Monitoring and Enforcement, Objective 42 - Increase the quality of monitoring and enforcement data through improved technology. • 3.9.1 Recordkeeping and Reporting – describes industry self reported data collection • 3.9.2 Observer Program – describes observer data collection • 6.2: Management and Enforcement Considerations – provides information about management and enforcement including monitoring to estimate the total catch & use of increasingly sophisticated catch-monitoring tools, such as observer coverage, electronic reporting, vessel monitoring systems, and the use of at-sea scales. 	See Table 2	Yes – see Table 2	See Table 2

Region and Council	Name of Fishery Management Plan (FMP)	Does the FMP have defined data collection goals?	FMP sections addressing fishery-dependent data collection monitoring goals.	Brief description of the data collection methods.	Have fisheries been reviewed to identify where ET would be appropriate?	Identify the fisheries where ET has been incorporated and the type of ET (ie VMS, elogs, electronic reporting, video, flow scales, etc)
Alaska - NPFMC	Groundfish of the Gulf of Alaska	Yes	Sections of FMP (http://www.npfmc.org/wp-content/PDFdocuments/fmp/GOA/GOAfpmp613.pdf): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.2.1.9: Improve Data Quality, Monitoring and Enforcement, Objective 41 - Increase the quality of monitoring and enforcement data through improved technology. • 3.9.1 Recordkeeping and Reporting – describes industry self reported data collection & observer data collection. • 3.9.2 Observer Program – describes observer data collection • 6.2: Management and Enforcement Considerations – provides information about management and enforcement including monitoring to estimate the total catch & use of increasingly sophisticated catch-monitoring tools, such as observer coverage, electronic reporting, vessel monitoring systems, and the use of at-sea scales. 	See Table 2	Yes – see Table 2	See Table 2

Table 2. Summary of the existing monitoring tools currently implemented in the North Pacific. Catch share programs require a more intensive suite of monitoring tools for management and are therefore listed separately from the non-catch share programs³. **Green cells** indicate fisheries where electronic technologies have already been implemented and regulated programs are in place. Fisheries where additional Electronic Reporting (ER) and Electronic Monitoring (EM) could potentially be suitable are noted; **yellow cells** indicate fisheries that have been identified as high priority for implementation and have initiatives underway. (Note: AFA = American Fisheries Act; BSAI= Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands; CP = catcher/processor; CV = catcher vessel; GOA = Gulf of Alaska; IFQ = Individual Fishing Quota; IERS=Interagency Electronic Reporting System; LOA = length overall of vessel).

Program Type	Fishery	Current Requirements									Additional ER Potentially Suitable?	Potential EM Application?
		ER for Landings &/or Production (IERS)	Paper logbook ⁴	ER for logbook (elogbook in IERS)	ER for Observer data (Atlas)	Flow Scale	VMS	Video	Observer Coverage	2 nd Observer		
Catch Share	BSAI pollock trawl CP & mothership (AFA)	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100%	Y		
	BSAI non-pollock trawl CP (Amendment 80)	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100%	Y		Y - video and/or flow scale to monitor deck sorted halibut PSC
	Central GOA Rockfish Trawl CP	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100%	Y		
	BSAI Pacific cod Longline CP	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100%	Y		
	BSAI rationalized crab CP	Y	Y	Few- voluntary	N	Y	Y	N	100% - not NMFS	N	Y- elogbook	
	BSAI pollock trawl CV (AFA)	Y	Y	Few- voluntary	Y/N ⁵	n/a	Y	N	100%	N	Y- elogbook; Atlas	
	CGOA Rockfish Trawl CV	Y	Y	N	Y	n/a	Y	N	100%	N	Y- elogbook	Y-compliance monitoring & estimation of halibut PSC
	IFQ Sablefish CP	Y	Y	Few- voluntary	N	N	Y- AI only	N	100%	N	Y- elogbook	
	IFQ Halibut CP	Y	Y	Few- voluntary	N	N	Y- AI only	N	100%	N	Y- elogbook	
	IFQ Sablefish CV	Y	Y	N	N	n/a	Y- AI only	N	Partial	N	Y- elogbook	Y- video for catch estimation.
	IFQ Halibut CV	Y	Y ⁶	N	N	n/a	Y- AI only	N	Partial	N	Y- elogbook	Y- video for catch estimation.
IFQ Halibut & Sablefish <40' LOA CV	Y	Y ²	N	N	n/a	Y- AI only	N	None	N		Y – video for catch estimation	
Non-Catch Share	BSAI Turbot longline CP	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	100%	N	Y- elogbook	
	GOA Trawl CP	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	100%	N	Y- elogbook	
	GOA Longline CP	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	100%	N	Y- elogbook	

³ Table replicated from Alaska EM/ER implementation plan available at: <http://alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/sustainablefisheries/em/akremerimplementationplan.pdf>

⁴ Paper logbooks are required by NMFS for vessels >60ft

⁵ Electronic reporting software for observers, Atlas, is currently required for vessels >125' but some vessels <125' voluntarily use Atlas

⁶ Paper logbooks are required by IPHC for vessels >26 ft fishing for halibut; vessels >60ft are also required to submit paper logbooks by NMFS and there is a shared IPHC-NMFS paper logbook.

Program Type	Fishery	Current Requirements									Additional ER Potentially Suitable?	Potential EM Application?
		ER for Landings &/or Production (IERS)	Paper logbook ⁴	ER for logbook (elogbook in IERS)	ER for Observer data (Atlas)	Flow Scale	VMS	Video	Observer Coverage	2 nd Observer		
Non-Catch Share	BSAI Pacific cod Trawl CV	Y	Y	N	N	n/a	Y	N	Partial; some vessels 100% voluntarily	N	Y- elogbook	
	GOA pollock Trawl CV	Y	Y	N	N	n/a	Y	N	Partial	N	Y- elogbook; tLandings for tenders; Atlas	Y- compliance monitoring of no discard
	GOA non-pollock Trawl CV	Y	Y	N	N	n/a	Y	N	Partial	N	Y- elogbook; tLandings for tenders; Atlas	Y-compliance monitoring & estimation of halibut PSC
	Pot CP	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	100%	N	Y- elogbook	Y – video for catch estimation
	Longline & Pot >=40' LOA CV	Y	Y	N	N	n/a	Y	N	Partial	N	Y- elogbook; tLandings for tenders	Y – video for catch estimation & PSC monitoring
	Longline & Pot <40' LOA CV	Y	N	N	N	n/a	Y- AI only	N	None	N		Y – video for catch estimation & PSC monitoring
	Jig	Y	Y	N	N	n/a	Y- AI only	N	None	N		