GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE

Astor Crowne Plaza New Orleans, Louisiana

August 15, 2016

VOTING MEMBERS

Greg Stunz.....Texas
Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
Myron Fischer (designee for Patrick Banks).....Louisiana
John Greene.....Alabama
Kelly Lucas (designee for Jamie Miller).....Mississippi
Robin Riechers.....Texas
Andy Strelcheck (designee for Roy Crabtree).....NMFS
Ed Swindell.....Louisiana
David Walker.....Alabama

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

Kevin Anson (designee for Chris Blankenship).....Alabama
Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
Doug Boyd.....Texas
Pamela Dana.....Florida
Leo Danaher.....USCG
Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
Tom Frazer.....Florida
Martha Guyas (designee for Nick Wiley).....Florida
Campo Matens.....Louisiana
John Sanchez.....Florida

STAFF

Steven Atran.....Senior Fishery Biologist
Matt Freeman.....Economist
John Froeschke.....Fishery Biologist - Statistician
Douglas Gregory.....Executive Director
Beth Hager.....Administrative Officer
Karen Hoak.....Administrative & Financial Assistant
Ava Lasseter.....Anthropologist
Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
Emily Muehlstein.....Fisheries Outreach Specialist
Claire Roberts.....EFH Specialist
Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
Camilla Shireman.....Administrative Assistant
Carrie Simmons.....Deputy Director

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

Ken Anderson.....Panama City, FL

Pam Anderson.....Panama City, FL
Patrick Banks.....LA
Eric Brazer.....Reef Fish Shareholders' Alliance
Derek Breaux.....New Orleans, LA
Chester Brewer.....SAFMC
J.P. Brooker.....Ocean Conservancy
Traci Floyd.....MS DNR
Benny Gallaway.....LGL, TX
Sue Gerhart.....NMFS
Gary Jarvis.....Destin, FL
Joe Jewell.....MS DNR
James Kejonen.....NOAA OLE, LA
Bill Kelly.....FKCFA
Rich Malinowski.....NOAA, St. Petersburg, FL
Ron Messa.....NOAA, LA
Bonnie Ponwith.....SEFSC
Lance Robinson.....TX
Mike Rowell.....
G.P. Schmahl.....Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary
Clarence Seymour.....Ocean Spring, MS
Bob Spaeth.....SOFA, FL
Jessica Stephen.....NMFS
Stephen Szedlmayer.....Auburn
Helen Takade-Heumacher.....EFH
Amanda Wimbish.....CLS America

- - -

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- - -

The Data Collection Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council convened at the Astor Crowne Plaza, New Orleans, Louisiana, Monday morning, August 15, 2016, and was called to order by Chairman Greg Stunz.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA
APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CHAIRMAN GREG STUNZ: We will call to order the Data Collection Committee, and the materials for this committee can be found in Tab F. The first order of business, it looks like -- Let me see. I think we've got all of our committee members around the table, so we meet those quorum requirements.

The first order of business is the Adoption of the Agenda. There have been a few changes that I will tell you about in a second, but does anyone else have any changes they would like to make to the agenda?

Seeing none, one of the changes is Bob Gill is not able to be with us today for that Item Number IV on the NFWF Presentation for the For-Hire Pilot, and so we won't be getting that presentation. I would recommend to staff that we put that on for the next meeting agenda, because I think we're all kind of interested to hear how that's going, and that will play quite well into the discussions that we're having, and so we will hold off on that. Otherwise, I think our agenda, with that modification, will remain the same. Is there a motion to approve the agenda?

MR. ROBIN RIECHERS: So moved.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: It's seconded. Is there any discussion or any other changes? If none, the agenda is approved. The next item of business is Approval of the Minutes. Are there any changes or edits to the minutes? Seeing none, does anyone want to make a motion to approve the minutes?

MR. RIECHERS: Move to adopt the minutes as written.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: There is a second. Seeing no discussion, the minutes are approved. We will move on to our first order of business, Item Number III, which is the Action Guide and Next Steps that Dr. Froeschke is going to walk us through. While he is getting ready to do that, just a summary of the last time of what we did.

We had several motions at the last committee meeting, and one

was to accept the recommendations of the Data Collection Technical Committee, with obviously the intent to build that into the document, and I'm sure John will go over that with us.

Myron was concerned last time about defining some of these minimum data elements a lot better, and so we had a motion to do that that I think we'll hear some discussion on. Then the last thing that everyone can be thinking about as we're going through these discussions is we made another motion to convene the technical committee after this meeting.

I am recommending that probably we're going to need some motions to charge this committee with exactly what we want and some products and some things like that, in terms of action, and so be thinking about that as we move along. With that, John, do you want to talk us through our action list?

ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS

DR. JOHN FROESCHKE: Good morning. I'm going to start on Item V. Item V has three parts, essentially. There is the Updated Generic Reporting Document, which I will give you an overview of the changes and the reorganization of the actions and alternatives, to reflect the guidance you provided at the last meeting. That is Tab 5(a).

Tab 5(b) is a summary spreadsheet that I put together compiling a list of reported data elements relative to catch, effort, and trip information from twenty-two programs in the Atlantic and Gulf region, and I will go over that and we can talk about some of the common fields.

Then the remainder of this item will be from SERO staff, and they have a couple of different things. They have put together a list of potential data elements to be included in the program that you all are considering. They have organized them in elements that would be reported prior to initiating the trip, during the trip, and then possibly after the trip, with some summary information, and Jessica has a presentation to give you a feel for how this might work in a simulated trip, and so that will be Tab 5(c).

The last two items, Item VI and VII, are informational. Item VI is a report from Dr. Ponwith about the commercial electronic reporting program that we asked for last time, or that you did, and then, last, Greg has a summary from a meeting that he attended on behalf of the council in May from ACCSP, where they discussed for-hire reporting. That's what I've got.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: All right. Thanks, John. Then the next agenda item would be to go through this Tab 5(a). Do you want to start there, John, or how do you want to recommend that you go through these materials? I will kind of leave it up to you, since you've sort of got three related things.

FOR-HIRE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS
MODIFICATIONS TO GENERIC CHARTER VESSEL AND HEADBOAT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

DR. FROESCHKE: I am ready. I would like to start on Tab 5(a). If you're fine with that, just go to Chapter 2. It's on page 7 of the document. There are four actions in the document, and, just to update you and for those new members, the way the document is organized, Actions 1 and 2 are essentially the same, the difference being that Action 1 refers to documents that we consider charter vessels. Action 2 considers vessels that we consider headboats.

Understanding that the distinction between these can be murky, the way we have continued to define this is if a vessel participates in the Southeast Regional Headboat Survey, it is a headboat and it would be included under Action 2. The remaining vessels would be under Action 1.

The actions and the alternatives, there are four in this document. They are essentially unchanged from the last time that you saw them, and what this refers to is the frequency and mechanism of data reporting.

You have previously selected Preferred Alternative 4 that would require federally-permitted charter vessels in Action 1 to submit fishing records to NMFS for each trip via electronic reporting, using NMFS-approved software prior to arriving at the dock. The clarification or the additional information on the types of devices and things are covered in Actions 3 and 4, and so we will get to those.

Just for our new members, the difference or the rationale for Preferred Alternative 4 is trip-level reporting is the only way that we can require them to provide information prior to them returning to the dock. For example, a daily reporting, if they only submit one a day and they do multiple trips, they wouldn't have to submit their information before returning to the dock, and that's a fundamental break in the type of validation that can be done.

If they have to submit their report before they know whether or not they will be intercepted, it provides an additional rigor to the validation process that we're always interested in. In many discussions, we've always considered that sort of the gold standard of validation, and that's the primary motivation for selecting that alternative. While I've got the mic, Alternative 2 is exactly the same, but it just refers to headboats. I will stop and take any questions there.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: John, I have something, or go ahead, Myron.

MR. MYRON FISCHER: I know this has been our preferred alternative in Action 1, to go with Alternative 4, since the beginning of the document, but -- It doesn't have to be this meeting, but I do think we need further discussion.

Our local fishermen have expressed displeasure about it, because of the type of boats they operate, mainly. 95 percent of them are outboards, and, reading Bob Zales's letter on the boats that make the multiple trips, we envision, from the state standpoint, a different method of validating, where we're taking a sample of the vessels arriving and checking a random sample. We have always felt the burden should be on the agencies doing the work and not putting the burden on the fishermen.

This may not be the place, but I would like to put a bookmark to one day we do discuss this, because it's all part of the larger picture of what are we trying to get, what data elements, and so we can't decide whether we want them to report prior to getting to the dock until we know the whole basket of data elements that they will be offloading. I think I would rather wait to have the discussion until we see all the data that's going to be necessary and then come back and discuss this.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Fischer, and I believe we'll discuss some of that data today, and so then maybe we can continue that, but my comment was related to along your same lines and the same email that I got from Mr. Zales about these multiple trips and how that confounded things and added all sorts of problems that we weren't really anticipating.

How we handle that, I don't know, John, and did you see those emails, John? Were you on those? Maybe you can comment, if you can, how this reporting -- How we could alleviate that, essentially, is what I'm looking for.

DR. FROESCHKE: I did read the emails. They were pretty long, but one thing that I am not clear, just to try to reflect your

intent in a subsequent draft, is, as we understand it, if you're reporting per trip before you hit the dock, the validation would still occur. A subsample of those would be validated, and so it's not clear to me, to revise the document, how that's inconsistent.

I guess the only difference could be, as I understand it, is the estimate of catch would be determined based on what they report and not from the subsample of the intercepts, and so I'm not sure if that's where the confusion is, but it seems like this was consistent with the validation that Myron is describing.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mr. Fischer.

MR. FISCHER: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and it goes back to the purpose and need. If the purpose is timeliness and accuracy, we still feel you can get the same timeliness and the same accuracy with reporting after the fact, reporting either that night or some other window. It won't really affect it.

I think the concept, or what's in some people's mind, is they hit the button -- On all the boats, they're hitting the button and suddenly a red light goes off in Roy's office to shut it down, and that's not the way it's going to work. Maybe, after we have all of the discussions on all of the aspects, we could come back and review, but I think we're attempting to burden a lot of fishermen unnecessarily, because I don't know at what speed this data is going to be utilized.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Bonnie.

DR. BONNIE PONWITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You're absolutely right that this does not take the place of dockside validation. There would still have to be an equivalent dockside validation component of this. The notion of submitting the data prior to hitting the dock enables that dockside validation to be done with a higher level of precision.

Essentially, if a captain submitted their data, it would have effort data in it and it would have catch data in it, and those data would be submitted before they had knowledge of whether they were going to be intercepted by a biologist or by a law enforcement officer.

What that does is it creates a stronger incentive for the report that is submitted to actually map very tightly with what's on that vessel and map very tightly with the actual effort and catch of that fishing trip.

If a captain comes back at the end of the day and records what was caught, we would, over the dockside intercepts, be able to take a look at what the average catch was across captains and what the average landings report that was submitted electronically was and do a comparison, but that creates a looser comparison, a much less precise comparison, between those two to refine them and calibrate them. The intent, I don't think, is to use those data in absolute real time, but it's to create a much more precise report.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Robin.

MR. ROBIN RIECHERS: Bonnie, I mean obviously you summarized the notion of incentives there. Getting to Myron's point, you know, as this document started, and I don't remember which meeting it was at, but certainly we heard from lots of folks, and specifically it was the Venice area, of fishermen who didn't think this current notion of on-the-water reporting was going to work for them.

In your point, Bonnie, it really comes down to a cost-benefit question of the expense, what you're gaining from the reporting and that level, versus what you're gaining if you do it at the end of day or by the next day or whatever that case is.

I think, whether it's three trips or one trip, I think that can all be worked out in whatever the questionnaire and the design of the reporting is, but I think those are the issues that we're struggling with.

The other thing that's a little bit left unsaid here in this document is we're struggling with what's it going to cost and what's it going to cost to the fishermen, and, right now, those are unknowns, and we're kind of leaving it unknown in this document, and so you're asking the council to possibly go forward and approve something where we don't know what it's going to cost various angling groups. We've got some estimates and some ranges, and I understand that, but I think that's one of the questions, as we try to select what it is, what those true costs are going to be as well.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: First, I have Andy and then Mr. Greene.

MR. ANDY STRELCHECK: Jessica will be speaking to this a little bit later in the committee. We've given a lot of thought to this, especially the hail-in requirement. In the commercial fishery, when you hail-out, we've thought about the differences

between what the commercial fishermen would provide versus what a charter vessel could provide to help with data validation and on-the-dock, essentially, reporting.

With the hail-in requirement, we have also given some considerable thought in terms of, if it is required, how can we simplify it and have a minimum number of data elements, so that it wouldn't be a huge burden on those that are participating in the program.

At the end of the day, we're constantly criticized for our statistics and data, and so we're trying to build a system, obviously, that's going to be a balance for the fishermen and for the agency, those that are using the data, that ultimately is going to be better than what we're currently using, and so we have to figure out where that happy medium is.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mr. Greene.

MR. JOHNNY GREENE: I am looking forward to that presentation as well, but, in the state that I reside in, in Alabama, it is required through the State of Alabama. There is an app that you have to report before you hit the dock. Obviously the State of Alabama has put that in place for a particular reason. I am certainly not going to put them on the spot, but I do believe it's certainly going to reduce the recall bias.

I have used the electronic logbook program this year. It's taken a little getting used to, but it's something I can do within three to four minutes now, understanding everything that's in it, and it goes through some pretty detailed information, as required through the MRIP process, and so, while I appreciate the conversation around the table, I think that this alternative is the correct one at this time, but I certainly want to hear more discussion about it and see the presentation and see how we go about it. With that conversation to be continued, I will let it go at this time.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mr. Anson.

MR. KEVIN ANSON: Thank you. Johnny, you touched upon a little bit of it. Alabama's program has the mandatory reporting requirement before a fisherman lands their snapper in Alabama. Granted, we've had relatively low participation rates, as far as the timing of that report being submitted before the fish are actually brought onshore, but it kind of is in line to the comment that Dr. Ponwith had mentioned regarding the use of the data, if the was a mandatory reporting requirement before the

trip had ended, but yet you weren't going to be using that information for any estimation of catch at a point in time, and did I hear you correctly when you said that?

DR. PONWITH: Those data would absolutely be used to reflect effort and absolutely be used to reflect catch. It's that the reason for pushing the button before you hit the dock isn't so that you know whether you have hit your ACL before you hit the dock. The timing of that is not going to be that precise. It is to be able to more tightly map the record from the vessel report to the intercepts, to be able to do a closer comparison of how closely those match.

If they match very closely, it bodes very well for the success of the electronic reporting. If there is a wide disparity between what's reported on the vessel and what shows up at the dock, it points to there being reporting error, and that reporting error has to -- You have to adjust those landings to calibrate for that reporting error, and so that would be the strongest use of those data.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Dr. Lucas and then Mr. Swindell.

DR. KELLY LUCAS: Thanks. I just wanted to point out, when Johnny was talking about Alabama's program and requiring them to report before they hit the dock, we too have a mandatory reporting system in Mississippi. We do not require them to report before they hit the dock, but we do require them to submit information before they leave the dock, letting us know they are going fishing.

We do have a very high compliance rate, and I noticed, during our MRIP review of our program, that three of the four professors of statistics that they had in the room did not say that reporting before they hit the dock was important to the system.

The compliance rate being what it was was beneficial to them, and having the information where you notified that you were going out fishing was important, but, because of the high compliance rate, it was more of a concern of who wasn't in the system at all, in terms of the validation, more so than being required to report before you hit to dock.

I am not a professor of statistics. They can probably explain it a little better than I could, but I was impressed that they felt that that wasn't necessary and that there were other ways to get at the data.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mr. Swindell.

MR. ED SWINDELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The problem in Louisiana is that a vast majority of the charter boats that go out, as far as twenty and even forty miles, are center-console boats with no head cover or no nothing.

I was out there snapper fishing last year and out there was a boat that I estimated to be twenty-eight feet long, forty miles out in the Gulf, fishing around the same rig we were fishing around, and that boat had no cover. As we started back in, it was raining. There's no way this guy can do a before landing report in the rain aboard that vessel. There was no way that that was going to happen.

Too many times, and I don't know about Texas, but I think Texas has a lot of center-console charter boats that are going out twenty miles, fifteen miles, whatever it may be, to catch red snapper, and I just don't see that this is a practical way for us to try -- I agree that we would love to do the great validation of what is really being done, but I just don't see that we can demand that these people report as they return. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: We will move on here in just a little bit, but these are probably some good points as we start thinking about how we want to charge the technical committee, if we decide we want to do that, but the state reps here have brought up some good points, and that is that we need to have some discussion at some point, and we won't have enough time today, I don't think, but how is this program going to interface with the programs that they already have going on?

That's going to be something important, but, related to what Robin said, in terms of costs, I am concerned about not only real costs, but also time costs as well. I mean, I'm a big proponent of reporting before you get to the dock, but I was surprised, in those emails that we all got, that there was actually three trips going on per day. That is something we obviously want to capture.

What I am wondering, and maybe Bonnie can tell us or someone else around the table, but, from a time cost, when you're stopped for validation, how long -- If you're turning around another trip, or two more trips, potentially, that day, how long does the validation take, on average?

DR. PONWITH: That's a tough one to answer, and it's because a lot of it would be dependent upon how many passengers the vessel had. I can go ahead and look at, right now, what the average MRIP dockside intercept looks like, in terms of the timing, and give some statistics on that. I don't have that right now, because the dockside intercepts are being run by the MRIP program at this point.

If you're interested in that, I can see if I can gather up some statistics on that, but, if the vessel is a large vessel with a lot of passengers and the catch is large and it has big species diversity, it can take some time.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Headboats obviously aren't making a lot of multiple trips a day, but, in the Headboat Collaborative, this was recognized as an issue early on, and we worked with the Headboat Collaborative members and our port agents to set up some efficient sampling methodologies that everyone can work with, so that we avoided the problem of passengers having to wait a considerable amount of time in order to do that dockside validation. We can't obviously codify anything like that in regulations, but I'm sure there is avenues to make sure that that process is as efficient as possible, moving forward.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: In the interests of time, we probably need to -- Mr. Greene, if you have your hand up, go ahead.

MR. GREENE: I have participated in the program, and, going back just a second, the units that we're using right now in the program that we're in is a little bigger than my iPhone, roughly twice the size. It's in a waterproof case.

I understand the points that everybody makes, but I can assure you that if a captain is offshore and he gets a text message or an email about a fishing trip, he is going to reply to that. In the same amount of time it takes to reply to an email or a text message about a trip, he could report without any trouble.

Now, as far as the question about the timeliness, if they are running three or four-hour trips in a day, they're not going to have a whole lot of species diversity, to speak of, and they're not going to have, typically, a whole lot of people, because they're typically smaller boats and it shouldn't be that big of an issue. It's not going to be a large headboat coming in with 149 passengers, to any degree.

The times that I am at the dock and the people are at the dock to do the validation, by the time we get in and get the fish unloaded, they go through them and process them and weigh them and measure them and do the stuff. By the time, we get through cleaning fish, they are typically pretty close to being done. They're probably working on the surveys with the individual anglers, and it seems like it always works out to be fairly close in time.

Now, if there is a situation where there is a little bit of a time lag, any good, astute captain is going to explain what we're doing and why we're doing it, in an effort to get the data right, and people understand that there might be a little bit of a delay, but I don't think you're talking about hours and hours of time. I mean you're talking about a few extra minutes to get something right, and I don't think anybody would be opposed to such an idea.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: That's exactly what I had envisioned, Johnny, to that point. I think the technology now is -- I am envisioning a three to five-minute entry process, at least once it's set up and all your fields are populated the same each time, so this not a big burden. John.

DR. FROESCHKE: I just wanted to chime in briefly on this. My intent here was just to sort of give you a 30,000-foot overview of the changes to the document. I think a lot of this will be more clear on how it could work during Jessica's presentation, and so I guess I would propose that I briefly just highlight the changes we made in Actions 3 and 4 and then perhaps we could just turn it over to her and let her make the presentation, and some of this would be -- Some of these questions might be answered.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Yes, John. If that's okay with the committee, I suggest that we do that, because we do have these two presentations that we need to move forward as well.

DR. FROESCHKE: Okay. What I would like to do now is just briefly go over Actions 3 and 4 and just give you some information on how we reorganized this. Then I think we can, like I said, come back to anything that you need to discuss.

Action 3 now refers to the trip notification and reporting requirements. As has been discussed and recommended by the technical committee, we have hail-out and hail-in considerations.

The action is constructed of three alternatives. Alternative 1, there are no hail-out or trip notification requirements. The only caveat to that is that dual-permitted vessels that are participating in the commercial reef fish fishery, they do have a hail-out requirement when participating as a commercial reef fish participant, but it isn't directly applicable to this.

Alternative 2 addresses the hail-out, and so this is the starting of the trip. There is an Option a and b, which pertains to charter or headboats, and it's really just, prior to departing for each trip, a vessel would be required to hail-out the trip and include the expected return time and landing location, and this was recommended from the technical committee report.

Alternative 3 could be selected in addition to this, and it addresses the hail-in requirement. This is, prior to arriving at the dock at the end of each for-hire trip, require the vessel operator to hail-in and submit the fishing records via electronic reporting. The device is addressed in Action 4, and, again, there is two options, a and b, for charter vessels and headboats.

There is a note here describing that the mechanism is not determined yet, and so we have some broad distinctions in Action 4 for your review. Some of that will be described in the presentation that's coming up. Is there any questions about that? Otherwise, I will move to Action 4, quickly. Okay.

Action 4 addresses the types of devices that were considered, and, if you want to put up Figure 2.4.1 in the document. It's on page 15. As we've discussed, there are really sort of three types of devices.

Alternative 2 addresses the cellular-phone-based archived GPS capabilities. If you look on the figures, that's sort of the one in the middle there. Electronic logbook with archived GPS, that's analogous to Alternative 2.

Alternative 3 refers to something intermediate between that and a full-fledged VMS, in which this would be a portable tablet-based device, but, instead of working on a cell-based system, it would work on a VMS satellite-based system that could transit location and reporting information anywhere in the world. It would have some safety at sea improvements, and it would accommodate places in the Gulf where cell range is limited, but this still would be a portable type of device, and so VMS lite, perhaps.

Then Alternative 4 would be akin to full-fledged VMS, if you will. That's similar to what currently is used in commercial reef fish and CMP vessels. It would be permanently affixed to the vessel. You could submit report information as well as hail-in and hail-out types of information, and so it's sort of a good, better, best type of arrangement.

The costs and things sort of reflect that. Depending on the council and depending on where your deliberations go, it may be possible that you select one and then everything better than that could also be included. For example, if you pick the middle one, that would also allow a full-fledged VMS to be used.

That is sort of the arrangement of the document, based on our last discussion. I am not asking for you to make any recommendations, I guess, at this time, but perhaps we could lead into Jessica's presentation, to sort of outline how this could work.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: All right. Thanks, John. Unless the committee members have any comments, I think it might be a good idea to let Jessica give the presentation and then we can have some discussion after that. Are you ready? This is going to be Tab F-5(c).

DR. FROESCHKE: F-5(c)(1) is the PowerPoint.

PRESENTATION ON ELECTRONIC REPORTING

DR. JESSICA STEPHEN: What we did is we came up with kind of a flow chart of how the process would work, from when they leave the dock to when they get back to the dock, and we based this on a lot of the information we've had available from commercial boats, from the headboat pilot program, as well as knowledge of other reporting mechanisms throughout the country.

The first thing to start with is the hail-out requirement. One of the good things about a hail-out is you know that a vessel has left for a trip. In this, we anticipate an idea where the vessel would be identified and they would select a landing date and time when they are expected back as well as a location. They might even choose something such a target species, if they had that knowledge known. That would probably differ between a headboat and a charter boat. A charter boat might have more knowledge of it.

With building into this, we could have that hail-out built into

a system that emails both law enforcement and port agents, so that they're aware of a trip being sent out. We did use that with the headboat pilot program, and it was very effective, and I will go into a little bit more detail about this step now.

As I mentioned, one of the good things is that this becomes an indication that a trip was taken, and it's also a spot where you can start identifying a unique trip identifier that identifies a trip throughout the entire process, so you can link everything together.

If we use something like a landing location -- In the commercial and the headboat pilot program, we used approved landings locations. The benefit of that is that they can use a code or a name that's been approved and law enforcement knows exactly where that is. Most charter and headboat guys come and go from the same place, and so they will know that prior to the start of the trip. Again, this would be different from what the commercial hail-out requirement is.

They would also give the estimate for the return time for their hail-in, and this helps plan a bunch of different types of activities for it, and a lot of information, such as the vessel identifier and all of that, could be preloaded into the form, so that they don't have to enter it every time, and keep that in mind for some of the other information as we go through.

Then they would go out fishing. At some point in time, we would require a hail-in. Now, depending on the system chosen, they could possibly record their at-sea information while they were fishing or after, as they're heading back after the catch has actually been taken.

Again, we would have a mechanism for email that would go to law enforcement and port agents, to notify them that they are coming in. If the hail-in had a requirement of some kind of catch effort, they would have that information given to them for biological validation of what they caught.

At-sea data collection, the location information could be automatically collected from the system they would use. This would be a little dependent on whether they chose a VMS or archived GPS, whichever methodology for hardware was chosen. '

Then the hail-in, again, it might not be viable for all hardware options, and so I'm going to start with the VMS. The hail-in would work, but, if we move to something like a cellphone, a lot of times you won't have cellphone coverage until you get very

close to land, and so consideration of what type of hardware is used kind of goes hand-in-hand with what you want to consider for the hail-in.

If you want them to hail-in prior to coming in to land and you want a certain timeframe above that, you have to consider that cellphone won't work, because then they will have to idle out there to work with it. Some locations, I believe we don't even have cellphone coverage really close to where the landing location is.

What the hail-in does, and I think Bonnie has kind of mentioned this before, is it allows a comparative validation of what you have. You have stated in your hail-in that you have that many fish onboard. They're able to count that. That makes it better data collection for what we use the data for, in the long run. This was instrumental in the headboat pilot program in double checking what they were landing against what was reported in the landings.

Now, the hail-in can be used in a couple of different of manners when you're thinking about it. We could use it solely as a validation tool, where it's used to check against the biological agent, or you could use it as part of the final logbook dataset.

If you were thinking of it as a validation tool and you were concerned about how much entry was going on at sea, you might want to consider something that has more of a species-specific reporting validation tool. Maybe you don't have to report all the species you're catching in the hail-in, but you want to report the ones that are of high interest, and NMFS would probably make the determination of which species would be reported. For example, red snapper would probably be one we would want reported coming in.

The opposite way is looking at it as part of the final logbook. In that sense, you would want the entire catch reported in the hail-in part, and that just, later on, becomes part of the final logbook record. We connect it to the hail-out information as well as the hail-in information and some other information as we keep going on. Again, there is a unique trip identifier to link it back to the other information, and we could also allow them to provide an updated landing date and time.

You all know the weather changes when you're out there or a trip maybe got extended because people weren't catching a lot. You could then send through something that says, you know, we thought we would be in at nine, but now we're going to be in at

ten. That allows the agents, again time to plan and schedule.

Then there is the final part of that, the final submission of all the data. This has some information that -- As we go into the data elements, we will see that there are some data elements that probably aren't necessary to be reported while they're at sea or the person who is reporting, the captain or the first mate, might actually not know that. This is typically the socioeconomic data that's needed or information about fees for the trips, things like that.

At the final logbook completion, that type of information could be entered in, and, again, with a unique trip identifier, it would link it all back to one record. Then you have to think about timeframes to complete this final record. As I mentioned before, the idea of at-sea validation and the fact that there are multiple trips, we want to think about recall bias or mixing up information from one trip to another.

One of the suggestions would be to do it at the trip-level reporting where we're at. We did have problems, occasionally, in the headboat pilot program were two trips were run in a day, and the captain got confused about what was what when they were doing their landing records. What helped us is that the hail-in straightened out what that was, because they reported them at the time they were doing the trip.

The last thing I want to go over is I was out in San Diego, and I was working with an electronic reporting and monitoring group, and what we got to do is we went out on -- We didn't go out to sea, but we went on the charter vessels out there, the charter headboat and partyboat vessels, and they created their own system for reporting that is similar in concept to what we're trying to do here.

Now, this is not run through NMFS. It is run through the charter association there. They voluntarily put it together, but there were some lessons learned there that I just kind of wanted to go over.

One of the things is they had a four-section logbook reporting. They had a pre-departure, which is very similar to what we kind of have in our hail-out requirement thoughts. They had the vessel information and they had the port they were returning to, and they also there could also declare a no-fishing activity. If they were taking a sunset or dinner cruise out instead of fishing, they could claim it right there and that would be the end of their records.

Then they had information about the trip itself. They had information about the length of the trip and the target species, information about bait and gear. Some of that, they could fill out before they even left for the trip. They kind of knew what they were going to target and what type of gear they had onboard.

Then they collected the trip catch information while at sea, and they had rugged tablets that were waterproof. With that, they kept information about the species that were caught. They kept both kept fish as well as discarded fish and fish that were lost to predation.

That information was all entered at sea. They had an app-style webpage that they could enter it in on, and then they had -- When they got back into range, that information was sent to the system. Finally, they had the post-trip information. This is the stuff the captain might not necessarily know, is how much did everyone pay to go out, how much fuel did we use, things that maybe the owner had more information on.

Here they had departure and return times finalized, number of hours fished, the depths that they fished at, number of fishermen and crew, et cetera. At this point, I've gone through kind of what we had in mind, and I am willing to take any questions about the kind of concept and thought we were having.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Any questions? If there are no questions or maybe while you're thinking about it, Dr. Froeschke also wanted to talk about these minimum data elements and sort of a review of some of the other programs and that kind of thing of what they're collecting, and so, John, would you like to do that now? This will be a good time, and then maybe we will have the full suite of information, at least for this meeting, that we can have a little more discussion.

REVIEW OF MINIMUM DATA ELEMENTS

DR. FROESCHKE: Yes, and so what I would propose is I'm going to go over 5(b), which is a summary of the minimum data elements that I will describe, and then I'm going to let Jessica go over the 5(c), the spreadsheet that they prepared.

What I did is the ACCSP put together a report, and they reviewed twenty-two or twenty-three programs, in terms of the minimum data elements that were collected, in terms of trips, vessels, and catch and effort. This spreadsheet and the PDF really just

sort of describes this. There are three tabs for them, and I was just going to go through them one-by-one and not get too far in the weeds.

For example, in this trip tab, the way that spreadsheet is organized is the fields are on the columns, on the top, and then the programs are on the rows on the left, in Column A. Then if that information is submitted as part of the trip, then it just has an X in the column.

You can see that there is some consistency and some different. What I did, in order to sort of make heads-or-tails of this a little bit easier is, if you scroll down, there's a chart at the bottom of this. What I did here is I took each of the programs and then I just tabulated, for each of the fields, how many programs reported a particular data element.

As you will see, there are a few of these, dates and times and things like that, that are reported in almost everything, and then there's sort of a natural break there, about the fourth element, where there is fewer and then it just sort of decreases on in.

The trip identifiers and things like that are fairly standard in nearly every program. As you get further down into the weeds and depth fished and sea surface temperature and things like that, it's only a few of those, but it, I think, provides some depth or breadth of the types of fields that are presented. Again, if you want to go deep into these, they're in the briefing book, and so I wasn't planning on going deeper than that, unless you had a specific question.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: John, I think that's probably fine for now, unless a committee member has an alternative suggestion. This graph that you have here is very informative, in the sense that's what most common among these different programs, but I didn't see that in the briefing book, or maybe it's -- It's hard for us to read here, and maybe you could provide that, so we can take a closer look at that, particularly for future discussions, because, at least to me, I think what I'm seeing is a lot of these things are starting to really fall out, in terms of what all of these programs are feeling is essential. We just need to decide where we're going to draw the line as you go down that chart. Go ahead, John.

DR. FROESCHKE: Yes, and we can certainly share the spreadsheet with you. The vessel tab, if you click on the vessel tab, it's sort of the same pattern. Again, you can see the programs,

which are the same. They are in Column A, and then the specific attributes that are collected are, again, in the columns. Most of this is vessel registration and things that you can think of that could be pre-populated, and so they're not attributes that would require at-sea kinds of things.

Again, if you scroll down, you will see there is a chart, and, again, I ranked these in terms of the number of attributes collected by programs. That was sort of a declining field. There isn't really strong break like in the vessel, but you can get a pretty good idea on what's collected in nearly every program.

Again, we can certainly provide this to you to delve into, and so the last tab, which is the catch and effort tab, it summarizes perhaps the types of attributes that are collected potentially at-sea or reported at-sea. It's the same programs, and this deals with the number of anglers, the number of fish, and primarily the species, what are caught and how many.

Then some of these programs are pretty detailed, in terms of lengths, weights, and discards. Many others don't have quite that much detail, and then, again, there's a summary of most of those down there. For example, everyone collects species. Number of rods and things, there is only a couple, and so there's a pretty good range and perhaps some natural breaks, depending on what you felt is appropriate for this program. Then Jessica has put together a summary of synthesizing some of the things that we've talked about at the IPT level, perhaps how it could work in the programs that we're discussing now, and so if you want to bring up 5(c), the spreadsheet.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: John, while she is bringing that up, at least I didn't find it, but the summary graphs that you did of each of those tabs and the spreadsheet, if you could provide those, that would be good. It helps to synthesize what's in these charts. Maybe they're there and I just missed it, but I couldn't find them.

DR. FROESCHKE: I think that they didn't come through in the PDFs, which was in the briefing book. After the committee, I can certainly send those around.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: While she is pulling that up, Andy, did you have a comment?

MR. STRELCHECK: John, I would be interested in your take on the summary graphics. Looking through the programs, there is

certainly some differences, I think, in what they're intending to collect. There is some discard programs in here, a catch card program, and so how comparable would you say the graphics would be if some of that would be removed? Do you still think the same trends would exist or do you think that the variables that are being collected would be more consistent with the program that we're envisioning implementing here?

DR. FROESCHKE: I am not aware, in my review of these, that there's anything that's exactly what we're doing. I think, in terms of the tabs and how the information is divided into when it is reported, is similar. In terms of specific data elements, I don't know. There are a number of them, and so there's a fair bit of variability, but I think most of them all have aspects of the -- There's a description of the trip, a description of the passengers and vessels and what was caught.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: The last meeting, or at least the last couple of times, Myron, you specifically had brought up several good points about we need to know specifically what are we collecting and what are these data elements and that kind of thing. I think, and maybe I'm wrong, and I don't want to speak for you, but I think this Table 5(c) here probably captures what you're thinking. If it doesn't, and, John, please go through it, but if it doesn't, Myron, certainly let us know if that's what you're envisioning. John, are you going to talk us through the 5(c)?

DR. FROESCHKE: Jessica is going to go through that.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Go ahead, Jessica.

SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL DATA ELEMENTS IN FOR-HIRE PROGRAM

DR. STEPHEN: What we did as the IPT is we went through and we looked at a bunch of different data elements, and I am going to concentrate on when they're reported and what types of things versus what previous surveys or whatever collected, since John kind of covered that.

A lot of these fields, you will notice there is auto-populated field there, and that means that we can minimize data entry by the participant by having it auto-populated or kind of saved as a template from it.

The information we felt that was needed within a hail-out would be some kind of vessel number, the vessel identifier. Typically, this is the Coast Guard vessel identifier.

Occasionally, it is the state vessel identifier.

The type of trip that they were going on, and this is typically used to identify if they're doing a commercial trip versus a headboat/charter type of trip or some other trip, such as the research cruises or sunset cruises that a lot of these vessels also take.

Landing location and landing date, as we mentioned before, and an estimated time of the return time, with the landing time. That estimated time could also be the final time. As I mentioned earlier, they might have an ability to update that time in a different portion of it after we get past the hail-out portion of it.

The other information in it would be also what the species targeted for that trip would be, and, again, this might be something more suited to a charter boat than a headboat, which might not target a particular type of species. That type of information though is extremely helpful in the analysis of the data we collect, and especially with the socioeconomic aspects.

Then, the very last thing that we were thinking that could go into the hail-out would be the number of passengers onboard. This would be the number of paying passengers, and, again, this information starts to get relevant when we're doing additional analysis to it, and that is known before you leave for a trip, and so it's one of those information that you can do that you're not worried about being out at sea and entering more information.

The next thing we thought about is what could go into either the hail-out or logbook style. If you remember the presentation, we kind of had the hail-in part could be just catch and effort or it could be everything, catch and effort and all the other information you want in the logbook, versus having just the catch information and some additional information later for the final logbook.

Then the fields we were concerned about adding there would be the landing time, which would be the actual time, if it differed from the time put in on the hail-out. The number of hours fished, the number of anglers onboard, and remember this could be different than the number of passengers. Not all passengers are anglers.

The species that were caught, and we would want that both as retained catch, what they're landing, as well as released catch,

which are the discards. What type of trip was going on, and so their pay type, that is some boats charge by person and some charge by group. Some have a mixture of these types of things, depending on what type of trip they're doing. Again, this is helpful information in the final end, to summarize it, and that might be information that is more well suited to be done in the logbook at the very end, versus something being done at sea. Again, this is something that the person who is physically entering the data might not not be aware of all of that, especially if it's a captain or a mate running the vessel and filling out this information.

There is a bunch of fields that we thought would probably be more well suited to a subsample versus a census of all information, and these are grouped together here. They're under the charter fee, the amount of fuel used, the fuel price, how much the crew gets paid.

The next set of fields have to do with gear, for the most part. What type of gear was used, and some of these in purple are ones that we're still thinking about, such as the type of hook, in particular the manufacturer, the number, and the size of the hook.

A lot of the hooks might change by different manufacturers, and, depending on the analysis done, that might be something we would want to investigate later. It's not necessarily something we are going to require here, but we want everyone to start thinking about how that could be used and how that would better suit our data analysis after the fact. That's all I have now, if anyone has any questions about the different types of fields.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Jessica. Johnny, hold that thought one minute. We're, as usual, running out of time here, and so I want to make sure that we get through a few things, because there is a few items that we need to take care of, but, Johnny, go ahead.

MR. GREENE: I was just going to give a little feedback to Jessica. Like on the fuel quantity and fuel price, that's something that is in the current program that I've been using, and it's always kind of been a estimation on the amount of fuel burned, as well as the cost.

I think that's something that you could almost do retroactively and say, okay, during this past week, was the average amount of fuel burned and what was the average cost of the price, because it's kind of hard, as fuel may fluctuate a little bit while

you're gone, as well as fuel burned as well, and so that may be something that you could have -- If you want to do stuff daily, then that's great. Then if you want to have a set of parameters that was due weekly or biweekly or something to that effect that would kind of capture that, it may work out as well.

I mean everybody is going to have a copy of a fuel ticket. Now, I know that there are some places that charge a fare plus fuel, and there are other places who charge a total fare including fuel, and that may be something to look at as well.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Yes, and that's a good example of a concern that I share here, I think with some other people, and maybe this is a good charge for this technical committee. I guess I can say this, because I'm as guilty as anyone. When you turn scientists onto something like this, we want the kitchen sink, but then what do we really need?

Maybe what would be a good exercise for this technical committee is what's the essential -- I mean the hook manufacturer, that's great, and, believe me, I completely understand that a 4/0 from one company is different than a 4/0 from another one, but that is not as important as how many red snapper did you land, for example, and so what's the bare essentials that you need to do effective management? What are really needed and then maybe what is this bonus kind of thing?

That's where I kind of recommend we go with that, because, at least from our experience, we don't want to burden the captains and the anglers with entering too much, where they're disenfranchised.

This needs to be a simple, clean process and then figure out other ways to get at some of this other information, an example that Johnny is talking about. Anyway, that's my comment on that. I am looking around the table to see if there is any more comments, because we need to see where we really want to go with all of this, since we're running out of time here, but, Andy, go ahead.

MR. STRELCHECK: I think that was the intent here, was to give you what we believed were the minimum data elements, and I think, going down to at least crew pay, maybe some of those economic variables weren't necessarily minimum data elements, but most of these are, and many of them can be auto-populated, and so we're trying to minimize the burden while also collecting the necessary biological and economic data for fishery management and science.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thanks, Andy. I guess, committee, if someone wants to make a recommendation on how we want to proceed here. I mean obviously we need to have some more discussion, which we're not going to have time. I think we'll have about forty-five minutes during full council that we can discuss some more of these in a few days, but we had a motion the last time to convene this technical data collection group, and I don't know if we need to provide them with a charge or I don't know --

Maybe, Doug, you can give me some comments or suggestions on how you normally do this. When we're asking the committee to do something, do they need a charge from us? I think it would be nice, to make sure we're getting what we want. Then, really, where do we want to go from here with this amendment, given that we have about eight minutes left and Dr. Ponwith still wants to give us a brief summary of this commercial cost analysis? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: This is fairly atypical, for I guess the council to be discussing or even getting the technical subcommittee to advise on data elements. This is something that is typically specified by the Science Center, in conjunction and coordination with the council and the SSC and others.

To me, this is essentially the information needed as a placeholder for the document itself. It's laying out the intent of the information that would be collected, and it's certainly the opportunity of the council to provide input into that, but, ultimately, at the end of the day, we need to make decisions about what is necessary for managing the resource and the science. I am questioning the need to send this back to the technical subcommittee to discuss this further, given the amount of work and time that's already been put into this.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. That's a good point, Andy, and one discussion that we had that's related to what you pointed out is that if we specify this in too great detail in the amendment process, that kind of hamstrings us just a little bit in terms of if we want to make some changes on something that's not working. We're going to have to go back through a relatively burdensome process to make the changes, rather than giving you some flexibility, but, on the other hand, we also want to maintain some control, in a way, so we can ensure that the captains and anglers are getting what they want out of the program, and so I'm not real sure where the balance is there. Maybe we don't want to have this group meet. I don't know, but does any of the committee have any suggestions on that?

MR. DAVE DONALDSON: Based on what Andy was saying, I'm not sure that the technical committee can provide any more insight into those elements, other than saying, yes, these look good, and we all were kind of struggling with what are we going to charge these guys with, and we all just kind of looked at each other. If we can't come up with something fairly quickly, maybe we don't need them to meet.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: I feel like we're at a spot with this amendment that we have sort of gone a long way to -- I mean there's still some more discussion, certainly, but, at least on this topic, we've kind of gone as far as we can go without moving it to the next level. Johnny, did you have your hand up? Then, Myron, you're next.

MR. GREENE: Thank you, Chairman. If you remember a couple of meetings back, we had a liaison for the South Atlantic Council, and they said that they had put in the -- In this portion of the document, in the appendices, is where they went in and put in the data fields, and I think -- I thought it was a good idea then, and I still think it's a good idea, because obviously every document we do is going to be a living document, and that may very well be the way to go to kind of find our way out of this.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mr. Fischer.

MR. FISCHER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe where we are today is a function of we assembled the technical committee with the charge to look at the minimal data elements, and it was in conjunction with the Southeast Center, who we thought might be making the presentation, but it's not until this meeting that we see this list.

When they met, they didn't have this list to look at, and the technical committee is made up of the data specialists from each of the five states and Gulf States, along with some Science Center staff. It was to give us advice that may not necessarily be needed on what data elements should be involved in a program, and possibly that's their call. It's very possible that that's the Science Center and National Marine Fisheries call on exactly what is needed.

This committee did meet, and I think they are scheduled to meet again, and it might be by webinar. I am not sure. I would have no problem with them reviewing this, because some states might collect different datasets, and so you don't want to omit something that a state is collecting. At the same time, they

may feel something is useless, and so I would like to at least see their comment. That's what the original motion was about.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. So are you recommending that we proceed through a webinar or a conference call type of thing with them or how would you recommend that we move forward?

MR. FISCHER: I don't recall what was set up, and Doug would have to answer that, but I thought I had seen where it might be a webinar.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DOUG GREGORY: Are you talking about with the technical committee? John arranged all of that. I don't recall.

DR. FROESCHKE: I was discussing something with Jessica. Can you repeat the question?

MR. FISCHER: We were discussing your raise, but I don't think anyone was in agreement. It was the technical committee coming up, and was that to be by webinar or it was going to be an in-person, or was it even going to happen?

DR. FROESCHKE: We have it sort of on our radar to happen. In terms of whether it was a webinar or in-person, we hadn't decided, and I think that kind of hinged on what happens here or my raise or whatever.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mr. Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Based on what we want them to do, I think we can handle it through a webinar. I don't know that we need to have them face-to-face, because we're just essentially having them review that one document, and so I would recommend that, if we do decide to proceed, that we do it via a webinar.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Dr. Lucas.

DR. LUCAS: As part of the webinar or part of the information provided, I would like to have the states submit also -- I mean, I see that we've got MRIP and all the different programs, but, like Myron said, states may have a different thing, and so make sure that those are included in that chart as well.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: That's a very good point that Dr. Lucas brings up, and also a way, during that webinar, to somehow liaison with the state programs, to make sure that this meshes well. I think

that's where we're going with that. Mr. Chairman, I know we're running out of time here. We probably can continue some of this discussion, particularly as it relates to the alternatives, during that time in full council.

I know Dr. Ponwith wanted to give a quick brief on the cost analysis, and I was asked to report really quickly on that ACCSP, and I think we can do that in just a very few short minutes, but how would you recommend that we proceed here, since we're almost done?

MR. ANSON: I would suggest go ahead and try to knock out that last agenda item and Dr. Ponwith's comments, and Andy is frantically waving his hand over there.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Sorry, Andy. I can't see you down there behind seven or eight other people.

MR. STRELCHECK: If I can make two closing comments. One is I think, to convene the technical subcommittee, it's very important to decide on how you want to proceed with the hail-in option as well as hardware, because some of these data elements are contingent on those reporting mechanisms, and so, if that could be discussed during full council, it would be highly beneficial, in particular to select preferreds at that point.

The second part of this just a recommendation for the next council meeting. An hour-and-fifteen minutes is obviously way too short for this committee, and we need to spend more time on this. This has been a lingering issue for quite some time, and so I would certainly recommend that more time be devoted to Data Collection at the next meeting.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Mr. Strelcheck. Mr. Chairman, if we could maybe get a little more time the next time. Dr. Ponwith, do you want to briefly talk to us about the cost analysis?

COST ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL ELECTRONIC REPORTING PROGRAM

DR. PONWITH: Yes, and thank you, Mr. Chair. I will try and help you keep on track, and that is we talked a little bit about the fact that, at the South Atlantic Council, we're making a presentation on what we learned during the pilot study for the commercial electronic logbook pilot about some of the costs that were incurred, or could potentially be incurred, if we went operational on this.

We have got some materials together. They are in review right

now, and so I don't have materials that made it into the briefing book. With the council's indulgence, what I would like to do is do a good thorough job of reviewing those materials and then get them into the briefing book for the October meeting and have a longer discussion about that, because it's twofold. It is what we learned about the potential costs to the charter industry of an electronic reporting option for meeting that reporting requirement, but, secondarily, we are looking, on the technical side, on timing.

If a commercial vessel voluntarily wished to report electronically versus on paper, number one, does that meet the legal intent, the way the amendment or the plan is written right now? Number two, what would those costs be to actually do that, rather than doing it on paper? Three, when would we be able to receive, on a voluntary basis, that information electronically, because there are some steps that we would have to go through to be able to ingest those data.

I bring all this up right now, but we will have two presentations at the next council meeting that are carefully reviewed and ready to look at at that point, but I would like to plant a seed with the council right now, because, ultimately, we think that it would be valuable to shift toward mandatory electronic reporting in the commercial logbooks.

We are interested in the council's views on that. We think what that would do is provide us finer-scale information, more timely information, and ultimately get that information transitioned much more efficiently than the current logbooks.

The real issue then is, if the council is interested in doing this, how do we set that in motion, so that the regulatory side of it sets up nicely with the timing of the technical side of it, so that we finish and cross the finish line at the same time?

Again, we would have two presentations, the voluntary reporting and what it would take to get there from here, some of the costs of hardware and software, and then a discussion about shifting from voluntary to mandatory, if that is in the council's interest.

ATLANTIC STATES COASTAL COOPERATIVE STATISTICS PROGRAM MEETING SUMMARY

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thanks, Dr. Ponwith. I am speaking for the committee here, and if someone disagrees, please jump in,

but I think that would be very useful and we could build that into the agenda for the next time, if that's okay with you, Mr. Chairman. John, if you would please get with me, and we will work with Bonnie to get those built in for our next meeting in October.

That brings us to the last formal thing on our agenda, if there's not any other comments, and hopefully we can carry some of these discussions into full council, when we meet on that in a few days. The last was this Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program.

I didn't know I was representing the council there, but I was at least there, and so they asked me to present. The key staff people from NOAA there were Rich Malinowski, who is back there, as well as Ken Brennan, and I know Dave Donaldson and Greg Bray were represented there as well, but, for those of you not familiar with that group, it's obviously Atlantic States centric, but their goal is to organize federal and state partners and essentially coalesce the data and then serve that back out to managers, in, ideally, a really rapid QA/QC'd process.

They put together this workshop on electronic reporting, and also electronic monitoring, particularly for the for-hire sector, in terms of what was working broadly across the sectors, and hopefully, in a second here, Dave Donaldson can just chime in quickly on how this relates to what is really happening right here in the Gulf with that sister group, but, anyway, what came out of that, in terms of the for-hire meeting, was that several things -- For example, like how do you deal with the HMS system and the for-hire one we're dealing with here, for example, but they agreed to have this workshop, and the report is still pending.

This is all preliminary, but they will send a letter to all the councils requesting a reduction in duplicate reporting, because a lot of that is going on, particularly in the Atlantic states. They provide a lot more technical guidance on minimum data elements, which certainly would be relevant to this group, and as well as what are just some of the best management practices for electronic reporting.

Also, summarize some of the working directly with the fishermen and what their concerns are and what's really best for their business. Then the final outcome of that workshop was to provide a summary of all the pilot projects that are going on and hopefully coalesce those into some working real projects,

but that was the overall summary from the meeting. There will be a final report that will ensue here, hopefully in just a few weeks, and so, Dave, I don't know if you want to mention real quickly how this might interface with some of the work here in the Gulf.

MR. DONALDSON: Well, ACCSP is kind of the sister program to GulfFIN here in the Gulf of Mexico, and the staffs from both GulfFIN and ACCSP work closely together, and have for a number of years, because we realize there are some benefits in learning from what we're addressing versus what they are, and so we are closely aligning what we're trying to do and they're doing and learn from their programs and vice versa and share ideas and outcomes routinely.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: So there is a lot of similar things going on among all of our areas, and there is a lot of lessons learned and that kind of thing. As we're all trying to move forward, this is just trying to facilitate that process, essentially, and so I will forward that report on as soon as it comes out, for those that are interested. That will bring us to our last item of Other Business for this committee. Are there any committee members that have any other business? Seeing no other business, I will adjourn the Data Collection Committee.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on August 15, 2016.)