

**Shrimp Committee Report
September 28, 2020
Leann Bosarge, Chair**

The Committee adopted the agenda (**Tab D, No. 1**) and approved the minutes (**Tab D, No. 2**) of the April 2019 meeting as written.

Gulf Fishery Analytical Requirements, Program Updates, and Reporting Options (Tab D, No. 4a)

Dr. Gloeckner provided the committee with an overview of analytical requirements, program updates, and reporting options. Four types of shrimp data are required to complete an array of SEFSC/SERO outputs: effort data; bycatch rates; landings data; additional data for economic and regulatory analysis. Bycatch information is acquired through observer programs and covers about 2% of offshore trips. Landings, economic and regulatory data are collected through monthly dealer reported state trip tickets and through the gear, landings, and economic paper surveys completed by fishermen. Effort data is derived from time-stamped GPS coordinates collected by 3G cellular electronic logbooks (cELBs). The 3G technology will be phasing out at the end of 2020. The shrimp industry is currently required by the states to report monthly, but not electronically. This data is then subsequently transmitted to NMFS for federal data analysis purposes. Shrimp effort is measured in units of days fished. A CPUE is derived by matching trip level cELB effort with state trip tickets, and match efficiency generally ranges from 50-80%. It was noted by Dr. Gloeckner that cELB are mostly on offshore vessels, which may provide bias in the effort estimate toward offshore vessels.

SEFSC proposed four possible options to continue vessel reporting following the end of the 3G reporting capabilities. Option 1 would no longer produce effort data through vessel reporting. Option 2 would retain the ‘status quo’ of vessel reporting with electronically transmitted time-stamped GPS data. Option 2a would require a trip ticket link, which would improve the match efficiency. Option 2b would require census level coverage. Option 3 would build upon the requirements in Options 2a/2b in that vessels would electronically report gear information upon returning to port. Option 4 would build upon the requirements in Option 3 in that vessels would electronically report landings in weight by shrimp species at a tow-by-tow level. Per the presentation, the Council would need to pursue an amendment if it decides to make changes to the expiring cELB effort data collection program, require shrimp dealer permits, or require weekly electronic reporting to NMFS by all permitted shrimp dealers.

The Committee inquired how new reporting requirements and technology would be implemented if 3G will no longer be available at the end of 2020. Dr. Gloeckner stated that another method for collecting this information needs to be identified. The shrimp industry is working on having a proof of concept completed for NMFS to scale up, pending the results of the pilot study. After

discussions with the industry, P-Sea Windplot which is a software currently used on a majority of the vessels, was identified as a potential option for replacing the 3G cELB. The Committee discussed that the causes for unmatched or mismatched data needs to be better understood in order to properly address any issues and encouraged a thorough review of the unmatched data list as a first step. The Committee inquired as to the costs from dealer reporting going from monthly to weekly. Dr. Gloeckner stated that the primary cost to dealers would be if they needed to purchase a computer and/or internet connection, but that the time required would be comparable. The Committee inquired if there would be additional costs to fishermen. Dr. Gloeckner stated, unless the reporting program is expanded to the entire fleet, the only costs would be if fishermen didn't have an onboard computer they would need to purchase a computer for on-vessel use, cost of P-Sea Windplot software, and a reoccurring transmitting cost.

The Committee stated that, for the industry to pursue the P-Sea Windplot proof of concept, Council and SEFSC support would need to be voiced. In response, Dr. Porch expressed support for the proof of concept project, as did several state representatives on the Committee. The Committee suggested that an amendment may not be needed, if only the platform is changing for reporting. Ms. Levy noted that Council action and rulemaking may be needed, if switching to the new platform will change equipment requirements or costs borne by the permit holders. The Committee asked that the Shrimp AP be convened to be briefed on the proof of concept project, discuss potential costs to the industry, discuss the issue of unmatched data, and any other relevant topics.

Mr. Chair, this concludes my report.