Tab D, No. 4(b)

Draft Framework Action: Modification of the Vessel Position Data Collection Program for the Gulf of Mexico Shrimp Fishery

November 4, 2024

Outline

- Review P&N Statements
- Discuss IPT Proposed Changes to Alternatives 2 and 3
- Review Differences between Alternatives 2 and 3
- Tentative Timeline

Purpose and Need Statements

- The purpose of this framework action is to transition from the expired 3G cellular electronic logbook program to a system that would maintain the Council's and NMFS' scientific ability to estimate and monitor fishing effort in the Gulf shrimp fishery while minimizing the economic burden on the industry to the maximum extent practicable.

- The need is to base conservation and management measures on the best scientific information available and to minimize bycatch to the extent practicable, as required by the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, and minimize interactions with protected species as required by the ESA.

Action 1

Modify the Method Used to Collect Vessel Position Data for the Gulf of Mexico Shrimp Fishery

- Note: The types of data and amount/timing of data collection would not vary between alternatives. Consistent with current requirements, the permitted vessels selected to participate must also provide the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS): the size and number of shrimp trawls deployed for each set, and the type of bycatch reduction device and turtle excluder device used in the nets. As set forth in Amendment 13 (GMFMC 2005) and 50 C.F.R. § 622.51, compliance with these requirements and the requirement to submit vessel position data is required for permit renewal.

Action 1

Modify the Method Used to Collect Vessel Position Data for the Gulf of Mexico Shrimp Fishery

- **Alternative 1:** No Action - Maintain the current method to collect vessel position data through the cellular electronic logbook (cELB) units supplied by NMFS. ~~Prior to December 7, 2020, the owners or operators of selected vessels were responsible for the cost of cellular service necessary to transmit the data. Currently, because 3G cellular transmission is no longer possible,~~ NMFS ~~will~~ would collect the memory cards from the units via mail.

Action 1

Modify the Method Used to Collect Vessel Position Data for the Gulf of Mexico Shrimp Fishery

- **Alternative 1:** No Action - Maintain the current method to collect vessel position data through the cellular electronic logbook (cELB) units supplied by NMFS. NMFS would collect the memory cards from the units via mail.

Action 1

- **IPT rationale for changes to Alternative 1:**

- The text with strikethrough can be moved to the discussion and/or to the economic analyses.

Action 1

- **Alternative 2:** Implement a ~~cellular~~ vessel monitoring system (~~e~~VMS) requirement for the Gulf of Mexico (Gulf) shrimp fishery that provides ~~archived~~ position data compatible with the SEFSC's shrimp effort algorithm. If selected by the Science and Research Director (SRD), the owner or operator of a ~~shrimp~~ vessel with a ~~valid or renewable~~ Gulf shrimp moratorium permit (SPGM) would be required to install a type-approved VMS unit (50 C.F.R. § 600.1501). ~~that archives vessel position when on a shrimp fishing trip in the Gulf and automatically transmits that data via cellular service~~ If satellite VMS is installed, vessel position data would be automatically transmitted to a NMFS server. If cellular VMS is installed, vessel position data would be archived when on a fishing trip in the Gulf but out of cellular range and would be transmitted to a NMFS server when the vessel is back within cellular range.

Action 1

- **Alternative 2:** Implement a vessel monitoring system (VMS) requirement for the Gulf of Mexico (Gulf) shrimp fishery that provides position data compatible with the SEFSC's shrimp effort algorithm. If selected by the Science and Research Director (SRD), the owner or operator of a vessel with a Gulf shrimp moratorium permit (SPGM) would be required to install a type-approved VMS unit (50 C.F.R. § 600.1501). If satellite VMS is installed, vessel position data would be automatically transmitted to a NMFS server. If cellular VMS is installed, vessel position data would be archived when on a fishing trip in the Gulf but out of cellular range and would be transmitted to a NMFS server when the vessel is back within cellular range.

Action 1

- **IPT rationale for changes to Alternative 2:**

- Due to vessels with a SPGM permit as well as other permits that require a satellite VMS, it would be burdensome to require those vessels to have 2 VMS devices onboard, as well as pay for 2 transmission fees. Instead, this allows owners/operators to have a choice of which device they want.
- Remove initial reference of 'archived' position data, as that depends if cellular or satellite VMS.
- Remove text of 'shrimp' and 'valid or renewable', as they are not needed; it's a matter of any owner/operator of a vessel with a SPGM permit being selected.
- The IPT may have additional wordsmithing of the last two sentences if the Council decides to allow for cellular and satellite VMS, but they address that satellite VMS transmits automatically whereas cellular VMS transmits when in cellular range.

Action 1

- **Alternative 3:** Implement a cellular VMS ~~ELB~~ (cVMS~~ELB~~) requirement for the Gulf shrimp fishery that provides archived position data compatible with the SEFSC's shrimp effort algorithm. If selected by the SRD, the owner or operator of a ~~shrimp~~ vessel with a ~~valid or renewable~~ SPGM would be required to install a NMFS-approved cVMS ~~ELB~~ that archives vessel position when on a shrimp fishing trip in the Gulf and automatically transmits those data via cellular service to a ~~SEFSC or Office of Science and Technology~~ non-OLE NMFS server. NMFS-approved cVMS~~ELBs~~ would be type-approved through a process external to ~~not be type-approved based on regulations at~~ 50 C.F.R. § 600.1501.

Action 1

- **Alternative 3:** Implement a cellular VMS (cVMS) requirement for the Gulf shrimp fishery that provides archived position data compatible with the SEFSC's shrimp effort algorithm. If selected by the SRD, the owner or operator of a vessel with a SPGM would be required to install a NMFS-approved cVMS that archives vessel position when on a shrimp fishing trip in the Gulf and automatically transmits those data via cellular service to a non-OLE NMFS server. NMFS-approved cVMS would be type-approved through a process external to 50 C.F.R. § 600.1501.

Action 1

- **IPT rationale for changes to Alternative 3:**

- Retain cellular only option and non-OLE NMFS server, as this alternative originated from industry input.
- Refer to cellular ELB as cellular VMS, as that is what the devices would be.
- Remove text of 'shrimp' and 'valid or renewable', as they are not needed; it's a matter of any owner/operator of a vessel with a SPGM permit being selected.
- The Council in April '24 changed 'non-OLE NMFS' server to 'SEFSC or Office of Science and Technology'. Recommend changing that back, as it limits potential future changes where the data may be stored, and simply recognize that any NMFS server outside of OLE could be the data recipient.
- State that the process for type-approval is external to 50 C.F.R.

Primary differences between Alts 2 and 3

	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
Allowed Data Transmission Type	Both cellular and satellite	Cellular only
Data Recipient	NMFS (NOAA OLE) server	Non-OLE NMFS server*
Initial VMS Device Reimbursement through Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission and NOAA OLE	Yes	No
Additional NMFS Costs from not utilizing 50 C.F.R. § 600.1501	No	Yes**

- *OLE would be able to access these data.
- **These will be detailed in Chapters 3 and 4. Mr. Dettloff will also be covering this aspect in his presentation momentarily.

Tentative Timeline and Next Steps

- Tentative timeline:
  - Bring the draft framework action back to the Council at its January 2025 meeting.
  - Prepare Chapter 3 of the draft framework action and discuss with the IPT the preparations for Chapter 4.
  - If Chapter 4 is prepared, consider selecting a preferred alternative based on those analyses.

- Following Mr. Dettloff's presentation, the Committee may want to consider a motion to adopt any or all of the IPT's recommendations for Alternatives 2 and 3.

- In addition to the regular Shrimp AP meeting that would be held in March '24, does the Committee want an additional meeting convened prior to the Jan '24 Council meeting, if possible?

Questions?

GULF OF MEXICO Fishery Management Council