

ASMFC Lobster Advisory Panel Report to the Board

January 23, 2007

Conference Call

Meeting participants:

Jon Carter, Steve Train, Bob Baines, John Whittaker, Bob Nudd, Bro Cote, John Carver, Elizabeth Kordowski, David Spencer; ASMFC Staff: Toni Kerns

Recommendations to the Board Regarding Addendum X:

1) Adopt Option 3 of Addendum X with the following modifications:

Dealer and Harvester Reporting

1a) would be changed to read; A percentage (to be determined by the TC) of harvester reports include...

1b) would be changed by deleting the last phrase; areas fished and hours fished. A sentence would be added stating that collected data would have to be in a verifiable form. In other words, the harvester would have to verify at year end the data submitted by his dealer.

2) **The AP does not agree with the last statement of the Port Sampling section.** The consensus of the AP is that sufficient sea sampling can replace port sampling but NOT vice versa.

3) **When states are designing their reporting programs consideration should be given to situations where a harvester is also classified as a dealer.** In such situations, we recommend that reporting requirements (both harvester and dealer) be completed using only one form.

4) **There needs to be an easy mechanism for ACCSP to receive lobster reporting data from the NMFS FVTR database.** This data should be forwarded to ACCSP on at least an annual basis.

Addendum X Discussion

Staff reviewed the data collection issues contained in Addendum X. Concerns were raised about 100% mandatory harvester reporting, particularly in states with large numbers of fishermen. The amount of paperwork created by this requirement along with the administration of such a large scale program seemed problematic and burdensome. There was agreement that having dealers report trip level data rather than each harvester made more sense. This type of program would reduce the amount of paperwork and make the system more manageable. Dealer reports would include unique trip id's, species, quantity (lbs), state and port of landing, market grade and category. It was understood that a certain percentage of harvesters (determined by the TC) would be required to report at trip level to ensure that the TC receives the necessary data.

There was agreement that port sampling is not a good substitute for sea sampling. Port sampling does not recognize the discards (shorts, eggies, V- notch, oversized) that are observed with sea sampling.

Concern was also raised that the TC was not in possession of valuable data from the NMFS FVTR's. Agreement was reached that there needs to be a better way of conveying this data to ACCSP.

