

# Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

## Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council

*May 5, 2020  
1:00 - 1:30 pm  
Webinar*

### Draft Agenda

The times listed are approximate; the order in which these items will be taken is subject to change; other items may be added as necessary.

1. Welcome/Call to Order (*L. Fegley*)
2. Council Consent
  - Approval of Agenda
  - Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes
  - Committee and Program Updates
3. Consider Approval of Funding Decision Document and 2021 Request for Proposals (*J. Simpson*) **Action**
4. Discuss Marine Recreational Information Program State Partnership Report to Congress (*G. White*)
5. Other Business
6. Public Comment
7. Adjourn

**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE  
ATLANTIC COASTAL COOPERATIVE STATISTICS PROGRAM  
COORDINATING COUNCIL**

**Wentworth by the Sea**  
New Castle, New Hampshire  
**October 28, 2019**

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the  
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.  
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Call to Order, Chairman Lynn Fegley ..... 1

Approval of Agenda ..... 1

Approval of Minutes from April 30, 2019 ..... 1

Funding Subcommittee Update ..... 1

Consider Recommendations for FY2020 Submitted Proposals ..... 2

Consider Revising ACCSP Technical Committee Structure ..... 10

Consider Establishment of a Data Coordination Committee..... 14

Program and Committee Updates ..... 17

    Electronic Vessel Trip Reporting Status..... 19

    Update from the Federal Information Management Modernization Meeting..... 19

    Electronic Trip Reporting Status ..... 23

    Registration Tracking ..... 26

    Update from the Operations/Advisors Joint Meeting..... 27

    Advisors Committee Report ..... 27

    Committee Updates ..... 29

The For-Hire Workshop Summary ..... 31

For-hire Telephone Survey State Conduct ..... 32

Adjournment..... 33

## INDEX OF MOTIONS

1. **Approval of agenda** by consent (Page 1).
2. **Approval of minutes from April 2019** by consent (Page 1).
3. **Move to fund all maintenance proposals as ranked in the FY20 Average Proposal Rankings spreadsheet following the 75/25 percent split between maintenance and new proposals. Fully fund the three highest ranked of the four new proposals. For the new proposal from Maine, fund with remaining available funds** (Page 7). Motion by Kathy Knowlton; second by Jason McNamee. Motion carried (Page 8).
4. **Move to adjourn** by consent (Page 33).

## ATTENDANCE

### Council Members

Megan Ware, MA, proxy for P. Keliher  
Renee Zobel, NH, proxy for D. Grout  
Dan McKiernan, MA, proxy for D. Pierce  
Jason McNamee, RI (AA)  
Justin Davis, CT  
Maureen Davidson, NY, proxy for J. Gilmore  
Joe Cimino, NJ (AA)  
John Clark, DE, proxy for S. Michels  
Lynn Fegley, MD, Chair  
Lewis Gillingham, VA, proxy for P. Geer

Dee Lupton, NC, proxy for S. Murphey  
Mel Bell, SC, proxy for R. Boyles, Jr.  
Doug Haymans, GA  
Kathy Knowlton, GA, proxy  
Bob Beal, ASMFC  
Tom Nies, NEFMC  
Brandon Muffley, MAFMC, proxy for C. Moore  
Marty Gary, PRFC  
John Carmichael, SAFMC

### Staff

Bob Beal  
Geoff White

Julie Defilippi Simpson

### Guests

Bill Anderson, MD DNR  
John-Paul Biladeau, New England Fish Co.  
Barry Clifford, NOAA  
Kelly Denit, NOAA  
Katherine Deuel, Pew Trusts  
Jon Hare, NOAA  
Kris Kuhn, PA Fish & Boat Comm.  
Mike Luisi, MD DNR  
Arnold Leo, E. Hampton, NY  
Jaime Masterson, USFWS  
Nichola Meserve, MA DMF  
Kim McKown, NYS DEC  
Allison Murphy, NOAA

Susan Olson, NOAA  
Patrick Paquette, MA SBA  
Alesia Reed, NOAA  
Story Reed, MA DMF  
Bob Ross, NOAA  
Jocelyn Runnebaum, The Nature Conservancy  
Geoff Smith, TNC  
Kevin Staples, NE Regional Ocean Council  
Lauren Staples, NH F & G  
Kevin Sullivan, NH F&G  
Pam Thames, NOAA  
Mike Waine, ASA  
Chris Wright, NMFS

The Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened in the Wentworth Ballroom of the Wentworth by the Sea Hotel, New Castle, New Hampshire; Monday, October 28, 2019, and was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chairman Lynn Fegley.

### **CALL TO ORDER**

CHAIRMAN LYNN FEGLEY: I'm going to go ahead and call us to order here. We have a bit of a long agenda, and we have a reception after this, so I'm hoping we can get through this in short order, so to speak. I'm Lynn Fegley; I'm the Chair. I represent the state of Maryland. I want us to start the meeting.

I know you all know that we had a staff change up at the Commission, and I want to welcome Geoff and Julie as our new Director and Deputy Director. I just want to say that having had the honor to sit through the interviews for this position, these two are amazing. They are truly a dynamic duo with enthusiasm and vision, and a lot of smarts.

We have put this ship in very good hands at the helm. I really am excited to see where they're going to take it. I wanted to start with that.

### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The next thing I wanted to say is that I think that Julie has a couple of items to add to the agenda during the updates; one has to do with the FIS Grants, and the other has to do with FIN. With that does anybody have any other modifications to the agenda, and is everybody okay with the agenda modification I just listed?

Okay seeing no opposition to either of those.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: The next is the meeting minutes were provided to you in your meeting materials. Does anybody have any changes,

modifications that are needed to the meeting minutes? Seeing none, we will move right along. Is there any public comment? Okay seeing none.

### **FUNDING SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE**

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Our first item on the agenda is a Funding Subcommittee Update by Julie.

If you'll recall, there was a motion back in April to amend the step-down language in the RFP to say up to 33 percent. Between this and the 75/25 split, the Funding Subcommittee met over the summer to talk about that. We are going to see as we have discussions going forward in this meeting there is some work that they're going to have to do upcoming over the next year, so I'm going to turn it over to Julie to go through that.

MS. JULIE DEFILIPPI SIMPSON: The recommendation that came out of the Funding Subcommittee that went to the Coordinating Council during the conference call, and thank you to everybody that was able to get onto that conference call. The recommendation was that all of the maintenance projects would abide by the year 5 33 percent step down, and that the 75/25 split would remain for FY20. The Funding Subcommittee also had a number of discussions on the future of the 75/25 split, and that group decided that it was best to continue to meet, so they will be reconvening in the January/February timeline to discuss the 75/25 split. The Coordinating Council recommended that at the Joint meeting the Operations and Advisors also discussed this issue. There are a few things that came out of that discussion.

The first is, that the Joint Committee looked at potential of what the step down was going to mean, and realized that at this point it's somewhat difficult to determine what the future funding in the next couple of years would look like, so they are recommending to keep the

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the  
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.  
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

25/75 split, but also note emphatically that the 25 percent is a minimum allocation for the new projects, it's not a maximum allocation.

They did also recommend that there is only a single year of new funding, and then projects would move into four years of maintenance funding, and that all four years of maintenance funding would be used to calculate the step down base. They also discussed the potential for project caps or funding ranges.

Wherein a project that had a large expenditure would fall into a higher range, and therefore would receive a lower score. These are ideas that they were putting forward to the Funding Subcommittee for discussion at their January/February meeting. Does anyone have any questions about those discussions?

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Dee Lupton.

MS. DEE LUPTON: One of their items that were talked about in the conference call that we had was if money was left over on one side of the 75 or the 25 split that it could be available to the other. I recommend that the Funding Committee makes sure that that is in the decision document to clearly specify that.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Okay we can make that so. Thank you, Dee. Are there further questions for Julie? Okay, seeing none.

### **CONSIDER RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FY2020 SUBMITTED PROPOSALS**

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: The next item on our agenda is to consider the recommendations for the funding proposals. You all have in your meeting materials, and this is going to be on Pages 35 through 37.

You've got the proposal of rankings by the Operations Committee, and by the Advisors, and the third table is the average of the two. As always we have that uncertainty in our funding

level where it could be 3.35 million, or it could be 3.5 million. I think actually Alan Lowther is here. Alan, do you have any insight for us on funding levels for this year?

MR. ALAN LOWTHER: Most likely it will be the same as last year we would assume, which was the 3.35. But then we did get an additional \$63,000.00 to bring it up to like 3.413, so just over 3.4. We expect that that additional funding will continue, but we don't really have any guarantees yet. That is our best guess right now.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Thank you. That gives us something to direct our conversation. Bob.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ROBERT E. BEAL: Before we go too far into funding conversations and all of this. I just wanted to let everyone know that the ACCSP Grant that ASMFC has with NOAA Fisheries is on about year 3.9, so we've got about a little over a year left. As we normally do as we sort of wind down these five-year grants, we're kind of working right now, Laura and her staff are looking kind of to scrub that grant and see if there is any money that is left over that we'll need to spend out by the end of February in 2021.

There is a potential that you know we had a number of vacancies that were left open for a little bit longer as we went through the leadership transition in ACCSP, and you know a number of other things that may have resulted in under spending in a couple areas. We'll get that done in the next few weeks, and we'll be able to report out to the leadership of ACCSP, what if any is available above what we anticipated.

Then, I guess the process will need to be set. What do we do with that money? I'm not suggesting it all necessarily goes to these projects; there may be some in-house things that take priority. But I think we'll need to work with the Chair and Vice-Chair and Geoff, and

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the  
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.  
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

sort of come up with a prioritized list of how to spend that money, if there is any additional money available.

I'm not saying there will be. I anticipate there may be a bit. I don't know what that means exactly. But as we get into this, just there is one more variable that after these decisions are made, may affect sort of downstream how much money is available, which may free up a little bit more to help out with some of the decisions today. But we're not going to know that today. We'll just have to do the leadership and then get back to the Coordinating Council after the fact.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: That's good to know. I know we had some conversations offline about looking through the Administrative Grant and so on, so that is good to know thanks. What we're going to do is we're going to have Julie summarize the findings of the Operations Committee. We have Nicole Lengyel as the Operations Chair up here, and also Jerry Morgan from the Advisors, if you could help answer any questions if needed.

I do just want to say a quick word up front about Maine's proposal. It was a high dollar number. Maine is in a pretty tough spot, and so it in turn makes our conversation. You know we're going to have to figure out a way through it, and I really want to thank Maine for working with us on this. We did catch up with them before this meeting to brainstorm some ideas, and talk through some things with them.

They'll have a presentation to show you what sort of deliverables they can achieve at different funding levels. You know the worst case scenario would be the 3.35, and then the highest scenario would be if miracles happen and we found all the extra money, we got 3.5 million and some fees were waived. They're going to go through that after Julie goes through the proposals, and then as a reminder

too, I'll be looking for a motion at the end of this conversation, so with that take it away.

MS. SIMPSON: I'm going to just move to the next one, and try to blow this up as much as possible. The project names are just short sentences or short phrases that are helping to indicate what project it is without being the full name, so that it's a little bit more readable. We've included the partner and then the first column of numbers is the cost of the proposal. The next column is the cumulative cost with a NMFS fee. I just wanted to point out that this should be taken with a mild grain of salt, and that's because this is across the board a potential of this is what the NMFS fee could be. But we spoke with Alan earlier today.

There is the potential that the NMFS fee might not be in place for the southeast, and so if that happens that could be potential extra dollars that are included if there is no NMFS fee for the southeast. That column in particular is a little bit nebulous right now, and is subject to change in the next couple of weeks as things move forward.

The next two columns are just the amount remaining in that group, whether it be this slide which is maintenance, or the next slide which is new. That is based on a 3.5 or 3.35. As Alan indicated we're probably somewhere in the middle at a 3.41. But again with NMFS fees it's a little bit changeable. Are there any questions? Again these are actually done in order, the rank is not here on the slide, but it is in your materials and these are in order with the top being the highest rank.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Are there any questions for Julie?

MS. SIMPSON: Okay, so moving on to the new projects. Again this is the rank. The columns are all the same, so I'm not going to explain them again. As you can see the red there is indicating the funding deficit if we were to fund



all of them. We obviously don't have enough money to fully fund everything. But this is the same as the previous slide, in terms of columns. Does anyone have any questions for any of us about the rankings that came from Operations and Advisors?

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Kathy Knowlton.

MS. KATHY KNOWLTON: Not a question so much as a clarification with regard to what Dee said earlier, just so everybody understands and I understand correctly. If you go to the previous slide above with the maintenance funding, if we were to receive more than about 3.4 or 3.45 million, then anything in the extra in that second column from the right would then be applied towards the new proposals that's correct. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Yes thank you, Kathy. I'm going to say that another way. I think is that any money that is left at the bottom after we get through the maintenance proposals do get rolled over into the new proposal area. That's how it works. Are there any other, Brandon Muffley?

MR. BRANDON MUFFLEY: I just had a quick question in regards to the maintenance proposal rankings. All of them rank generally about the same except for the Maine mackerel and menhaden project. I'm just wondering what the reason was for the really, well at least comparative to the other proposals, why that proposal ranked so low. I mean I don't remember the differences like that in the past, and I understand maintenance proposals have a different sort of ranking process, the simplified ranking processes, but it just seems to stand out quite a bit with how different that proposal is.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Yes, I will turn that one over to Julie.

MS. SIMPSON: There was well what we'll just consider a clerical error in Maine in that when

they submitted their final proposal after corrections they submitted last year's final proposal. The final proposal for this year as corrected was not available for ranking. The group felt as a whole that it was too late for Maine to resubmit that and make everyone read it at the meeting, so they ranked it based on the fact that it had been a clerical error, which they recognize does happen, but people were obviously a little more harsh with their rankings on that.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Any other questions? Okay with that I think the next step then we're going to move on to Maine. Are you guys ready? We'll see what they got.

MS. MEGAN WARE: Sure. Do you guys have the slides that we sent you? Perfect. All right so we have had some calls with ACCSP, given that it is unlikely at this point that the new project would be fully funded. We were asked to provide some information on what can be accomplished under partial funding levels.

Hopefully that will become clear this presentation, and then we had also pulled together an Excel sheet in a more thorough presentation for the meeting materials. Hopefully people were able to take a look at those. The three funding levels we were asked to look at, were the \$82,000.00, \$200,000.00 and \$300,000.00.

Just a reminder on what we're focused on in the proposal, the nuts and bolts. We are trying to support the implementation of 100 percent lobster harvester reporting through the lobster FMP in Addendum XXVI. We have a deadline of 2024 to achieve that. Then with the recent right whale discussions through the Take Reduction Team, it seems like that could get pushed up, and so we're trying to work on this now.

The proposal includes funding for nine new positions, many of those are in the data and

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the  
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.  
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

reporting field, I'll say. But there are also a few licensing staff, since our reporting and licensing they do interact. It also looks at LEEDS enhancement, and I will explain what that is on the next slide. At our first funding level, \$82,000.00, what could we accomplish?

The first thing that we could do is move forward with our necessary LEEDS enhancement. LEEDS in the state of Maine are our License Enforcement and Environmental Data System. It's where we store all of the Maine DMR licenses, as well as scanned paper landing reports. It's also what we use to manage reporting compliance.

It's proposed that the enhancement would automate this harvester compliance, and we feel like that will save a significant amount of staff time down the road, particularly as we're trying to move to electronic reporting through this proposal for the lobster fishery. Also at this funding level we could hire a Harvester Reporting Coordinator for three months. That position or through that funding for three months that position could be kind of trained as to what the reporting would look like in the state, become familiar with our rules and regulations, and kind of just get someone onboard. What we cannot do at that funding level. We would not be able to implement 100 percent lobster reporting by January, 2021. We would have to continue with another year of the 10 percent harvester reporting, which is what we currently do, and this is because we cannot hire and train the full complement of staff that is in the proposal.

We don't feel like we could provide industry with the level of customer service that is needed. This is something that the Department has really focused on, customer service. I think we feel like we have one shot to get this right in moving to 100 percent harvester reporting, and there is already a bit of reluctance within the industry, so we want to make sure that we get it right when we do it, and we provide the

services that are going to be needed to make sure it's successful.

At the next funding level we looked at what we could accomplish with \$200,000.00. Just to orient you to the slide, the blue text is what we could accomplish in addition to what we did under the previous funding level. At \$200,000.00 we could still move forward with the LEEDS enhancement.

We could hire that Harvester Coordinator for now nine months instead of three months, and then we could hire one additional staff halfway through the funding cycle, so we're saving half on their yearly cost. Again, bringing these people onboard will help get them up to speed before we move in the direction of higher reporting.

What we are not able to do under this funding level is pretty much what we could not do under the previous one, so we don't feel like we could move to 100 percent lobster reporting by January 2021, because we're not hiring the staff that is needed. We don't feel like we're going to be providing the level of customer service that's needed, so we would do another year of the 10 percent harvester reporting.

Then the final funding level we looked at was \$300,000.00. Again we would move forward with LEEDS enhancement, hire the Harvester Coordinator for nine months, and under this option we could hire three additional staff halfway through the funding cycle. The pattern here is the more money that we receive the more staff that we would hire.

What we would not be able to do under the \$300,000.00. We would not be able to implement the 100 percent lobster reporting unless there was some sort of future funding that had been identified and secured. We're really only able to make that commitment for 100 percent reporting if we're able to secure a

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the  
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.  
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

second, and likely third year of funding at the \$600,000.00 level.

Under specifically the \$300,000.00 level we can't hire that full complement of staff, and as I mentioned that will impact customer service, audits and outreach. I think that's the full presentation. I would just like to give a shout out to Rob Watts, who put this information together. I'm really just the messenger here today. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Thank you Megan for that. With that are there any questions for Megan about these various funding levels and what they can or cannot do that will help guide us in our discussion about approving the proposal funding? Jason McNamee.

DR. JASON McNAMEE: Thank you, Madam Chair. One question, so I think this goes to you, Megan. You had mentioned in a couple of spots it couldn't implement the 100 percent reporting by 2021. Isn't there more? In the FMP there is, of course it should happen as quickly as possible, it's important. I guess what I'm trying to make sure is there is not an FMP compliance piece on top of this. There is more time beyond 2021 per the FMP, is that right?

MS. WARE: Yes, I believe under Addendum XXVI it's January 1, 2024 that we're required to move to 100 percent harvester reporting, when that Addendum passes a five-year window from the implementation date. But it is likely that through the Take Reduction Team and the Take Reduction Plan that we will have a requirement for sooner than that. That is where the compliance may come in.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Are there any other questions for Megan? Lewis Gillingham.

MR. LEWIS GILLINGHAM: My question is, if the funding remains static for the five-year period, do you move forward with each year or are you held to what you can do with say, \$200,000.00?

MS. WARE: I think I understand your question. I think we would have significant troubles moving forward with 100 percent harvester reporting if we just had the \$200,000.00 moving forward, just because we don't feel like that will support all the staff. Obviously it doesn't look like we're going to get the full funding through this proposal, so we'll start to look at other funding opportunities, and where other pockets of money may exist.

We have talked about trying to like roll some of that money over, so that we might have a larger pot down the road that we could draw from. I think that is maybe something we could still consider, but taking that leap to the 100 percent harvester reporting is really going to require a larger amount of funding.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Okay, Dee Lupton.

MS. LUPTON: I'm just going to put this out there. If you get money this year, which I'm actually supportive of, but if you get a smaller amount you start the funding decision timeline, and according to the current document, which could be modified. Your first two years under the new category levels you out for the next four years.

Strategically, would you want any money this year, and hope for the step down next year, which is another 33 percent would make more money available to new projects a la Maine's project, which would start you out at a higher level, so in the funding process over the next six years you're at a higher level and maybe can achieve the 100 percent reporting. I just want to put that on the floor. I've heard various things. The other thing is if you get some money this year, if the Coordinating Council approves the money. Would your scope change drastically, you know if you only get \$200,000.00 then your scope changes, and then if you submit something next year, does the scope change enough to be considered a new

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the  
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.  
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

project again at Year 1? I'm just throwing out various options for consideration, to try to get something for Maine for consideration under the current guidelines.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Megan Ware, do you want to respond to that at all?

MS. WARE: If I could. I'm not sure I'm going to respond to all of it. That was actually a question I had is about the two year being like the new baseline, I'll say for future decisions. If we could have a conversation on that I think that would be great, whether that's today or at a workgroup meeting, or however you guys see fit.

I think that would be something for us to talk about. In terms of like waiting until next year to get potentially a larger pocket of money, or deferring our proposal until next year. I mean we got a fairly low rank number this year on the proposal. I'm not sure if I see, and perhaps I'm wrong, but I wasn't at that meeting.

But I'm not sure I see a reason for the rankings to substantially change next year from the same individuals. I get it's a large pocket of money, so there may be some incentives for people to rank it lower, because it's really benefiting one state. I do recognize that. I'm just not sure if the outcome would really change in another year.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Okay I'm going to turn that over to you, Geoff.

MR. GEOFF WHITE: Procedurally the choice is up to Maine as to what they can get done with partial funding this year and then of course it is up to them to submit for full funding or partial funding next year. There is the Funding Subcommittee, which we just covered, and it's going to meet again in January/February.

That was a mix of the Operations Committee and Coordinating Council folks, including Bob

Beal. They might make a few adjustments and decisions on what is in the RFP for next year, but in the grand scheme of what are ACCSP funds intended for, what is available, and are there components that Maine has put on the table at three different funding levels that would move them forward towards lobster reporting?

I think it's a fair question about what is the strategy of first-year funding, two-year funding, getting something in place, the read that I have on the proposal, and what they've put in front of us is the changes to the LEED software, the development of their own App with different funding, and the beginning of staffing is up to the Council to consider if that moves the fisheries reporting in general down the line. From a procedural standpoint it's up to Maine as to would they want to accept partial funding this year and yes they could put in a proposal next year.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Given that are there any questions or further discussion on the Maine proposal? Okay so seeing none, I think what we are going to need to do here is we're going to need to have a motion to approve the funding recommendations. We've heard from Alan Lowther about the funding situation, so we're going to have to bear in mind that we ought to be prepared for that lower funding level. If the lower funding level happens to be clear, we are likely going to need to convene what was the Executive Committee, which I think we all believe is now titled the Management and Policy Committee to go over and reach out to the PIs and work through to a solution. With that can I ask for a motion on the floor? Kathy Knowlton.

**MS. KNOWLTON: All right, submit a motion to fund all maintenance proposals as ranked in the FY20 Average Proposal Ranking Spreadsheet.**

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the  
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.  
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Second by Jay McNamee. Is there any discussion on the motion? Megan Ware.

MS. WARE: It's just a question. The discussion was brought up about the two years being the new level that year based on moving forward. Is it possible to have a discussion on that in the upcoming January/February? I don't know if that's the right spot. But if it's just possible to put that as a discussion point moving forward, I think that would be helpful.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Sure, and I'll send that over to Julie. Do you want to respond to that?

MS. SIMPSON: Yes. The Operations and Advisory Committee had a similar discussion about the calculation of base funding, and they have recommended that the Funding Subcommittee discuss one year of new funding, four years of maintenance funding, and then the calculation of the base being done on the four years of maintenance funding. That is on the slate for the Funding Subcommittee to discuss in January.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Kathy Knowlton.

MS. KNOWLTON: All right had a little bit more to add to that for the full motion. First sentence, following the 75/25 percent split between maintenance and new proposals. Just for the record, need to have that noted probably. Second motion, fully fund the three highest ranked of the four new proposals, for the new proposal for Maine from the portion of the proposal with remaining new funds.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Jason McNamee, since you seconded the motion, are you okay with this modification as it stands?

DR. McNAMEE: Yes.

MR. JOHN CARMICHAEL: When it says remaining new funds, does that include any

total remaining funds so any that would potentially carry over?

MS. KNOWLTON: Yes thank you for that clarification. It probably should just say fund with the remaining available funds.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think so.

MS. KNOWLTON: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Yes.

MS. KNOWLTON: I think it would also be appropriate to include separate from the motion the comment about a funding shortage, and the deciding body being our illustriously named ACCSP Management and Policy Committee, as well as Maine's request for a specific note relative to resolving the number of years, and how the base funding is calculated. I think that would be an appropriate place.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Are you asking to add that to the motion?

MS. KNOWLTON: Not to the motion, just notes for proceeding forward. It's procedural in my mind.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: I believe that it is on the record.

MS. KOWLTON: Okay thank you.

**CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Okay so now we have the motion slightly tweaked. Are there any questions at all on the motion as it now stands? Okay well then I'm going to read it into the record. This is to move to fund all maintenance proposals as ranked in the FY20 Average Proposal Ranking Spreadsheet following the 75/25 percent split between maintenance and new proposals.**

**Fully fund the three highest ranked of the four new proposals, for the new proposal from**

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the  
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.  
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

**Maine fund with remaining available funds.**

Motion by Ms. Knowlton, second by Dr. McNamee, and with that we'll try to do this the easy way. Is there any opposition to this motion? All right the motion carries, very good. Okay, so with that we're going to move on to our next agenda item. Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I just want to follow up on the discussion that will come about the future years and how this gets handled. To me part of it is what constitutes the project. If Maine were to get to \$300,000.00, and do parts of what was proposed this year, and then propose doing more next year, they could come in with essentially two projects potentially doing this work over a number of years.

Or would it be considered that everything that's encompassed in the universe of this initial proposal sort of always stands as that project, no matter how it is funded in bits and pieces maybe in future years. I think that needs to be part of the discussion. If something that comes in like this really big gets divided up into multiple projects. How will that be viewed, given like you know Dee mentioned the comment of coming in later years, and I think that needs to be part of this discussion for managing this in the future that we can have in January/February.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Those are good comments. You know there really is, I think the Funding Subcommittee has a fair bit to talk about in their sort of overarching philosophical thought about how much money is appropriate. Should we talk about caps or ranges of caps going forward? They're going to have a lot to discuss going forward, and Kathy Knowlton did you have a comment?

MS. KNOWLTON: Yes, just that to direct the Funding Subcommittee to have a specific review of the language in the Funding Decision Document that incorporates significant change in the scope of work. We already have an

allowance in the proposal process that would allow for a partner to present change in scope of work, but only when I think in the first two years of the new, and we usually preclude partners from doing that in all these many years of maintenance.

If they are requesting a change in scope of work, we ask that they be very clear about it and why. I think that shows the flexibility of this process is that we don't want people to skip telling us about things. Just tell us the truth, tell us what you need. The Operations and the Advisors have their process with the ranking system, but the Coordinating Council has always had flexibility to take into account special needs and special issues.

For me, even though this example of Maine's proposal has a very big price tag, we've accommodated this process before. We have had regional proposals that had very large price tags. Back when I was much younger and Rec Tech was submitting for these huge increases for Atlantic coastal work.

We could do that because the money was available, and then we started decreasing it. I think the process is already there. The process works. Just ask the Funding Subcommittee to try to articulate the definition of what are scoping changes. Give the partners the freedom that they need to make those requests through the process of the proposals.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Geoff.

MR. WHITE: I just wanted to add the idea of with different projects being able to clearly define different deliverables. The one thing that they pointed out in this first year was the modifications to the LEEDS software. That was something that would be a onetime cost that was pointed out during the Operations Committee meeting and during our discussions in preparing for this meeting. I guess that was that comment.

Just before we move on, I do want to thank Maine for their work and their time that they put into this. One of the things that we wanted to do, and have therefore put in front of you, was options of what would actually be accomplished at different funding levels. That took some extra work on their part, but hopefully allowed you guys to make a little bit clearer evaluations of what can be done at this point with a little bit more information on what the deliverables would be at different funding levels, so thanks for the extra work.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Okay great, so with that we will go ahead and move forward to the next agenda item. It has an action, on the agenda this is an idea. No, and yet my mistake. We have one more slide. Julie just wants to talk to us a little bit before we move on about the step down.

MS. SIMPSON: I promise this will be my last slide with numbers, well at least ones that have dollar signs on them. The purpose for this slide is to just take a look at planning for our future funding. This is a reminder from two important aspects that the maintenance projects are going to have to be stepping down again, and so this slide has a circle around the maximum available Year 6 funding. If you're a partner that has one of these proposals, it's really important to take a look at the available funding that's going to be out there, and ensure that alternatives are being sought after.

The other point on this is that even though the 75/25 split is going to be in place, we've already discussed heavily the idea that that split is just a starting point, and that money can be moved, overages can be moved from one side to the other if possible that very likely means that there will be overages.

There will be underages essentially on the maintenance side, so there is going to be money on the maintenance side that will very

likely be available for new projects. Partners should be keeping an eye toward potential new projects for next year's funding cycle. I know it seems early to be talking about that but it's never too early to be thinking about those kinds of things, because it happens very quickly.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Are there any questions there, basically a reminder that as we work through the step down there is going to be funding available for new projects, so go home and do some thinking. Are there any questions?

### **CONSIDER REVISING ACCSP TECHNICAL COMMITTEE STRUCTURE**

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Okay seeing none, now we're really going to move on to the agenda item about Revising the Structure of the Technical Committees.

As I was saying there is an action by this item, and the action that's desired here is not to make it happen right away. What we're looking for is an endorsement of this idea from the Coordinating Council, basically a green light to staff to let them go and gather information, and really do a little research on what this might look like, and bring it back to us to present the full idea. With that I'll send it over to you, Julie to talk in more detail.

MS. SIMPSON: The proposal that was in the charge in your meeting materials is to combine the existing Technical Committees such as the Biological and Bycatch Committee, Commercial and Recreational Committees, Information System, into a large Technical Committee that has workgroups that would follow those topics, but also follow other topics.

The driver behind this is that with a large number of technical committees we're asking for a lot of different staff members, which can be a burden on the partners. It can also be a burden when the same staff member is

assigned to multiple committees. We're also finding that as we move toward integrated reporting, and move forward with our various modules, there are far more things in the ACCSP domain that cross sectors.

It's very difficult to have a conversation in the Commercial Technical Committee about the gear codes that doesn't also affect the Recreational Technical Committee and the Information Systems Committee. To pass that same item from committee to committee to committee is a very time consuming process, and it slows down our ability to implement things.

We are looking for a way to solve some of those inefficiencies. This is a proposal that was put in front of the Operations Committee. They felt that it was worthy of investigation in the information gathering phase, but wanted to ensure that this group also felt the same way before any staff or partner staff time was spent on investigating this. None of the committees have been briefed on this, because we have not done any information gathering at this stage yet. That goes back to the way that Lynn summarized the action at the bottom. That's the story.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Great thanks, Julie. Are there any questions about this? All right, Jason McNamee.

DR. McNAMEE: I don't know if you want me to, I was going to kind of offer some comments, so I don't know if we're in question mode right now.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Kathy Knowlton, did you have a question or more of a comment? All right let's go to Kathy's question and we'll come back to you.

MS. KNOWLTON: Sorry, Jay. I know this is only a request for our approval, but I did find it difficult to give an opinion without more

information. I know you were in a chicken and egg situation with that. In hearing you say that it's often for some of the agencies the same person that's on more than one committee.

What about the flip situations? When I think for many more of the partners there is a specific person that is a subject matter expert for that technical committee that is on only one committee, maybe two, but only one. Moving forward with your data gathering is your intention for it to be a giant super technical committee, where the people that have traditionally been, for instance at my agency, Rec Tech is one person, Com Tech is one person.

There is a lot of overlap with Com Tech and the codes, and some of the issues that pop up through some of the subcommittees. That makes sense to me. But it's also another person that does bycatch and biological. Those three people are very distinct in their job responsibilities and knowledge.

Are you saying that we would then be pushing forward in that situation to have the one person representing it all, because in that case there would be a loss of technical knowledge? I would look forward to seeing how you all incorporate those scenarios in. We also have little buggers like travel restrictions.

That is sort of not so much a policy or a directive, but a technical component in how you get from Point A to Point B, if you have a situation in your home state, hypothetically, where you have to justify more than one person going to a meeting it is extremely difficult. My question to you all would be to see if there could be, as you move forward with the information gathering, sort of a hybrid to this idea.

Where can you utilize specific components of sort of this super committee through webinars and conference calls, when you have updates

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the  
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.  
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.



and things that incorporate more components of them, but save the truly technical issues that are very different, and require a different person to still split out and have technical workgroups? You could call the whole thing a technical committee, where you fold everybody in. But knowing that you're still going to have items that require workgroups and conference calls and in-person travel, because as much as everybody loves MRIP and hearing about it. I imagine there are quite a few commercial folks that don't want to be involved in a day of that and vice versa. I really look forward, I appreciate the idea, and having staff time be used more efficiently and effectively, get it, so thanks.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Do you have an answer to the question?

MS. SIMPSON: The answer is yes. We have thought about all of those things. Some of them were discussed at the Operations and Advisory level of how do we want to structure it? Some of us thought of the idea of you know the way that a SEDAR data workshop works, where there is a plenary session. Everyone gets together and then the workgroups can go do their own thing, where they really get to be experts.

But state travel is a consideration there, because it would be multiple people, and that's something that we need to bring back and forth, and see if we go that way. Instead of you sending three people to three different meetings, can you send three people to one meeting? What is the appropriate venue? Those are all excellent points, and I wrote them all down, so that we make sure we incorporate them in our conversation.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Jason McNamee, why don't you go on with your comments?

DR. McNAMEE: I was kind of having a similar thought process to Kathy. First I'll start by

saying I endorse the concept. I think it's a great idea. I looked at the kind of myriad of committees over the years and wondered you know about the structure a little bit. I like this effort to try and think about it.

When I was reading the document there were a couple of things struck me, the memo that you put together, and I just wanted to make a few comments. I started to question a little bit of the incentive for doing this. A couple of the comments in the memo had to do with efficiency. I like efficiency it's great. But when you're working with partners it is messy business, right?

It is important to make sure that being efficient. I'll just offer a really extreme example. If I was on a technical committee, if everybody did what I wanted it would be super-efficient, right? We have to work with each other to think about the challenges in Georgia versus the challenges in Rhode Island, and hash through those things.

You know I don't want to lose the notion of collaboration and partnership on these committees to efficiency. I think it's going to be important to keep that in mind. Maybe I was reading too much into the memo. I'll acknowledge that. The other thing there is a part in there about these kinds of volunteer ad hoc groups that come together, and that's really cool.

That is what companies like Google do; you know they do these kinds of teams that come together for special tasks. I think that is another good approach. However, when it comes to volunteering, just from my experience on other technical committees, you could end up with the same people doing everything, and it's not fair to those people. They are proactive and they want to be involved, and they want to do work. But there needs to be a little bit more thought into keeping the partners engaged, not just going with the people that raised their hand every time, because that's in their nature to

raise their hand every time. You know be cognizant of that. Then final point, thank you, Madam Chair is I wondered again, another kind of hybrid type of idea. When I was thinking about my staff and how they participate on the ACCSP panels, I kind of saw not one mega; I like super, super technical committee, super mega technical committee?

Feel free to use that one if you like. But maybe there are two. I saw kind of like a biological, you know like the bio and bycatch group. They seem to do kind of different stuff, and then you've got the dependent reporting group. I wonder maybe if it's two rather than one, just something to kick around while you're thinking about this, but in general I support the concept.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Megan Ware.

MS. WARE: Kind of building off of some of what Jay was saying. I can definitely see from the memo that there are ways we could streamline how these groups are interacting right now, and I think that's a good idea. Coming from the ISFMP world, they have had to deal with a lot of workgroups in the past couple of years.

I think there have been some outcomes of that that may be counter to what you're trying to accomplish. From my personal opinion, I feel like the workgroups have actually increased the staff workload, because there has not been a clear person who is like the leader or the modeler, or something like that that has like an assigned task.

Also as Jay mentioned, I think you get the same people on the workgroups, so you have a small group of people that can be overworked through that style. I'm wondering has ACCSP talked with ISFMP staff about some of these challenges that have come up with workgroups. I think there are workarounds, but just like knowing some of the challenges that have come up might be helpful.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Are there any other questions or comments? John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Has there been discussion of how the workgroups would function relative to the full committee for making decisions? Like is it the type of system where all the decisions would be the responsibility of the Full Technical Committee? If you use the SEDAR example, the plenary makes all the decisions, the workgroup provide recommendations and don't, or is that the kind of details we still need to think through if we endorse just the general concept, and then hammering out all the particulars over the next year or so?

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Julie.

MS. SIMPSON: Yes that is something that is still being worked out. The idea, and again this is the idea that we were throwing around in our heads that we have not investigated or discussed with even the technical committees. But yes that would have to be something. The idea of the workgroups is essentially there might be standing workgroups that are topic specific, but then there would be the ad hoc ones, where we would say okay the SAFIS redesign is a short term project, so we need a group. When the redesign is over the group would go away. I appreciate Megan's perspective, and I think that's a great idea to talk to the ISFMP staff. I did take note of that because that is a consideration. I think everyone has had really great ideas today, and I think that as we talk through a lot of these ideas with the technical committee members, they'll be able to provide detailed perspectives that will give us good fodder for a more solid discussion to bring recommendations back to this group.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Before I try to sum up, are there any other questions about this? Does anybody have any more questions or comments? You know this is a big idea, and I

know that a lot of people, I really appreciate the deliberative discussion. What I would say is that there is some more work to do in developing this idea, if this body is okay with that.

Really I think the question before us is are we onboard with staff developing this and really laying it out, and bringing some options back to use, to decide whether we want to proceed. That would of course involve engaging closely with the technical committees themselves. With that I guess I'll just ask. Is there any objection to staff going forward with an information gathering phase? Okay seeing none. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Julie, I think that everyone recognizes the challenges, and you guys have laid out a good case for looking at the structure with the whys. We've heard a few more things raised here today that should be considered. But I think it would be good to go to the technical committees with just a question that was on the plan of how can we adjust the structure to address the challenges.

Maybe not seed them the idea of doing a super committee, but see what they come up with. Each one may come up with various hybrid approaches and different solutions, if they're not sort of told well these are the problems. We're going to do a super committee, what do you all think? They'll focus on either beating that up or supporting it. Give them more an open ended, so how would you all fix these challenges?

#### **CONSIDER ESTABLISHMENT OF A DATA COORDINATION COMMITTEE**

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: That's a good approach. Okay, so I think we have resolution on that and we're going to move on to the next agenda item, which is Consider the Establishment of a Data Coordination Committee. This one I think began evolving at last years annual meeting.

Really this is about developing a way to make sure that all of the various efforts and initiatives that are happening across different agencies are connected, to avoid overlap. I think John Carmichael had some pretty elegant examples of that at our annual meeting last year. With that I'm going to turn it over to Geoff.

MR. WHITE: Excellent, thank you Lynn. As we have on the slide and Lynn introduced. This was discussed last year as how do folks better discuss projects that kind of have effects cross jurisdictional? The quick summary is that integrative reporting initiatives, which have typically been regional, highlight greater need for coordination.

One of the items there last year was SEFHIER, the Southeast For-Hire Integrated Reporting, and how there were a lot of the federal partners working on it. Some of the states wanted to be involved, and how the data flow would work, figuring out a broader range of how that project would move forward, and how also it would affect others. One of the things that really hit home, was how reporting in the South Atlantic for a duly permitted vessel or entity in the Mid-Atlantic would now have different reports to address.

The end goal of one report going to multiple agencies was kind of the idea that it covers more than just the one region that those things are meant to address. On the flip side, in the summary that was sent out over e-mail last week, there are some other examples that start more at the state level that may require changes to other reporting systems, and whether that was the Tautog commercial landings tags, American Lobster gear – vertical lines.

There is an initiative, which I'm not sure how many of you have heard of, but it's a one-stop reporting project. These are all activities that are more inclusive within a region, but

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the  
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.  
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

sometimes the recognition of how it affects partners not in that initiative, be that a state or a further region are not included.

The charge was really to provide a cross jurisdictional forum for sharing information on data collection initiatives. That might be a relatively informal three to four conference calls a year, to share projects that are up and coming, regulations that are around the bend, how that might affect data collection, and other things.

This morning at the Lobster Board they talked about, we've got this need for a data item; it can be put in one, two, three different data reporting flows. But if it's not on the paper form or it's not in this other primary application, how do we consolidate the data at the end of the year? How is it useful to management as a holistic view?

Getting a little bit more lead time and sharing, these are the projects, these are the successes. Maybe it's an outreach item. Maybe it's a data collection item. Maybe it's a technical issue, but being able to share those things would be pretty useful. That is where the idea came from. We've even had a couple of, and it's a little off the list here, but a couple of successes.

Recently where we were at a meeting that the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission and PacFIN were also at, they were very interested in how ACCSP website confidentiality worked for the data warehouse, and we were able to begin sharing those tools with them. That was kind of the idea here of a Data Coordination Committee, being able to share projects, share information and move things forward.

With that I would certainly entertain any questions. But the proposal on the table here was consider approving the Data Coordination Working Group, and tasking staff to request members via e-mail. The intention again would be to not really have it as a voting group.

Everybody still has their own regulations and needs to meet.

But knowing that we all have the same end goal of coordinated data reporting, by creating this group, again nonvoting group, but more of a sharing, membership will be open to all of the state, regions, councils, feds, the folks that were interested and involved in this. I think the tieback to the integrated reporting is with greater data flow, from more various places that's flexibility that is really necessary in the data collection world. But when it all lands at one place and that choice has been more and more ACCSP, which we're proud to be there. Being able to share the different requirements early enough with folks so that it all comes in to the same standards is really what this was after. With that I'll entertain questions.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Sir, I apologize, I do not know your name.

MR. TOM NEIS: Hi, Tom Neis; New England Fishery Management Council Executive Director. Thank you, I don't show up a lot. But when its ten minutes from my house it's hard to find an excuse not to come. Thank you, Madam Chair. I've got a question for Geoff. I guess I'm a little confused.

It seems like this group to be effective is going to have to involve many of the people or represent many of the groups that are sitting at this table. Was there any thought to considering that maybe the way to address this is not to form another group, but to include some sort of information sharing agenda item on a periodic basis at this meeting?

MR. WHITE: We could certainly do part of it at this meeting. The intention was really somewhere in between. It's choosing the right people, somewhere in between the Operations Committee level, the technical folks that have the IT knowledge, and the policy level. My time is precious at these meetings.

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the  
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.  
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

I think the ability to delve into the issues and consider what's up and coming, and figure out whether it's a database piece or a reporting piece. I'm not sure there will be enough time to follow through on that in this particular forum. If we wanted to handle it more at the Operations Committee level, and bring in people, then initially that makes some sense as well.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Mel Bell.

MR. MEL BELL: I was just going to ask, so you envision one person from each state, and we would just designate who, and it being kind of an informal, improved communications that's what this is about?

MR. WHITE: The intention was one person per agency. If we're having all these via webinars and conference calls, certainly more people can participate and learn from it that would be fantastic. That is the intent of the group. In the event that we needed to have an in-person meeting, I would expect that budget would dictate limiting membership a little bit more, or limiting travel.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Dee Lupton.

MS. LUPTON: The way I looked at this, it sounded very much like the Operations Committee in a new task to the Operations Committee, because at least in our state that is probably who would sit on this Committee. I was having some trouble with we want to streamline the Technical Committee aspect, but create a new committee that maybe somewhere between policy and technical, which was operations to me. I know not everybody may have that person on the Ops Committee, but I was just wondering if you had considered adding it as a task to the Operations Committee. Maybe even have maybe additional meetings, but just have those additional meetings be a webinar focused

totally on data coordination, and not all the other operations items.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Thanks, Dee, before I sum up on that Jason McNamee.

DR. McNAMEE: I had a very similar comment to Dee's, so I won't restate that. But I'm also struggling a little bit. Geoff, when you were kind of leading into this you gave some examples that made sense to me, like lobster. You know we talked about that this morning. Is that how this would work, you kind of pick a topic? It's such a huge thing that I'm struggling to figure out how you would kind of focus in and get to the output, you know so that. I'll stop there.

MR. WHITE: No, fair question. In the summary it did have kind of an "areas of interest." My current thought would be you would pick a call and say, we've got dealer reporting, whether that's online or tablet apps. Let's talk about that today, get a couple of folks to prepare presentations, and focus on that aspect and what upcoming initiatives there are going on.

The trip reporting is kind of the gorilla in the room about how this came about, and is one of the primary tasks for next year, with the different initiatives that are happening. But it could go to, you know the other thing might just be; let's talk about regulatory changes that might impact existing data systems, and leave that as a two-hour call. Pick a topic, feed in a couple of seed presentations of a major initiative, and get folks to talk about what other things are happening in their agency.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Does anybody else have any questions or comments on this? Okay, so I'm actually getting the sense, I think following on the comments we've heard from Dee Lupton and others that I think the way to handle this would be to take it back to the Operations Committee, and maybe discuss it with them.

Above all we need this to be useful, and we certainly don't want to commit ourselves to death. We want to make sure that we are communicating well, and not duplicating efforts. That would be my proposal, if that suits staff. Is there any objection to sending this back to Operations Committee, and having them talk about it as a task for them? Okay, seeing none that is what we shall do.

#### **PROGRAM AND COMMITTEE UPDATES**

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: With that we are going to move on to the Update portion of our agenda. We're doing well on time; we'll try to motor through this.

MR. WHITE: As we get into the program updates. We did structure the agenda, thank you again for the beginning of the meeting and the work of the Selection Committee in choosing myself and Julie as Deputy Director, to keep us moving. Under the Program Activity in highlights here, I did want to highlight a couple of approach items, then give you guys in the sense of transparency and a little bit more information on some of the initiatives that we've been involved in, and some updates that have occurred since your last meeting, really.

But, internally we've certainly been evaluating and focused in on our existing commitments. What is the focus of our resources and the core issues that we need to address internally. One of the first things that we needed to do was fill some open slots, so we had three open positions, two kind of were defined early this spring. Adding a person to the data team to work on biological data, replacing our Outreach Program Coordinator with a Program Assistant, and then backfilling the recreational team leads slot.

As an update for you guys, we've actually had those positions out. We've interviewed for all of them, and we need to complete a couple more interviews before we make our selections,

but we're glad to be kind of bringing ourselves back up to full staffing. Another thing that we've worked on is really expanding our internal program management in greater integration with ASMFC.

We've been functionally a part of the ASMFC family since the decision in October of 2016. But, based on when the ACCSP Strategic Plan ran out, when the new ASMFC Strategic Plan is out, and the Action Plan, this is actually the first year where the Action Plan for the year is fully integrated into ASMFC.

That was a process that we got to be involved in, involve Lynn and John on and, of course that document is going to be coming out later this week through the Administrative Oversight Committee, and so it's been good to be a part of that process, and begin kind of regular Coordinating Council Leadership status calls, to keep coordinated on what these issues are.

Those are some of our approaches, and it just points out that 2020 ASMFC Action Plan Goal 3 is really focused on ACCSP, and we are glad to be taking steps towards that integration. The other items on the list, we've got slides for each one, so I'll step into those. FISMA, so the Federal Information Security Management Act.

Mike was able to give you guys updates in the past on how this was proceeding, primarily this was growth of ACCSP Security Systems and the interaction with the federal systems, and a task that was necessary to document and move forward with the SEFHIER data sharing and data collection.

We've had several meetings with them between the Director, staff, our contractor support, HMS folks, people from GARFO, and SERO, and primarily with the office, OCIO, so the information officer at NOAA. We've given them an overview of the ACCSP and the partner actions, and received a commitment from them to help support this process. The FISMA

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the  
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.  
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

process can be long, and is primarily documentation.

They were able to define us, the ACFIN, Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Information Network as moderate but non-federal. That is a similar classification as the NMFS Regional Offices, and this was a benefit to us in the process, because based on the levels of classification, there are certain levels of documentation. This puts us at a lower level of documentation and security risk to federal systems.

The bottom bullet is really just a technical document that guides us through this. The overall process here is really two major things. We had an external security scan that was done. We passed that with no high criticality, only a couple of medium, and a few low priority criticality configuration changes that we needed to address. That means updating security protocols and software version changes, some operating systems on a couple of servers. That is really considered a short term completion, and we're on track to support SEFHIER, probably have most of those things done by the end of November.

It also includes things like extending. It's kind of an "in the weeds" thing, but the two-factor authentication when you log into your banking software it sends you a text message back to make sure you're the right person. Adding that to the SAFIS tools, not for every login, but when you initially create your account or when you request a change in your password. It goes back to the two-factor authentication.

There is a technical development there. We had part of it, we had to develop another part of it, and not be too onerous, because we're trying to walk that line between maintaining security and making tools easy to use by fishermen. That is not a two-factor thing of every time they log into the app, or every time the data gets submitted over the API.

But those are some of the initial configuration changes that we've been in the midst of doing. One of them that is complete at this point, moving all ACCSP laptops to Windows 10, because Windows 7 is going through end of support January of 2020. Those kinds of things take months to implement. They're already in place at this point.

We've already got the servers and things configured, so we're moving well along in that path. The second step of this takes a bit longer, and that is to document and evaluate the security procedures. We use something called the cyber security evaluation tool. It's a federal tool based on Department of Defense, and it goes through a whole road map of about a year and a half, to get through all of it.

That is an ongoing documentation and confirmation process, so once you have the procedures in place you have to test them every once in a while. The security scan that was done for us through an outside vendor, contractor, basically said you're doing a lot of great stuff. We need to tighten up the documentation so that we can check on it every once in a while.

That documentation of course involves pulling a lot of old things together, writing a couple of new policies, and thankfully we have enlisted the help, I think you were informed before of Joan Palmer. She retired as lead of the Information Technology Group in Woods Hole, and still considers helping us out in these things fun, which is fantastic for us.

We appreciate her help as we go through this. With that that is just a quick update on where we are with FISMA, and why it's important to not only maintain security and protocols, but to be able to move forward on some of these data collection initiatives with our regional partners. The next item on the list, and Julie and I are sharing some of these, is the FIS Projects. As

our lead on FIS Committees, I'm going to have Julie go over this slide.

MS. SIMPSON: We have two projects that have been funded by FIS that ACCSP is a PI on. The first one is to utilize quality management tools to improve data provision in ASMFC stock assessments. This is actually building on a quality management project that was done in the southeast. The basis behind this is simply using the Quality Management Professional Specialty Group. The tools that they have available and their facilitators to help us walk through the process of how the data are being provided to the stock assessment, to help us find any efficiencies so that that process can go as smoothly as possible, and provide data that is high quality but is provided in as quickly a fashion as possible, which is always an ideal scenario. The next one is development of one-stop reporting that Geoff mentioned earlier.

#### **ELECTRONIC VESSEL TRIP REPORTING STATUS**

MS. SIMPSON: Electronic Vessel Trip Reporting Technical Specifications, this one was actually I will say spearheaded by Barry Clifford at GARFO, but he very wisely brought in the Northeast Fisheries Science Center, the Southeast Regional Office, the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, HMS, and ACCSP all as PIs. This is really, truly a coastal joint effort, and once those meetings start to convene there is going to be quite a lot of discussion amongst various partners. We're very much looking forward to that project.

The final project is one that is not one that we will be receiving funding for; it's one that the Gulf States has proposed. But they are going to be transitioning to tablet-based APAIS data collection. As you all know that is something that we do on the Atlantic coast, so ACCSP will be sharing software on our base configuration.

While we're not directly receiving any funding for that we will be heavily involved in that

project, in that we're going to be sharing our information, and Geoff and Alex will very likely get down there on site and work with them on that project. Those are the FIS projects that we have officially received funding for as of a couple weeks ago for next year. We're looking forward to participating in all of those, and welcome any questions that you guys have about them.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Any questions?

#### **UPDATE FROM THE FEDERAL INFORMATION MANAGEMENT MODERNIZATION MEETING**

MR. WHITE: Okay, so the next one is just an update on a meeting that we participated in, both Julie and I got to go to the FIMM meeting that is the Federal Information Management Modernization meeting, this was middle of September. The objective here was really to discuss NOAA and partner, including the FINs and the Commissions data needs, and develop actions to modernize the information systems.

This was great because they had 40 or 50, probably a few more than that folks in the room, worked out through facilitated sections. It was a follow up to a net gains report on how to modernize and improve the underlying systems, the data sharing, and how it all moves forward. This covered a lot of areas, including weather information, it's all of NOAA really, and so it covered data buoys, fisheries independent surveys, camera work, electronic monitoring, as well as the part that we were involved in as fisheries dependent data collection.

As you see the bullets on here where some of the outcomes, and surprisingly a lot of the thoughts going into the meeting were oh, artificial intelligence, machine learning, way cool technology, move it all to the cloud, and in the discussions it became really clear that there might be some aspects that are really built for that. Moving the data buoys into one cloud that is shared by NOAA, instead of having three



different regional areas that do that sounds like a great idea. But a lot of the items listed here talked about communication being crucial, sustained funding, partnerships essential to successful fisheries information management. Timing again throughout that meeting, the experience of the FINS, ACCSP, GulfFIN, PacFIN, AKFIN as being able to both self-evaluate the external systems we're doing a pretty good job of moving forward on modernization tasks, as well as provide opportunities for engagement and partnerships to make sure that things are moving forward.

One of the highlights here on partnerships was really recognizing the annual data load, which Julie will talk about, and has really led for a long time. In 2007 with something like 42, 45 individual datasets to try and compile that number has come down a little bit to somewhere about 30. But the partnerships of knowing what datasets exist, and how you find them, and how you get them to the central place so that you can manage the data, seems to take a lot longer than the actual data management part.

That is where this workshop was interesting to be at and talk about those types of things, to sustain support both from leadership, funding, coordination, and partnerships was really the message that came back out of it. It was great to not only be invited to that workshop, but to be able to sit down on a couple of the panels of what the discussions were, and see kind of that national perspective.

That was another kind of activity that we participate in, and it's been pretty great. Along the same vein, just thought of another side one, Julie went to the American Fisheries Society meeting this year, and helped host a data management training class, continuing education class, and was able to over a four hour class, one of the things that folks weren't sure is oh is that too dry?

How many people are they going to get? They ended up with about 20 people in the room, a couple of walk-ins, and they were so interested in the exercises, both students and long term veterans that they stayed about an hour afterwards to finish the exercise and figure things out. It's like oh, I thought Excel was a database. No it's not.

How do we organize and work on our data so it lives beyond our project, and so teaching those kinds of things out to other people, and sharing is kind of a neat role in smaller areas we get to share and do, and so that was another highlight. The next slide talks about GARFO FDDI, and love to throw all the acronyms out, but frankly the whole explanation didn't fit on one line.

It's the Fisheries Dependent Data Initiative. This is really led by GARFO; they've been doing this for four years, and including ACCSP when it ended with a V for visioning. They are moving to the implementation phase, and it's really about a regional plan for integrated data information systems.

Improving, modernizing, and integrating fisheries dependent data systems, following the federal and regional standards. That's organized as an oversight, a technical, and a regulatory team. They have asked ASMFC and ACCSP to be part of that so Julie is on the Technical Team, and both Toni and I are on the Regulatory Team, and I'm also sitting on the Oversight group, and the entities are listed up on the screen. But it's really about all of the fishery dependent things that are happening through GARFO, the website data products, the trip reports, biological sampling, the pre-trip notification systems, but there are a variety of things happening. To be able to work with them and sit in on this for the partnership between what data comes through ACCSP, what data comes in through them, what data products are necessary, and being able to work on that jointly is a great thing, and we're glad to be part of that one. As I said they're just

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the  
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.  
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

forming those groups, and some of the first meetings are coming up later this week.

CHAIRMAN FEGELY: Kathy Knowlton, did you have a question to this point?

MS. KNOWLTON: I do. Is there a version of that FDDI for the South Atlantic, or has there been a corollary recently that produced that kind of outcome?

MR. WHITE: I'm going to ask for a little help here after a moment. The closest analog that I'm aware of is really the SEFHIER group, and the time that they spent to come up with the for-hire reporting piece. Again, the Data Coordination Committee idea comes to support things like this, and discussing what the initiatives are, what is it across regions. Since that idea was brought up a year ago, there has of course been progress on these kinds of ideas. But if there is a SERO or South Atlantic representative here that wanted to expand further, then that would be great.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Well there is a South Atlantic representative here, and I think you summed it up. There isn't as much going on, at least that we're aware of. It doesn't mean that there aren't things going on within the Center perhaps that haven't trickled out to our knowledge, but not sure of things going on.

There has been some discussion going back and forth among folks at the Council Coordination Committee, which is the Chairs and the EDs about some of the regional implementation plans that is crossing over into some of this data stuff, and what's been shared, and there seems to be a lot of variation across the different regions nationwide.

As far as how much has been shared and how far along they all are. It's just so that was kind of I think the Data Coordination Committee idea was to be up at that level, at least maybe get

the different regions on our coast talking a little bit more and sharing ideas.

MS. SIMPSON: I just wanted to say it's a small part of it, but that is an objective of the OSR/FIS project. I mean it's a small part of that FDDI effort to be doing those kinds of conversations, but you know SERO and the Southeast Fisheries Science Center are in those conversations, so hopefully those kinds of conversations, along with some of the other ones that we're having on just some standardization things that I'll talk about on the next slide, will start to maybe spur thoughts on something more formal.

MR. WHITE: With that I think we're ready to move to the next slide, so back to Julie.

MS. SIMPSON: There are quite a few bullets on this slide, and I just kind of want to touch very briefly on each one, to take the opportunity to either give you a little bit more information on them, and in a lot of cases thank you for the efforts that your various agencies have put into them. The spring/fall 2018 data load, which happened this year loading the 2018 data, was an exceptional year. We managed to be a few days early for the spring load. We were able to deliver those data on April 12 instead of April 15. We also set an internal deadline for the fall load, which is not as public or as crucial, but we actually managed to be about five days early on that one. These don't seem like huge numbers, but it is super significant, because it is the first time ever that we've been early on the fall load.

It is very rare that we are on time or early for the spring load. Being early for both of them says a lot about the efforts of not just our staff, but especially all of the agency partner staff in making sure that we got data in a timely fashion. Everyone was meeting deadlines and getting data early, and that was very, very helpful to that process, so please go back and thank the folks that are involved in that process.

The next item is the PRFC data feed, and this data from the PRFC have usually come to ACCSP. Oh sorry that was my bad, I accidentally pressed my button. I faked Caitlin out. That was my bad. The PRFC data have normally come to us through VMRC, and we have not been able to have data coming directly from PRFC, and this year we were able to work with PRFC.

Their staff did a great job, as well as their contractor Ray, I believe is his name. He did a great job in helping them do some programming, and so we're in the final stages of testing, and we're going to be getting data directly from PRFC, and that is a big step forward on our staff. We're very excited about that. We wanted to kind of recognize them for the work that they did on that.

The HMS data feed, it is a fairly complicated data feed, as it seems like everything with HMS sometimes is. But we are working diligently with their staff on trying to get a final data feed into the data warehouse that compiles all of the data, which is very tricky, because there is overlap with the Gulf, so we're actually pulling in data that actually goes from Maine to Texas.

It's been very difficult, but there have been a lot of people working on that and we've been very appreciative of those efforts as well. The next one is the new public queries in the data warehouse. If you've been on the public data warehouse lately, you'll notice that at the end of each row there is a new field that tells you the percent displayed.

There was some unhappiness with the original direction of the new data warehouse, and how the public data warehouse was displaying data. We were attempting to show true coastal totals, which meant that in some cases if one state was confidential we ended up hiding all the state data at the state level, and that was not desirable.

We kind of flipped everything on its head, we now show if it's non-confidential the state data is shown, and then as we roll up to the region or as we roll up to the coast, we just make sure that you can't back calculate anything that we didn't show you at the state region. Obviously that means that there are some regional and coastal totals that are redacted totals, which means they're not true totals.

That is that new column at the end, where it will show you the percent displayed, sometimes it's over 95 percent of the data, so it's actually, depending on your activity, still a useable number. We've gotten a lot of positive feedback about that. If you have any feedback we would love to hear about it. The next item is confidentiality in FIN coordination. We've worked very hard on automating our confidentiality. As Geoff mentioned earlier, we did have a conversation with the PacFIN/AKFIN folks when we were at the FIN meeting. They were very interested in it, so we did a demonstration for them, and we've started sharing information with them about how they can do that.

They were so excited by the exchange that they now want to start having a FIN meeting every once in a while. They volunteered to host the next one to demo something that they are doing in their FIN for the rest of us. We're going to involve GulfFIN and WPacFIN in those as well. We're going to start having these occasional FIN show and tells, so that we can learn a little bit more about what the rest of us are doing.

The data request volume is actually up over the last year and a half, so we kind of wanted to share that there has been a lot of data requests. We're averaging about a completion of anywhere from 10 to 12 data requests a month, which doesn't sound like a lot. But some of them are fairly involved. We were talking to someone earlier about all of the data that is

being used in the ecopath preparation in the South Atlantic. That is just one data request.

It took a while to figure out all the different 140 species groups, and manually code those in. That is something that would only count as one data request. Code standardization has been an activity that we've been working a lot on. When I say code standardization, in this case it actually doesn't mean what we normally think of it as, in terms of Standards Codes Committee, although that Committee has been doing a lot of work lately.

What we're actually talking about, more along the lines of, like the common names standardization. We did a lot of going through to make sure that those were being displayed in a consistent fashion, so that it's always things like snapper, red, so that it's easy for everyone to find and it's consistent across all of the various commercial/recreational biological datasets that we have.

The common names alone were a process that took about two years to do, and we just completed it. There has been a lot of partner involvement in that. We appreciate everybody's patience in response to e-mails and queries, and look at this really long list. Do you see any issues? Everyone has been very responsive to those, and we appreciate all the cooperation. Finally, I wanted to let everyone know about the biological module progress.

That was an activity that we had had to set aside, because of staffing issues. Because we are able to now bring someone else on, we have started working on that. We have new structures in place that we're testing various codes and things on, and we've started to work with partners to sort of beef up the existing data, and do some quality checks on it before we move it in.

Again, we've reached out to partners with some pretty old lobster data and said hey, what does

that mean? People have been really helpful in; you know digging back in their records and figuring out what those things mean, so that we can get them clarified before they get moved over. Essentially the theme of the slide is there is a lot going on. But everybody has been really cooperative from a partner standpoint, and that has made for a lot of successes, and we are very grateful for that.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: I'm just checking, are there any questions at this point? Okay, go ahead Geoff.

### **ELECTRONIC TRIP REPORTING STATUS**

MR. WHITE: Excellent, thank you. Update on Electronic Trip Reporting Status. There is a long list of items on the screen. I won't bore you by reading all of them, but the whole point here is that there are several different electronic trip reporting initiatives that are going on right now. They have overlapping data fields, timelines, and needs.

We as ACCSP are involved in many of them, along the lines of what's happening here and then of course the two bottom issues, the SAFIS redesign and integrated reporting are part of all of this. In addition to this list, several states have electronic options as well, some using SAFIS, some other systems that are becoming more widely used.

I point at Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, Maryland, and South Carolina that all have trip reporting, both commercial and for-hire that go through these types of things. The grand dream of the one-stop reporting is either the Olympic ring or the Venn diagram piece of saying; if you have multiple permits then the system will know about those permits and ask you all the right questions on one trip report, so that it will say add the extra economic questions for you if you've got a South Atlantic and Mid-Atlantic permit.

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the  
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.  
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

Then still include if you happen to encounter an HMS species, the extra target species and the individual fish information that goes along with that. That is the dream, and that is part of what the SAFIS redesign and integrated reporting are working towards. Again, the trick is to collect all the right data elements for each jurisdiction, even when there are multiple permits.

With that I'll just kind of step through a couple of what the parts are of SAFIS, as in today. A little different perspective on what the redesign means, I keep hearing some different perspectives on why has it been going on so long? Where are you at now? When are we going to see something at the end user perspective at the end?

SAFIS today includes a bunch of different modules. The initial big one was really the dealer reporting that was online. Not only is it online, but it allows file upload from third-party systems, and there is now EDR-Mobile, or tablet based, which allows dealers to either use a swipe card to identify the fisherman, or use it out on the dock and carry it back inside to complete the report that kind of thing.

There are multiple pathways to get the dealer reports in, and it includes the one-ticket system that is functional down in South Carolina and Georgia. On the vessel trip reporting side, again we've got those three components. There is mobile, which eTrips Mobile Version 2 works on tablets, iPhones, Android phones, Windows 10, and laptops.

It has an online component using the web form, which requires you to be online all the time, and it also has the file upload portion. Those kinds of common themes of three ways to get the data in are going to come back in another two slides. There is also a whole section on lobster trap tag management, and maybe the more centralized piece is the SAFIS management system, it's referred to by those who use it as just SMS. It says Partner Admins

there, because that is the place where partners need to go in and manage, what are the species lists that are okay, what are the gear lists that are okay, what are all the background pieces that should be displayed to their fishermen for their permits?

That interaction is a piece of software that is built and functions within the SAFIS system, but really relies on the data inputs and management and the workload of all of the partners, to make sure that the right things are being shown to their fishermen when their fishermen log in to the end app. On the redesign, the goals really are flexible, and the redesign has been kind of cast a couple of different ways.

It is oh, we're going to have new tools at the end, and that's the last step. The big part of the redesign, where it's been kind of talked about for a couple of years now has been an envisioning stage of what kind of flexible tools do we want? What general approaches should be there? What are the needs of the end users? That took some time.

The next step was really to change the database level approaches. This graphic is trying to show, where are we on development test instances, and where are we in the production status? The outside world really cares about where we're at in the production status, but sometimes we don't recognize all the work in progress that goes into getting up to that point.

The recursive database design basically means it's flexible, and you don't have to just collect the types of fields that have been defined ten years ago. That is a way to collect and store the data that is a lot more flexible. There is gear attributes, economic data fields, other species attributes. The species attributes might be it's standardly collected in pounds, but you also want numbers and then you also might need another field to go along with that.

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the  
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.  
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

The gear and economic attributes are functional in eTrips Mobile Version 2 right now, and we're working on updating the online tools to follow those same types of flexible design and opportunities. Another portion is to provide a partner switchboard. That is really in a way through the web tool, to add and remove optional data elements to the form, and it rebuilds that form dynamically, based on what your partner is and what your permits are.

This is like a geeky excitable thing, but this is the type of technology that enables one form to meet the same needs, whether you've got a state permit or you just have a federal permit in one region, or if you've got four permits across regions in different states. This approach has taken a lot to kind of figure out, and there is a part of that in demonstration mode, which when we've shared with folks the other technical geeks tend to get excited about it.

I get excited about it too. The other items on the list, which are kind of ongoing in development and test are consolidating the data processing, redesigning the online applications, and integrated reporting, meaning Universal Trip ID. Just to give a better visual of what this really means, the current data process, have you noticed the upload, online, and mobile those three sections from a few slides ago. They go through their own kind of gear box and processing, because as ACCSP systems evolved over time that processing was kind of developed, and then run in parallel. While functional, it takes extensive programming to maintain consistent logic across all three areas. You change one of them, then you've got to go back and make sure the logic is exactly right in the other, and then oh yes let's not forget about this third piece.

Future state would be different arrows and one set of gears. We're working on this, Karen Holmes and the software team are building the structures and the database procedures to be able to have it come in one way, have it

evaluated and looked at, go through the same set of gears and processing, and store that data in the central data warehouse, and then be able to present that back out through the query systems.

This takes a very complex process and makes it look simple. But it's a big step forward in terms of overall programming efficiency, and the ability for the data flow to work right from a variety of third party vendors, different database types, sharing the data back and forth between partner agencies in the background.

This is just kind of an approach, a different graphic and way to explain that to you guys that hopefully will build some transparency of where we're at, and where we're going. The next step of the redesign is really the integrated reporting, integrated reporting means different things to different people again.

One might be being able to send from your vessel the hail out, the tracking information via VMS, which is more of a Gulf requirement, or very few fisheries in the Atlantic, and your logbook. From the perspective of fishermen that is integrated reporting. From the perspective of where we're looking at it is a Universal Trip ID.

That would be where if you submit a hail out or a pre-trip notification, it creates a trip identifier, and it sends that back to the fisherman. Then when you submit your logbook it has that same identifier, so you don't have to go through a series of database gymnastics to try and match up a hail out to a trip report based on a vessel, a date, a port et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

Having Universal Trip ID and sharing that back and forth, being able to link biological sampling, port sampling, trip reports, and dealer reports tends to really, really help out. There are a lot of activities now where some of the best matching rates are close to like 80 percent between dealer reports and trip reports.

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the  
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.  
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

We want that number to go up using a system like this, which was to give credit where it's due, envisioned up in the northeast and GARFO, and shared with us to help implement, and extend into other regions. This one is really in Phase 1 of production. ACCSP is developing a hail-out feature for eTrips Mobile Version 2.1.

That is going to be to support SEFHIER, but in the Gulf where they have a hail-out trip requirement.

### **REGISTRATION TRACKING**

Those are all pieces of the SAFIS redesign of integrated reporting, and another piece of that redesign is Registration Tracking, which Julie has been working on, so I'm going to pass that one back to her before we ask for questions on this area.

MS. SIMPSON: The Registration Tracking portion is the participant module design, which is the component of the database that handles the people, the permits, and the vessels. One of the things that we are attempting to do in our new module is to incorporate a little bit more flexibility in the system, and this will allow for scenarios where I have my own individual permits, but I am also part of a corporation, and that corporation has permits.

It also allows for me to be part of one corporation over here, where I am partnering with Person A, but I am also part of another corporation where I'm partnering with Person B. Additionally this will give us the flexibility for me to be able to be, I happen to own a fleet of boats, for-hire boats, and I have various different captains that are responsible that I would like to have entering those data, and so I have sub accounts where they are data entry accounts, but they can only see certain data, the data that they are entering. Then I can see all of the data as the data owner.

Those are the kinds of flexibilities that we're attempting to achieve. However, we do recognize that the permitting systems, all of our partners vary greatly, especially at the federal level in the two regions. The permitting systems are different, to say the least. What we have done is we convened a small group that has come together and created something that we think will work for everyone.

Those scenarios and spreadsheets were distributed at the Operations Committee, though each Operations Committee member has been tasked with taking all of that information back to their partner agency, if they would like to engage in a webinar for further explanation. They've been given that option.

Every agency has until the end of the year to provide some kind of response, and we wanted to give that extensive amount of time, because we realize that it's complex. It can involve multiple staff at the agency level, but it is going to be vitally important for us to all be on the same page with that moving forward, because once we do so we are not going to be able to go back easily and make changes. We wanted to let you know specifically about that particular aspect, because there is a feedback loop on that one that is coming around the bend.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Great, any questions so far? Jason McNamee.

DR. McNAMEE: Wondering, so the integrated stuff is super cool. I'm wondering, I get most of it I think. It's kind of like the VTR eTrips with the dealer report being able to kind of track things through. What about observer information? Then my follow up, I see head nodding, so my follow up to that is then does that conflict between the different discard calculations? Maybe I'm up a level on that but there is some conflict on how discards are calculated, and I'm wondering if that causes a challenge for that aspect of the integrated reporting.

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the  
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.  
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: That is a great question. Julie.

MS. SIMPSON: The real key with TMS is that it is going to be a phased in approach, and so while observer data is slated to eventually have the TMS Universal ID tag, we are starting with what we consider to be the low hanging fruit, in that right now we're putting in Universal ID on a hail-out, and then we're attaching them to the same trip. The next step is to then you know take a trip and do a dealer report, because those two are integrated. As we move along we do intend to incorporate observers that are on the boat, also biological samples or recreational samples on the for-hire side that are sampling at the docks. The idea is to perpetuate the Universal ID throughout all of those things, but implementation of those last ends of the list is still way out there. The answer to your question is it hasn't been discussed in detail yet.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Okay Geoff, to you.

MR. WHITE: She answered it so, are we ready to move on? No more questions?

#### **UPDATE FROM THE OPERATIONS/ADVISORS JOINT MEETING**

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Okay, moving down our agenda we now have our Updates from the Operations/Advisors, Nicole.

MS. NICOLE LENGYEL COSTA: There was a joint Operations/Advisory Committee meeting in September, in Arlington. In addition to talking about FY20 proposals and the funding step-down projection, as well as the 75/25 split, we discussed many other items. I also wanted to give a quick shout out to Rob Watts for the lobster proposal.

He was in a seat of heavy fire during that meeting, and he responded very well to all of our questions. He did very well, and we were very impressed with his ability to answer all of

our questions, so I just wanted to mention him real quick. But some of the other things that we discussed, we were given a sheet that the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council had put together, an EVTR fact sheet.

The partners were asked to fill it out for their state, basically asking us what the status of EVTR requirements in our state were going to be. For example, in Rhode Island if you fill out an EVTR you don't have to fill out a state logbook, your EVTR will suffice for your reporting requirement. The partners were asked to fill that out and we got responses from almost all the states on that. We reviewed all the project expenditures to date. All the current projects looked good.

There was one state that might under spend a little bit, but we still weren't sure that they still had some bills to come in. We reviewed committee membership on all ACCSP committees, made some corrections to that identified some gaps, particularly talked about the Advisors Committee, which Jerry will touch on next.

We then received updates much to the same effect that you all have received today, reviewed all committee action items, which I'll get to next, got an update on the Accountability Workgroup, SAFIS redesign, FISMA, the For-Hire Workshop, MRIP Regional Implementation Plan, the fall data load and it's progress ahead of schedule, and then the FIS projects.

We then had elections, where I was voted in as Chair and Renee Zobel from New Hampshire is our new Vice-Chair, and I also wanted to thank Amy Dukes for her service as Chair the last two years, she did a great job.

#### **ADVISORS COMMITTEE REPORT**

MS. LENGYEL COSTA: I'll pass it over to Jerry for the Advisors Update.

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the  
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.  
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.



MR. JERRY MORGAN: On behalf of the Advisors, I would like to thank ASMFC, ACCSP, and the Coordinating Council for hosting the 78th Annual Meeting here at New Castle. I would also like to once again congratulate ACCSP's new Director Geoff and Deputy Director Julie on their newly appointed positions. It has been a challenging past few years of dwindling advisor membership. This occurred for a variety of reasons, including weather related events, health, travel, et cetera. However, one of the underlying reasons is that the purpose of the Advisors, their mission and responsibilities have not translated well through Operations down to perspective candidates, in part because of turnover in personnel, and also not being familiar enough with the Advisor's function so as to recruit and/or recommend candidates for effective.

Back in 2012, Ann McElhatton, Mike Bucko and myself initiated the development of the Advisors Guideline, available on the ACCSP website, which by the time it rolled out turned out to be a comprehensive thesis detailing mission, history, duties, responsibilities, and everything in between.

At our most recent joint meeting between Ops and Advisors, we had good discussions about function, recruitment, and outreach, where we educated new Ops members who ultimately will play a pivotal role in enhancing membership. As a result we are hopeful that this will have a positive impact on membership, and am thankful for the time allotted for that discussion, and that under ACCSP's new management positive things will happen.

During this year's ranking of Fiscal Year '20 proposals, both Operations and Advisors were pretty much together in the rankings of maintenance, as well as new proposals. The one creating most discussion, due to its \$837,251.00 request, was Maine's managing 100 percent lobster harvesting reporting, which was ranked 4th or last by the Advisors.

We must also comment on how well Maine's representative had done in explaining why they needed that particular amount, what they can do with and without it. Voice recognition using dragon speech within dockside intercepted application DIA ranked third, use of geographic data in SAFIS data sources to evaluate an aggregate landing commercial fishing management program ranked second. SAFIS expansion of SAFMC Release, and North Carolina DMF, Catch-U-Later, discard reporting applications ranked first.

Eight of the nine maintenance proposals fell tightly ranked between the top of 8.25. Maintenance and coordination of fisheries data dependent feeds to ACCSP from the state of Rhode Island, down to the 8th one being 7.25, electronic reporting and biological characterization of New Jersey commercial fisheries. The 9th one, portside commercial catch sampling and comparative bycatch sampling for Atlantic herring, Atlantic mackerel, and Atlantic menhaden fisheries ranked last with a score of 4.38.

Both Operations and Advisors were in agreement regarding funding priorities, and the recommendations to the Coordinating Council. Throughout the year as Chair, I used radio time to update fishers on progress made in various aspects of fisheries management, including key Council decisions, advancement in electronic reporting, MRIP, APAIS, striped bass concerns, as well as other fisheries that are currently pressured. This time was used primarily to reach out to the recreational and for-hire sector, although commercial fisheries benefit as well.

Lastly, the Advisors held elections during their meeting at the Joint Session, with the result being Fran Karp of Rhode Island elected Chair, and Ellen Goethel of New Hampshire elected Vice-Chair. At this time I would like to extend congratulations and a hearty thank you for stepping up to the plate, and having my back

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the  
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.  
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

when needed. The Advisors will be in good hands with both of these hardworking and dedicated members. After serving three terms as Chair, it is well pass the time to pass the gavel. Next year at this time Fran will be seated here addressing you, until then here are a few words she asked to relate, since arranging for an open microphone would be logistically problematic. I think Julie might have those.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Are there any questions for Jerry? Oh, I'm sorry Julie.

MS. SIMPSON: These are words that were sent by Fran Karp, the ACCSP Advisor Chair Elect. Anyone following in the role of ACCSP Advisor Chair behind Jerry Morgan has some pretty big shoes to fill, and I am thankful to Jerry for all of his wisdom and encouragement through the years. I have been a recreational advisor with the ACCSP since 2012, and have had the pleasure of listening to an amazing group of thinkers from both the Advisors and Operations Committees.

The group is passionate and committed to the work they do for fisheries. The Advisory Committee's main objective this upcoming year is to increase partner participation for both the recreational and commercial seats. I hope to increase the number of dedicated individuals on the Committee and Subcommittees. We'll work hard to improve data collection and fisheries management through technological innovations and standards.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Fran for sharing your kind words and sharing your thoughts and prioritizing partner participation, in order to increase committee membership, and God speed through your journey as the next Advisors Chair. I would also like to thank everyone who afforded me the pleasure of serving as Chair for the past several years, and being there when needed.

MR. WHITE: Nicole, just a moment. I do want to recognize Jerry for all of his work. Thank you for being a fantastic Chair of the Advisors. I could always count on you to be at the Rec Tech meetings and other meetings, whether it was a webinar or in-person, and have thoughtful input.

You kept us going during the Ops Advisors meeting thinking of process and protocol and quorum, and pulling people in, and really highlighting the need for different approaches to get Advisors nominated, and to keep them engaged. Those were all excellent points, and we very much appreciate your service to ACCSP and contributions. (Applause)

### COMMITTEE UPDATES

MS. LENGYEL-COSTA: Okay so next I'm going to go through some Committee action items, and I will try to be brief, as there are many of them. For Bio and Bycatch, both Committees have a sampling inventory. Previously that inventory has always been housed in Excel, it makes it difficult for version control, making sure it's up to date, and also it's not readily accessible by the public. There has been an effort to incorporate that into the data warehouse application.

This is currently on hold due to resource constraints, and has been for a little while. Hopefully in the coming year we can start to work on that again. For the Biological Review Panel, there is a column in the Biological Matrix for resilience. The Committee has struggled over the years on defining resilience, whether it's qualitative or quantitative. An effort, large effort was conducted to define this in a quantitative way. Richard Cody previously from Florida had started this, and put quite a bit of work into it. Mike Errigo from the South Atlantic then picked it up, and ran through a few examples for the Committee.

Now we've broken up into small groups, and we're going one species at a time through the biological matrix, and filling out this resilience column, so it should be ready for the next round next year. Then for the Bycatch Committee, Heather Konell and Jacob Boyd are going to coordinate a meeting to discuss moving forward with using Citizen Science.

We did have a date scheduled for this, but it has to be rescheduled, so we're going to work with Julia Byrd, who is the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council's Citizen Science Program Manager to get that on the books. For Com Tech, Com Tech has had quite a few items, been very busy. A couple of items that they have completed, they had a webinar to review gear attributes, and get feedback on the new gear details in the warehouse.

They also approved the traceability API and the process for seafood traceability. In progress are two small groups to be formed, one for electronic monitoring, and setting the baseline data standards for that. Then the second one is on accountability. They've received nominations for both those groups, so those are both in progress.

Also for Com Tech, another small group to list out a potential species for future conversion factor projects. The top ten species of interest have been compiled, and so they're going to move forward with that. Two additional completed items are staff monitoring any development in aquaculture reporting, and also documenting the process for reporting known illegal catches and discards via SAFIS applications.

This is something that partners have been doing, but there was never a documented process, so now there is a document that lives on the ACCSP website for folks to look to. For the Information Systems Committee, the swipe card documentation was generalized and added to the ACCSP website, or is going to be.

They have recommitted to this task, so this is yet to be completed. For valid ports, the states and NOAA are going to work together to determine which ports should be viewable in each state. Recommendation has been sent to Com Tech on this, so this is done. The group is in progress of working with HMS to address how HMS sales are done on for-hire trips.

For Standard Codes, Standard Codes is continually processing code change update requests. If I bored you with the massive list of changes they have made, we would be here for a while. They continually work to update codes in the warehouse. For Rec Tech, they have tabled the item to develop e-logbook standards.

In progress they're summarizing issues and possible approaches to improve PSEs, also in progress updating the comprehensive for-hire document with feedback received from the Committee. Also in progress, ACCSP staff and committee will refine the methodology for APAIS as validation, prior to submission for peer review. This will come up in the For-Hire Data Validation Workshop. With that we can take any questions on committee action items.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Okay thank you, Nicole. Are there any questions? All right Geoff, take us home.

MR. WHITE: All right thank you for your patience. I know we've kind of been throwing a bunch of things at you. The last couple of slides here are about the recreational program. I'll talk a little bit on this slide, and just let you know that things are coming and then get to the actual agenda items, so that we can get on to the reception.

The Rec Tech Committee has not met in a while. One of our things for this year is to revitalize the Rec Tech Committee. We've been down basically one and a half staff members on the four person Rec team since January 1. We were able to bring a new person in mid-August, and

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the  
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.  
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

getting back on track with that. As I mentioned earlier, we're looking to refill my old slot.

The activities for Rec Tech next year are really to continue working on a comprehensive for-hire data collection plan. This whole point about using APAIS as validation and working forwards towards MRIP certification, means that MRIP is really looking to the Atlantic states to figure out what is it that we want to propose, how is it going to work, and how can they evaluate that for certification?

We've got some homework to do before we submit that to them for certification, but bringing the Rec Tech Committee back into higher activity levels will be a good thing to move that way. Along those same lines, with the initiatives of SEFHIER and implementation of the South Atlantic and Gulf this year, is really kind of calling, MRIP has requested that all of the regions. But our Recreational Implementation Plan was developed in 2016 and approved in 2017, so they're looking for a revision of that in the next year.

#### **THE FOR-HIRE WORKSHOP SUMMARY**

MR. WHITE: That is on our list. The For-Hire Workshop Summary, if we can go to the next slide. This is a workshop that's purpose was really to evaluate minimum requirements and implementation challenge for the future comprehensive for-hire data collection program, spurred on by a bunch of new logbook programs, and the need for data validation, estimation, and kind of standardized procedures.

This workshop was very well attended, we had over 50 people from all over the country, fisheries survey design, data collection, estimation, consultants et cetera. We did meet in July, and we're still drafting that report for Steering Committee review. But the plan is to get that done, the Steering Committee approve it, and get that out before the end of the year.

In terms of what the workshop overall talked about, and some of their results. The terms of reference were really to characterize methods of current for-hire data collection. The second one was recommend issues to be addressed in a separate for-hire telephone survey peer review. That survey component is not yet certified, and MRIP is looking forward to taking that to peer review. Those two items we got a lot of information and clarity on, and that was fantastic. The last two items of recommending minimum required elements, and providing direction on catch estimation approaches are areas that probably need a little bit more work, but we recognize the need for some national sideboards on what the design elements could and should be with regional flexibility, and the group did support a blend of federal logbooks and state water effort survey methods, along with some sort of validation.

That in itself was a good process that was going forward. The statisticians were able to comment on the math. Having these different data collection pieces is wonderful, but it only really fits into what the MRIP estimation process is if you have the math right, of which vessels are in which frame, how does the data code go together, and can you add the pieces of a logbook and a state vessel together at the end of the day?

If you've got two vessels that are in the same marina but different slips, one fills out a federal logbook the other one does the traditional FHTS Effort Survey and they both get intercepted by the dockside survey. At the end of the year can you come up with believable statistics on how each group of those gets expanded?

That math hasn't been worked out, but the statisticians told us that there are a lot of viable options, depending on the reporting compliance rate, the validation surveys, and if the matching methods are high enough. Even this ties back to that whole Universal Trip ID trip

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the  
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.  
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

matching piece, and how those data collection systems work.

The next graphic is one you saw before, it's basically the idea of along the top is if you have a logbook frame in kind of the blue on the water piece, and top left and the some sort of onshore validation on the land on the green on the right. Those get combined into the orange box on top for kind of the logbook vessel estimate.

If you take the path along the bottom that's an effort survey on the bottom left, the same kind of survey catch frame. That makes the small orange box in the middle, and if it all works out right then those two are additive, and make the larger box which is comprehensive for-hire catch and effort statistics.

That is the goal, and the next slide is just recognition of a process that MRIP has been putting forth in many different venues for a long time, and that is that the process includes first completing the design and MRIP certification of the methodology, to use the logbooks with a catch survey where possible, to allow effort survey methods where logbooks are not practicable, and to develop an appropriate calculation approach for the combined estimates.

Once that piece is done, which is big, then there would need a bench marking period for the new method and a calibration to the historical data. This is going to be a long term process, but it's one that we're invested in, and from working and speaking with MRIP they're certainly open to options and hearing from us on approaches to go.

In the meantime there are surveys that need to be done this year and next year, maintaining the current methodologies.

## **FOR-HIRE TELEPHONE SURVEY STATE CONDUCT**

MR. WHITE: Good news on the For-hire Telephone Survey State Conduct. We have agreement from MRIP to move forward. We have approved budgets, and we are now drafting the new state agreements that will begin in January of 2020. We have been doing this data collection with functional software in three states for all of 2019, Maine, North Carolina, and Georgia, and we've been meeting our data delivery timelines for that survey so far. That sets the stage for next year, and we have a thumbs-up, so at this point to move forward with a for-hire telephone survey, large pelagic telephone survey via state conduct. That is in the budgets that your staff all helped prepare, and we're excited to move forward with that.

The other ongoing data collection, and we are getting close to the end, is an update on APAIS State Conduct. Again, the overall intercepts have gone up 25 percent since you all became more fully involved in this process, and the responsible party for the field data collection since 2016. That is about a 3 percent increase from last year, while we moved to the tablet data collection, and that shows stable or increasing interview rates, low edit rates, a good data review, and once again we're delivering data to NOAA five days earlier each month.

Those five days are critical for their processing and internal data review before releasing it 45 days after the end of the wave. Those are all pretty successful stories about our interaction and the partner approach to doing this. It does support one of the MRIP electronic reporting roadmap goals, which is getting field staff to use electronic tools.

They have other approaches that are in the pipeline. Again, just to highlight Julie's point on the tables and the FIS up where we are sharing

it as developed and that all the cost will not be re-incurred down there for them to use the dockside tablet application. Again, just to be fun and end with a graph.

The big picture here is the green bars are 2018, the blue bars are 2019. Each state is represented, but overall productivity, meaning interviews per assignment has gone up from 8.7 to 9.3. In most cases it's gone up a bit. There was a lot of concern before we put tablets in the field that oh the tablets are going to slow us down, we're not going to get as many interviews, we're not going to be able to get this done. We might drop them in the water.

We only had two or three tablets out of 160 that were broken this year, and then we had enough reserves in place that it didn't affect data collection. There were more errors with scheduling mistakes than there were with tablets malfunctioning. The big picture here is a lot of improvements in all of the states.

The next slide is another way to measure productivity, and it's the eligible angler percentage interviewed by year. The good news here is that between 2018 and 2019 that hovered right around 60 percent. This is a little bit more fair measure. Sometimes you have a bad weather day; there is nobody at the site. But this is how well are the staff doing, and are the tablet tools, data collection tools doing to capture the activity of those who are on site when you're there.

In general, 60 percent of the people that finish a fishing trip during an APAIS assignment are completing an interview. In most cases it's kind of even or up from last year, and there are a few cases where it's gone down from last year. We're not entirely sure which factors have contributed to that. It might be staff turnover and training. It might be pulses in overall fishing levels. It might just be comfort with the technology. It's kind of hard to say. Again, it's a good thing that we're getting that level of

interaction and participation with the fishermen, and that's really a blessing of your staff and how they are able to work with your anglers. With that are there questions on the recreational updates and components? Seeing none, thank you for your patience, I hope this was helpful. I want to invite anybody interested to give kind of the reporting tools and the APAIS tablet a test drive. We will have a laptop and a tablet out at the ACCSP table all day tomorrow and probably tonight if you need it. But I appreciate the time and the attention today.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: You guys have just so much going on, and we really appreciate your efforts, and with that do I have any objection to a motion to adjourn? It looks like I don't. Consider us adjourned. Thank you everyone!

(Whereupon the meeting adjourned at  
5:30 p.m. on October 28, 2019)

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the  
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council.  
The Council will review the minutes during its next meeting.

[View this email in your browser](#)



## April 2020 Committee Newsletter

This newsletter is intended to keep all committee members aware of the activities and accomplishments of ACCSP committees and staff. These updates will be monthly to ensure timely communication and keep each issue brief but informative. ACCSP staff welcomes feedback on all content.

---

---

---

## Upcoming Events

- **April 15th 10AM-12PM:** Operations and Advisory Committee Webinar
- **May 5th 1PM:** Coordinating Council Webinar
- **Early May:** ACCSP 2021 RFP release

### Coordinating Council Committee

- Next Meeting May 5th, 1PM.
  - Consider approval of 2021 ACCSP RFP
  - Discuss MRIP State Partnership
- 2017 Governance Transition Survey is currently open for Coordinating Council and Operations Committee members. The results will be shared later this year.
- Monthly status calls with the Chair, Vice Chair, staff to increase awareness and coordination have proven beneficial to program administration.

### Operations Committee

- Next meeting April 15th, 10AM – noon (with Advisory Committee)
    - Agenda, materials, and webinar information can be found [here](#).
    - Review 2020 ACCSP RFP
    - Program Updates
-



---

## Advisory Committee

- Next meeting April 15th, 10AM – noon (with Operations Committee)
  - Agenda, materials, and webinar information can be found [here](#).
  - Review 2020 ACCSP RFP
  - Program Updates
- New advisors wanted! Our list of [current advisors](#) is small. Here is more information on [being an Advisor](#).

## Biological Review Panel Committee

- The committee has been working diligently for a couple of years to improve the biological matrix by standardizing the resilience factor scores. A small group will finalize this process in 2020.
- Biological Matrix will be completed during the 2021 in-person annual meeting.

## Bycatch Prioritization Committee

- During the 202 annual meeting the committee discussed the potential availability of funds for bycatch projects in FY2021. Information on ACCSP funding can be found [here](#).
- Bycatch Prioritization Matrix will be completed during the 2021 in-person annual meeting.

## Commercial Technical Committee

- An electronic monitoring working group is forming to address the standardization of EM data. This group will include Commercial Technical and Recreational Technical committee members.
  - The committee is coordinating with the NOAA Office of Aquaculture on the future comprehensive collection of Atlantic marine aquaculture harvest data via SAFIS and Data Warehouse.
-

---

## Informational Systems Committee

- Mid-April 2020: Partner testing of switchboard available. The switchboard will significantly increase application flexibility by offering partner control of gear and species specific attributes.
- June 2020: Southeast For-Hire Integrated Electronic Reporting (SEFHIER) fishermen to start testing eTRIPS/mobile v2.

## Recreational Technical Committee

- The committee will have a preliminary 2020 call to review and determine priorities and directions, discuss new items, and schedule future meetings.
  - 2020 projects include:
    - Continue development of for-hire comprehensive data collection plan to submit for certification.
    - 2020 update of the 2016 Atlantic Recreational Implementation Plan.
-

---

## Standard Codes Committee

---

### New Grade Code

GRADE_CODE	88
GRADE_DESC	VISCERA (BIVALVE)
GRADE_LONG_DESC	“Internal organs of a bivalve, excluding the adducto muscle.”

### Updated Gear Names

GEAR_CODE	OLD_GEAR_NAME	NEW_GEAR_NAME
208	“GILL NETS, SMALL MESH”	“GILL NETS, DRIFT, SMALL MESH”
209	“GILL NETS, LARGE MESH”	“GILL NETS, DRIFT, LARGE MESH”

---

---

## Highlights

### Message from NOAA Aquaculture Program to seafood dealers!

- USDA typically procures food through entitlement purchases and through Section 32 purchases. The former are yearly orders from a set menu of items available and typically go to schools and similar institutions, while the latter are one-off purchases done in response to market evaluations and requests from industry.
  - The list of seafood items USDA can currently purchase is found here: <https://www.ams.usda.gov/selling-food/product-specs#Fish>, you will notice that no shellfish species or product forms are on the list. If the growers would like to add items to the list, **USDA should be notified ASAP**. To do this, email Carl Schroeder ([carl.schroeder@usda.gov](mailto:carl.schroeder@usda.gov)) with Steve Wilson ([steven.wilson@noaa.gov](mailto:steven.wilson@noaa.gov)) at NOAA. To purchase any item, USDA must have a specification for it. Developing a specification or an item is not a guarantee that they will purchase it, but it is needed should they determine to do so.
  - Another key item is that AMS only purchases from qualified bidders. Details for how to become a qualified bidder are here: <https://www.ams.usda.gov/selling-food>. They include both financial and technical requirements. If a particular vendor needs help navigating the process, NOAA and USDA can assist.
-

Editor: Marisa Powell

Please contact us if you have any questions or feedback at [info@accsp.org](mailto:info@accsp.org)



---

Copyright © 2020 ACCSP. All rights reserved.

You are receiving this email because you opted in via our website.

Our mailing address is:

ACCSP

1050 N Highland St, Ste 200A-N

Arlington, VA 22201-2196

[Add us to your address book](#)

Want to change how you receive these emails?

You can [update your preferences](#) or [unsubscribe from this list](#).



# ACCSP FY21 RFP Summary of Changes

## 1. RFP

### 1.1. General Changes

- 1.1.1. Updated dates appropriately
- 1.1.2. Updated references to Director and Deputy Director
- 1.1.3. Removed language referring to year 5 step-downs

### 1.2. Added reference to new Socioeconomic Priority Data Elements (**PAGE 1**) - updated appropriate appendices and reference numbers throughout

### 1.3. Language on 75/25 split added by Funding Subcommittee (**PAGE 2**)

- 1.3.1. Red text is new
- 1.3.2. Submissions will be reviewed in accordance with the FDD (Attachment I), ranking criteria (Attachment VI), and funding allocation. Current funding allocation guidelines are 75% for maintenance projects and 25% for new projects within the Program priorities. **If either allocation is not fully utilized, remaining funds will be available to approved projects in the other category. For example, if maintenance projects only use 67% of the total available funds, the remaining balance would be added to the 25% new project allocation to fund new projects as approved by the Coordinating Council.**

## 2. Funding Decision Document

### 2.1. General changes

- 2.1.1. Deputy Director role added as responsible RFP party
- 2.1.2. All dates have been updated

### 2.2. Develop Annual Funding Priorities, Criteria and Allocation Targets (maintenance vs. new projects) (**PAGE 2**)

- 2.2.1. Updated first sub-bullet tense and text changes to reflect that FY21 is entering year 6 of funding on some maintenance funding
- 2.2.2. Updated second sub-bullet to reflect decision of Funding Subcommittee to calculate the base funding as the average funding received during the project's **four years as a maintenance** project. Previously this was two years as a new project.

### 2.3. Determination of contingencies for funding adjustments (**PAGE 4**)

- 2.3.1. Moved from its own section to number 7 of detailed steps because it is becoming a more regular part of the process
- 2.3.2. Minor language changes to reflect that the adjustments have an equal likelihood of being an increase as a decrease

### 2.4. General Proposal Guidelines Bullet 3 (**PAGE 6**)

- 2.4.1. Suggestions proposed from Holly McBride and Rob Watts
- 2.4.2. Language adjustment to reflect the need for level of staff being an important component of proposal.

2.4.3. Recommendations do include feedback from staff to Operations, which is not reflected in current language.

2.5. Appendix A (**PAGE 15**)

2.5.1. Un-bolded year 5 and highlighted year 6 to emphasize

2.5.2. Adjusted language to note that table referred to year 6 FY21 projects

### **3. Biological Priority Matrix – No Changes**

### **4. Bycatch Priority Matrix – No Changes**

### **5. Recreational Technical Committee Priorities – No Changes**

### **6. Socioeconomic Priority Data Elements**

6.1. NEW! In FY21

6.2. Submitted by the ASMFC CESS

### **7. Timeline for Proposal Review**

7.1. Dates are updated

7.2. Overall timeline remains relatively the same

### **8. Ranking Criteria Document – No Changes**



## Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program

1050 N. Highland Street, Suite 200A-N | Arlington, VA 22201  
703.842.0780 | 703.842.0779 (fax) | [www.accsp.org](http://www.accsp.org)

**TO:** ACCSP Coordinating Council and All ACCSP Committees

**FROM:** Geoff White, ACCSP Director

**SUBJECT:** ACCSP Request for 2021 Proposals

The Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program (Program or ACCSP) is issuing a Request for Proposals (RFP) to Program Partners and Committees for FY21 funding.

ACCSP's [Funding Decision Document](#) (FDD) provides an overview of the funding decision process, guidance for preparing and submitting proposals, and information on funding recipients' post-award responsibilities. Projects in areas not specifically addressed in the FDD may still be considered for funding if they help achieve Program goals. These goals, listed by priority, are improvements in:

- 1a. Catch, effort, and landings data (including licensing, permit and vessel registration data);
- 1b. Biological data (equal to 1a.);
2. Releases, discards and protected species data; and,
3. Economic and sociological data.

Project activities that will be considered according to priority may include:

- Partner implementation of data collection programs;
- Continuation of current Program-funded partner programs;
- Funding for personnel required to implement Program related projects/proposals; and
- Data management system upgrades or establishment of partner data feeds to the Data Warehouse and/or Standard Atlantic Fisheries Information System.

Proposals for biological sampling should target priority species in the top quartile (Attachment II) of the Biological Priority Matrix. Proposals for observer coverage should align with fisheries affecting the top quartile priority species (Attachment III) of the Bycatch Priority Matrix. Brief descriptions of the current levels of biological or bycatch sampling by any of the Partners would be helpful to the review process. Projects for recreational catch and effort data should target the priorities set by the Recreational Technical Committee (Attachment IV). Projects involving socioeconomic data should reference the Socioeconomic Priority Data Elements (Attachment V).

Proposals to continue Program-funded partner projects ("maintenance proposals") may not contain significant changes in scope (for example the addition of bycatch data collection to a dealer reporting project), and must include in the cover letter whether there are any changes in the current proposal from prior years' and, if so, provide a brief summary of those changes.

*Our vision is to produce dependable and timely marine fishery statistics for Atlantic coast fisheries that are collected, processed, and disseminated according to common standards agreed upon by all program partners.*



Additionally, in FY16 a long-term funding strategy policy was instituted to limit the duration of maintenance projects. Maintenance projects are now subject to a funding reduction following their fourth year of maintenance funding. For maintenance projects entering year 5, a 33 percent funding cut (up to 33 percent for multi-agency proposals) will be applied to the average annual sum received during the project's four years of full maintenance funding. In year 6, a further 33 percent cut will be applied and funding will cease in year 7. See Appendix A of the FDD for a list of those maintenance projects entering step down years and the maximum funding available to them.

All project submissions must comply with the Program Standards found [here](#). Please consider using [this successful project proposal](#) as a template. Overhead rates may not exceed 25% of total costs unless mandated by law or policy. Items included within overhead should not also be listed as in-kind match.

Submissions will be reviewed in accordance with the FDD (Attachment I), ranking criteria (Attachment VII), and funding allocation. Current funding allocation guidelines are 75% for maintenance projects and 25% for new projects within the Program priorities. If either allocation is not fully utilized, remaining funds will be available to approved projects in the other category. For example, if maintenance projects only use 67% of the total available funds, the remaining balance would be added to the 25% new project allocation to fund new projects as approved by the Coordinating Council.

Attachment VI provides a timeline for the FY21 funding process. The final decision on proposals to be funded for FY21 will be made in October 2020. Project awards will be subject to funding availability and, if there is a funding shortfall, awards may be adjusted in accordance with the FDD. Successful applicants will be notified when funding becomes available.

Project Investigators will be required to report progress directly to the Program's Operations and Advisory Committees in addition to meeting the standard Federal reporting requirements.

Please submit initial proposals as Microsoft Word and Excel files no later than **June 15, 2020** by email to Julie Defilippi Simpson, ACCSP Deputy Director [julie.simpson@accsp.org](mailto:julie.simpson@accsp.org). If you have any questions about the funding decision process, please contact your agency's Operations Committee member (<http://www.accsp.org/committees>) or ACCSP staff (703-842-0780).

## RELEVANT ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT I	FY2021 Funding Decision Document
ATTACHMENT II	FY2021 Biological Priority Matrix
ATTACHMENT III	FY2021 Bycatch Priority Matrix
ATTACHMENT IV	FY2021 Recreational Technical Committee Priorities
ATTACHMENT V	FY2021 Socioeconomic Priority Data Elements
ATTACHMENT VI	FY2021 Timeline for Proposal Review
ATTACHMENT VII	FY2021 Ranking Criteria Document

**Funding Decision Process**  
**Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program**  
*May 2020*

The Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program (the Program) is a state-federal cooperative initiative to improve recreational and commercial fisheries data collection and data management activities on the Atlantic coast. The program supports further innovation in fisheries-dependent data collection and management technology through its annual funding process.

Each year, ACCSP issues a Request for Proposals (RFP) to its Program Partners. The ACCSP Operations and Advisory Committees review submitted project proposals and make funding recommendations to the Deputy Director and the Coordinating Council.

This document provides an overview of the funding decision process, guidance for preparing and submitting proposals, and information on funding recipients' post-award responsibilities, including providing reports on project progress.

---

## **Overview of the Funding Decision Process**

- [Funding Decision Process Timeline](#)
- [Detailed Steps](#)

### **Funding Decision Process Timeline**

April- Operations and Advisory Committees develop annual funding priorities, criteria and allocation targets (maintenance vs. new projects)

May- Coordinating Council issues Request for Proposals (RFP)

June- Partners submit proposals

July- Operations and Advisory Committees review initial proposals; ACCSP staff provide initial review results to submitting Partner

August- Final proposals are submitted. Final proposals must be submitted electronically to the Deputy Director, and/or designee by close of business on the day of the specified deadline. Final proposals received after the RFP deadline will not be considered for funding.

September- Operations and Advisory Committees review and rank final proposals

October- Funding recommendations presented to Coordinating Council; Coordinating Council makes final funding decision

ACCSP Staff submits notification to submitting Partner of funded projects and notification of approved projects to appropriate grant funding agency (e.g. NOAA Fisheries Regional Grants Program Office, “NOAA Grants”) by Partner

As Needed- Operation and/or Leadership Team and Coordinating Council review and make final decision with contingencies (e.g. scope of work, rescissions, no-cost extensions, returned unused funds, etc.)

## Detailed Steps of Funding Decision Process

### 1. Develop Annual Funding Priorities, Criteria and Allocation Targets (maintenance vs. new projects).

Prior to issuing the Request for Proposals, the Coordinating Council will approve the annual funding criteria and allocation targets. These will be used to rank projects and allocate funding between maintenance and new projects respectively.

In FY16, a long-term funding strategy policy was instituted to limit the duration of maintenance projects. Maintenance projects are now subject to a funding reduction following their fourth year of maintenance funding.

- For maintenance projects entering year 5 of ACCSP funding in FY20, a 33 percent funding cut was applied to whichever sum was larger: the project’s prior two-year-average base funding set in FY16, or the average annual sum received during the project’s four years of full *maintenance* funding. In year 6, a further 33 percent cut will be applied and funding will cease in year 7. Please see Appendix A for a list of maintenance projects entering year 6 in FY20 and the maximum funds available for these projects.
- For more recent maintenance projects (i.e., those entering year 5 of maintenance funding after FY20), the base funding will be calculated as the average of funding received during the project’s four years as a *maintenance* project. These projects will receive a 33 percent cut in year 5, a further 33 percent cut in year 6, and funding will cease in year 7.

### 2. Issue Request for Proposals

An RFP will be sent to all Program Partners and Committees no later than the week after the spring Coordinating Council meeting. The RFP will include the ranking criteria, allocation targets approved by the Coordinating Council, and general Program priorities taken from Goal 3 of the current ASMFC Five-Year Strategic Plan. The RFP and related documents will also be posted on the Program’s website [here](#).

All proposals MUST be submitted either by a Program Partner, jointly by several Program Partners, or through a Program Committee. The public has the ability to work with a Program

Partner to develop and submit a proposal. Principle investigators are strongly encouraged to work with their Operations Committee member in the development of any proposal. All proposals must be submitted electronically to the Deputy Director, and/or designee, in the standard format.

### 3. Review initial proposals

Proposals will be reviewed by staff and the Operations and Advisory Committees. Committee members are encouraged to coordinate with their offices and/or constituents to provide input to the review process. Operations Committee members are also encouraged to work with staff in their offices who have submitted a proposal in order to represent the proposal during the review. Project PIs will be invited to attend the initial proposal review, held in July. The review and evaluation of all written proposals will take into consideration the ranking criteria, funding allocation targets and the overall Program Priorities as specified in the RFP. Proposals may be forwarded to relevant Program technical committees for further review of the technical feasibility and statistical validity. Proposals that fail to meet the ACCSP standards may be recommended for changes or rejected.

### 4. Provide initial review results to submitting Partner

Program staff will notify the submitting Partner of suggested changes, requested responses, or questions arising from the review. The submitting Partner will be given an opportunity to submit a final proposal incorporating suggested changes in the same format previously described in Step 2(b) by the final RFP deadline.

### 5. Review and rank final proposals

The review and ranking of all proposals will take into consideration the ranking criteria, funding allocation targets, and overall Program Priorities as specified in the RFP. The Deputy Director and the Advisory and Operations Committees will develop a list of prioritized recommended proposals and forward them for discussion, review, and approval by the Coordinating Council.

### 6. Proposal approval by the Coordinating Council

The Coordinating Council will review a summary of all submitted proposals and prioritized recommended proposals from the Operations and Advisory Committees. Each representative on the Coordinating Council will have one vote during final prioritization of project proposals. Projects to be funded by the Program will be approved by the Coordinating Council by the end of November each year. The Deputy Director will submit a pre-notification to the appropriate NOAA Grants office of the prioritized proposals to expedite processing when those offices receive Partner grant submissions.

### 7. Confirmation of final funding amounts

The Director and Deputy Director will be notified by NOAA Fisheries of any federal grant adjustments (e.g. additions or rescissions). Additional funds will generally go to the next available ranked project. Reductions may include, but are not limited to:

- Lower than anticipated amounts from any source of funding

- Rescission of funding after initial allocations have been made
- Partial or complete withdrawal of funds from any source

If these or other situations arise, the Operations Committee will notify Partners with approved proposals to reduce their requested budgets or to withdraw a proposal entirely. If this does not reduce the overall requested amount sufficiently, the Director, Deputy Director, the Operations Committee Chair and Vice-Chair, and the Advisory Committee Chair will develop a final recommendation and forward to the ACCSP Leadership Team of the Coordinating Council.

These options to address funding contingencies may include:

- Eliminating the lowest-ranked proposal(s)
- A fixed percentage cut to all proposals' budgets
- A directed reduction in a specific proposal(s)

8. Notification to submitting Partner of funded projects and submittal of project documents to appropriate grants agency (e.g. NOAA Grants) by Partner.

Notification detailing the Coordinating Council's actions relevant to a Partner's proposal will be sent to each Partner by Program staff.

- Approved projects from Non-federal Partners must be submitted as full applications (federal forms, project and budget narratives, and other attachments) to NOAA Grants via [www.grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov). These documents must reflect changes or conditions approved by the Coordinating Council.
- Non-federal Partners must provide the Deputy Director with an electronic copy of the narrative and either an electronic or hard copy of the budget of the grant application as submitted to the grants agency (e.g. NOAA Grants).
- Federal Partners do not submit applications to NOAA Grants.

9. Operation and/or Leadership Team and Coordinating Council review and final decision with contingencies or emergencies.

Committee(s) review and decide project changes (e.g. scope of work, rescissions, no-cost extensions, returned unused funds, etc.) during the award period.

---

## Proposal Guidance

- [General Proposal Guidelines](#)
- [Format](#)
- [Budget Template](#)

### General Proposal Guidelines

- The Program is predicated upon the most efficient use of available funds. Many jurisdictions have data collection and data management programs which are administered by other fishery management agencies. Detail coordination efforts your agency/Committee has undertaken to demonstrate cost-efficiency and non-duplication of effort.
- All Program Partners conducting projects for implementation of the program standards in their jurisdictions are required to submit data to the Program in prescribed standards, where the module is developed and formats are available. Detail coordination efforts with Program data management staff with projects of a research and/or pilot study nature to submit project information and data for distribution to all Program Partners and archives.
- If appropriate to your project, please detail your agency's data management capability. Include the level of staff support (if any) required to accomplish the proposed work. If contractor services are required, detail the level and costs.
- Before funding will be considered beyond year one of a project, the Partner agency shall detail in writing how the Partner agency plans to assume partial or complete funding or, if not feasible, explain why.
- If appropriate to your project, detail any planned or ongoing outreach initiatives. Provide scope and level of outreach coordinated with either the Program Assistant and/or Deputy Director.
- Proposals including a collection of aging or other biological samples must clarify Partner processing capabilities (i.e., how processed and by whom).
- Provide details on how the proposal will benefit the Program as a whole, outside of benefits to the Partner or Committee.
- Proposals that request funds for law enforcement should confirm that all funds will be allocated towards reporting compliance.
- Proposals must detail any in-kind effort/resources, and if no in-kind resources are included, state why.

- Proposals must meet the same quality as would be appropriate for a grant proposal for ACFCMA or other federal grant.
- Assistance is available from Program staff, or an Operations Committee member for proposal preparation and to insure that Program standards are addressed in the body of a given proposal.
- Even though a large portion of available resources may be allocated to one or more jurisdictions, new systems (including prototypes) will be selected to serve all Partners' needs.
- Partners submitting pilot or other short-term programs are encouraged to lease large capital budget items (vehicles, etc.) and where possible, hire consultants or contractors rather than hire new permanent personnel.
- The Program will not fund proposals that do not meet Program standards. However, in the absence of approved standards, pilot studies may be funded.
- Proposals will be considered for modules that may be fully developed but have not been through the formal approval process. Pilot proposals will be considered in those cases.
- The Operations Committee may contact Partners concerning discrepancies or inconsistencies in any proposal and may recommend modifications to proposals subject to acceptance by the submitting Partner and approval by the Coordinating Council. The Operations Committee may recommend changes or conditions to proposals. The Coordinating Council may conditionally approve proposals. These contingencies will be documented and forwarded to the submitting Partner in writing by Program staff.
- Any proposal submitted after the initial RFP deadline will not be considered, in addition to any proposal submitted by a Partner which is not current with all reporting obligations.

## Proposal Format

Applicant Name: Identify the name of the applicant organization(s).

Project Title: A brief statement to identify the project.

Project Type: Identify whether new or maintenance project.

*New Project – Partner project never funded by the Program. New projects may not exceed a duration of one year.*

*Maintenance Project – Project funded by the Program that conducts the same scope of work as a previously funded new or maintenance project. These proposals may not contain significant changes in scope (e.g., the addition of bycatch data collection to a catch/effort dealer reporting project). Pls must include in the cover letter whether there are any changes in the current proposal from prior years' and, if so, provide a brief summary of those changes. At year 5 of maintenance funding, a project's base funding will be calculated as the average of funding received during the project's four years as a maintenance project.*

Requested Award Amount: Provide the total requested amount of proposal. Do not include an estimate of the NOAA grant administration fee.

Requested Award Period: Provide the total time period of the proposed project. The award period typically will be limited to one-year projects.

Objective: Specify succinctly the “why”, “what”, and “when” of the project.

Need: Specify the need for the project and the association to the Program.

Results and Benefits: Identify and document the results or benefits to be expected from the proposed project. Clearly indicate how the proposed work meets various elements outlined in the ACCSP Proposal Ranking Criteria Document (Appendix B). Some potential benefits may include: fundamental in nature to all fisheries; region-wide in scope; answering or addressing region-wide questions or policy issues; required by MSFCMA, ACFCMA, MMPA, ESA, or other acts; transferability; and/or demonstrate a practical application to the Program.

Data Delivery Plan: Include coordinated method of the data delivery plan to the Program in addition to module data elements gathered. The data delivery plan should include the frequency of data delivery (i.e. monthly, semi-annual, annual) and any coordinate delivery to other relevant partners.

Approach: List all procedures necessary to attain each project objective. If a project includes work in more than one module, identify approximately what proportion of effort is comprised within each module (e.g., catch and effort 45%, biological 30% and bycatch 25%).



**Geographic Location:** The location where the project will be administered and where the scope of the project will be conducted.

**Milestone Schedule:** An activity schedule in table format for the duration of the project, starting with Month 1 and ending with a three-month report writing period.

**Project Accomplishments Measurement:** A table showing the project goals and how progress towards those goals will be measured. In some situations the metrics will be numerical such as numbers of anglers contacted, fish measured, and/or otoliths collected, etc.; while in other cases the metrics will be binary such as software tested and software completed. Additional details such as intermediate metrics to achieve overall proposed goals should be included especially if the project seeks additional years of funding.

**Cost Summary (Budget):** Detail all costs to be incurred in this project in the format outlined in the budget guidance and template at the end of this document. A budget narrative should be included which explains and justifies the expenditures in each category. Provide cost projections for federal and total costs. Provide details on Partner/in-kind contribution (e.g., staff time, facilities, IT support, overhead, etc.). Details should be provided on start-up versus long-term operational costs.

**In-kind** - <sup>1</sup>Defined as activities that could exist (or could happen) without the grant. <sup>2</sup>In-kind contributions are from the grantee organization. In-kind is typically in the form of the value of personnel, equipment and services, including direct and indirect costs.

<sup>1</sup>The following are generally accepted as in-kind contributions:

- i. Personnel time given to the project including state and federal employees
- ii. Use of existing state and federal equipment (e.g. data collection and server platforms, Aging equipment, microscopes, boats, vehicles)

Overhead rates may not exceed 25% of total costs unless mandated by law or policy. Program Partners may not be able to control overhead/indirect amounts charged. However, where there is flexibility, the lowest amount of overhead should be charged. When this is accomplished indicate on the 'cost summary' sheet the difference between the overhead that could have been charged and the actual amount charged, if different. If overhead is charged to the Program, it cannot also be listed as in-kind.

**Maintenance Projects:** Maintenance proposals must provide project history table, description of completed data delivery to the ACCSP and other relevant partners, table of total project cost by year, a summary table of metrics and achieved goals, and the budget narrative from the most recent year's funded proposal.

**Principal Investigator:** List the principal investigator(s) and attach curriculum vitae (CV) for each. Limit each CV to two pages. Additional information may be requested.

## **Budget Guidelines & Template**

All applications must have a detailed budget narrative explaining and justifying the expenditures by object class. Include in the discussion the requested dollar amounts and how they were derived. A spreadsheet or table detailing expenditures is useful to clarify the costs (see template below). The following are highlights from the NOAA Budget Guidelines document to help Partners formulate their budget narrative. The full Budget Guidelines document is available [here](#).

Object Classes:

Personnel: include salary, wage, and hours committed to project for each person by job title. Identify each individual by name and position, if possible.

Fringe Benefits: should be identified for each individual. Describe in detail if the rate is greater than 35 % of the associated salary.

Travel: all travel costs must be listed here. Provide a detailed breakdown of travel costs for trips over \$5,000 or 5 % of the award. Include destination, duration, type of transportation, estimated cost, number of travelers, lodging, mileage rate and estimated number of miles, and per diem.

Equipment: equipment is any single piece of non-expendable, tangible personal property that costs \$5,000 or more per unit and has a useful life of more than one year. List each piece of equipment, the unit cost, number of units, and its purpose. Include a lease vs. purchase cost analysis. If there are no lease options available, then state that.

Supplies: purchases less than \$5,000 per item are considered by the federal government as supplies. Include a detailed, itemized explanation for total supplies costs over \$5,000 or 5% of the award.

Contractual: list each contract or subgrant as a separate item. Provide a detailed cost breakdown and describe products/services to be provided by the contractor. Include a sole source justification, if applicable.

Other: list items, cost, and justification for each expense.

Total direct charges

Indirect charges: If claiming indirect costs, please submit a copy of the current approved negotiated indirect cost agreement. If expired and/or under review, a copy of the transmittal letter that accompanied the indirect cost agreement application is requested.

Totals of direct and indirect charges

Example. Budget narrative should provide further detail on these costs.

Description	Calculation	Cost
<b>Personnel (a)</b>		
Supervisor	Ex: 500 hrs x \$20/hr	\$10,000
Biologist		
Technician		
<b>Fringe (b)</b>		
Supervisor	Ex: 15% of salary	\$1500
Biologist		
Technician		
<b>Travel (c)</b>		
Mileage for sampling trips	Ex: Estimate 2000 miles x \$0.33/mile	\$660
Travel for meeting		
<b>Equipment (d)</b>		
Boat	Ex: \$7000, based on current market research	\$7000
<b>Supplies (e)</b>		
Safety supplies		\$1200
Sampling supplies		\$1000
Laptop computers	2 laptops @\$1500 each	\$3000
Software		\$500
<b>Contractual (f)</b>		
Data Entry Contract	Ex: 1000 hrs x \$20/hr	\$20,000
<b>Other (h)</b>		
Printing and binding		
Postage		
Telecommunications charges		
Internet Access charges		
<b>Totals</b>		
Total Direct Charges (i)		
Indirect Charges (j)		
Total (sum of Direct and Indirect) (k)		

## **Post-award Responsibilities**

- [Changing the Scope of Work](#)
- [Requesting a No-cost Extension](#)
- [Declaring Unused/Returned Funds](#)
- [Reporting Requirements](#)
- [Report Format](#)
- [Programmatic Review](#)

### **Changing the Scope of Work**

Partners shall submit requests for amendments to approved projects in writing to the Deputy Director. The Coordinating Council member for that Partner must sign the request.

When Partners request an amendment to an approved project, the Deputy Director will contact the Chair and Vice Chair of the Operations Committee. The Deputy Director and Operations Committee Chairs will determine if the requested change is minor or substantial. The Chairs and Deputy Director may approve minor changes.

For substantial proposed changes, a decision document including the opinions of the Chairs and the Deputy Director will be sent to the Operations Committee and the ACCSP Leadership Team of the Coordinating Council for review.

The ACCSP Leadership Team will decide to approve or reject the request for change and notify the Deputy Director, who will send a written notification to the Partner's principal investigator with a copy to the Operations Committee.

When a requested major amendment is submitted shortly before a Coordinating Council meeting, the approval of the amendment will be placed on the Council Agenda.

The Deputy Director will notify NOAA Grants of any change in scope of work for final approval for non-federal proposals, and the Partner will need to request a Change in Scope through Grants Online. Necessary communications will be maintained between the concerned Partner, the Program and NOAA Grants. Any changes must be approved through the normal NOAA Grants process.

### **Requesting a No-cost Extension**

If additional time is needed to complete the project, Program Partners can request a no-cost extension to their award period. Partners should let the Program know of the need for additional time and then request the extension as an Award Action Request through NOAA Grants Online at least 30 days before the end date of the award.

Necessary communications will be maintained between the concerned Partner, the Program, and NOAA Grants office. Any changes must be approved through the normal NOAA Grants process.

### **Declaring Unused/Returned Funds**

In an effort to limit the instances in which funds are not completely used during the award period, draw down reports from the NOAA Grants offices indicating remaining grant balances will be periodically reviewed during each fiscal year.

While effort should be made to complete the project as proposed, if Program Partners find that they will not be able to make use of their entire award, they should notify the Program and their NOAA Federal Program Officer as soon as possible. Depending on the timing of the action, the funds may be able to be reused within the Program, or they may have to be returned to the U.S. Treasury.

Program Partners must submit a written document to the Deputy Director outlining unused project funds potentially being returned. The Partner must also notify their Coordinating Council member (if applicable) for approval to return the unused funds. If the funding is available for re-use within the Program, the Director and Deputy Director will confer with the Operations Committee Chair and Vice-Chair and the Advisory Committee Chair, and then submit a written recommendation to the ACCSP Leadership Team of the Coordinating Council for final approval on the plan to distribute the returned money.

Necessary communications will be maintained between the concerned Partner, the Program, and NOAA Grants office. Any changes must be approved through the normal NOAA Grants process.

### **Reporting Requirements**

Program staff will assess project performance.

The Partner project recipients must abide by the NOAA Regional Grant Programs reporting requirements and as listed below. All semi-annual and final reports are to include a table showing progress toward each of the progress goals as defined in Step 2b and additional metrics as appropriate. Also, all Partner project recipients will submit the following reports based on the project start date to the Deputy Director:

- Semi-annual reports (due 30 days after the semi-annual period) throughout the project period including time periods during no-cost extensions,
- One final report (due 90 days after project completion).
- Federal Partners must submit reports to the Deputy Director, and State Partners must submit reports to both the Deputy Director and the appropriate NOAA Grants office.

Program staff will conduct an initial assessment of the final report to ensure the report is complete in terms of reporting requirements. Program staff will serve as technical monitors to review submitted reports. NOAA staff also reviews the reports submitted via Grants Online.

A project approved on behalf of a Program Committee will be required to follow the reporting requirements specified above. The principle investigator (if not the Chair of the Committee) will submit the report(s) to the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee for review and approval. The Committee Chair is responsible for submitting the required report(s) to the Program.

Joint projects will assign one principle investigator responsible for submitting the required reports. The principle investigator will be identified within the project proposal. The submitted reports should be a collaborative effort between all Partners involved in the joint project.

Project recipients will provide all reports to the Program in electronic format.

Partners who receive no-cost extensions must notify the Deputy Director within 30 days of receiving approval of the extension. Semi-annual and final reports will continue to be required through the extended grant period as previously stated.

Partners that have not met reporting requirements for past/current projects may not submit a new proposal.

A verbal presentation of project results may be requested. Partners will be required to submit copies of project specifications and procedures, software development, etc. to assist other Program Partners with the implementation of similar programs.

### **Report Format**

#### **Semi-Annual(s) – Progress Reports: (3-4 pages)**

- Title page - Project name, project dates (semi-annual period covered and complete project period), submitting Partner, and date.
- Objective
- Activities Completed – bulleted list by objective.
- Progress or lack of progress of incomplete activities during the period of semi-annual progress – bulleted list by objective.
- Activities planned during the next reporting period.
- Metrics table
- Milestone Chart – original and revised if changes occurred during the project period.

#### **Final Report:**

- Title page – Project name, project dates, submitting Partner, and date.
- Abstract/Executive Summary (including key results)
- Introduction
- Procedures

- Results:
  - Description of data collected.
  - The quality of the data pertaining to the objective of the project (e.g. representative to the scope of the project, quantity collected, etc.).
  - Compiled data results.
  - Summary of statistics.
- Discussion:
  - Discuss the interpretation of results of the project by addressing questions such as, but not limited to:
    - What occurred?
    - What did not occur that was expected to occur?
    - Why did expected results not occur?
    - Applicability of study results to Program goals.
    - Recommendations/Summary/Metrics
- Summarized budget expenditures and deviations (if any).

#### **Programmatic review**

Project reports will inform Partners of project outcomes. This will allow the Program as a whole to take advantage of lessons learned and difficulties encountered. Staff will provide final reports to the appropriate Committee(s). The Committees then can discuss the report(s) and make recommendations to modify the Data Collection Standards as appropriate. The recommendations will be submitted through the Program committee(s) review process.

**Appendix A: Maximum Funding for Maintenance Projects Entering Year 6 of Funding in FY21**


<b>Project Entering Year 5 of Maintenance Funding</b>	<b>Calculated Base (formula used)</b>	<b>Maximum Funding Year 5</b>	<b>Maximum Funding Year 6</b>
ME DMR: Portside commercial catch sampling and bycatch sampling for Atlantic herring, Atlantic mackerel, and Atlantic menhaden	<b>\$133,452.50</b> (2-year base)	\$88,968.33	<b>\$44,484.17</b>
ME DMR: Managing Mandatory Dealer Reporting in Maine	<b>\$183,934.50</b> (4-year avg)	\$122,623.00	<b>\$61,311.50</b>
RI DEM: Maintenance and Coordination of Fisheries Dependent Data Feeds to ACCSP from the State of Rhode Island	<b>\$82,563.50</b> (2-year base)	\$55,042.33	<b>\$27,521.17</b>
NJ DFW: Electronic Reporting and Biological Characterization of New Jersey Commercial Fisheries	<b>\$163,803.75</b> (4-year avg)	\$109,202.50	<b>\$54,601.25</b>
SC DNR: ACCSP Data Reporting from South Carolina's Commercial Fisheries	<b>\$170,770.00</b> (2-year base)	\$113,846.67	<b>\$56,923.33</b>
ACCSP RTC: At-sea Headboat Sampling	<b>\$162,114.00</b> (2-year base)	\$108,076.00	<b>\$54,038.00</b>
SEFSC: Continued processing and ageing of biological samples collected from U.S. South Atlantic commercial and recreational fisheries	<b>\$266,792.00</b> (4-year avg)	\$177,861.33	<b>\$88,930.67</b>



## Appendix B: Ranking Criteria Spreadsheet for Maintenance and New Projects

### Ranking Guide – Maintenance Projects:

Primary Program Priority	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Catch and Effort	0 – 10	Rank based on range within module and level of sampling defined under Program design. When considering biological, bycatch or recreational funding, rank according priority matrices.
Biological Sampling	0 – 10	
Bycatch/Species Interactions	0 – 6	
Social and Economic	0 – 4	
Data Delivery Plan	+ 2	Additional points if a data delivery plan to Program is supplied and defined within the proposal.

Project Quality Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Multi-Partner/Regional impact including broad applications	0 – 5	Rank based on the number of Partners involved in project OR regional scope of proposal (e.g. geographic range of the stock).
> yr 2 contains funding transition plan and/or justification for continuance	0 – 4	Rank based on defined funding transition plan away from Program funding or viable justification for continued Program funding.
In-kind contribution	0 – 4	1 = 1% - 25% 2 = 26% - 50% 3 = 51% - 75% 4 = 76% - 99%
Improvement in data quality/quantity/timeliness	0 – 4	1 = Maintain minimum level of needed data collections    4 = Improvements in data collection reflecting 100% of related module as defined within the Program design. Metadata is provided and defined within proposal if applicable.
Potential secondary module as a by-product (In program priority order)	0 – 3 0 – 3 0 – 3 0 – 1	Ranked based on additional module data collection and level of collection as defined within the Program design of individual module.
Impact on stock assessment	0 – 3	Rank based on the level of data collection that leads to new or greatly improved stock assessments.


Other Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Properly Prepared	-1 – 1	Meets requirements as specified in funding decision document Step 2b and Guidelines
Merit	0 – 3	Ranked based on subjective worthiness

**Ranking Guide – Maintenance Projects: (to be used only if funding available exceeds total Maintenance funding requested)**

Ranking Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Achieved Goals	0 – 3	Proposal indicates project has consistently met previous set goals. Current proposal provides project goals and if applicable, intermediate metrics to achieve overall achieved goals.
Data Delivery Plan	0 – 2	Ranked based if a data delivery plan to Program is supplied and defined within the proposal.
Level of Funding	-1 – 1	-1 = Increased funding from previous year 0 = Maintained funding from previous year 1 = Decreased funding from previous year
Properly Prepared	-1 – 1	-1 = Not properly prepared 1 = Properly prepared
Merit	0 – 3	Ranked based on subjective worthiness

**Ranking Guide – New Projects:**

Primary Program Priority	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Catch and Effort	0 – 10	Rank based on range within module and level of sampling defined under Program design. When considering biological, bycatch or recreational funding, rank according priority matrices.
Biological Sampling	0 – 10	
Bycatch/Species Interactions	0 – 6	
Social and Economic	0 – 4	
Data Delivery Plan	+ 2	Additional points if a data delivery plan to Program is supplied and defined within the proposal.

<b>Project Quality Factors</b>	<b>Point Range</b>	<b>Description of Ranking Consideration</b>
Multi-Partner/Regional impact including broad applications	0 – 5	Rank based on the number of Partners involved in project OR regional scope of proposal (e.g. fisheries sampled).
Contains funding transition plan / Defined end-point	0 – 4	Rank based on quality of funding transition plan or defined end point.
In-kind contribution	0 – 4	1 = 1% - 25% 2 = 26% - 50% 3 = 51% - 75% 4 = 76% - 99%
Improvement in data quality/quantity/timeliness	0 – 4	1 = Maintain minimum level of needed data collections  4 = Improvements in data collection reflecting 100% of related module as defined within the Program design. Metadata is provided and defined within proposal if applicable.
Potential secondary module as a by-product (In program priority order)	0 – 3 0 – 3 0 – 3 0 – 1	Ranked based on additional module data collection and level of collection as defined within the Program design of individual module.
Impact on stock assessment	0 – 3	Rank based on the level of data collection that leads to new or greatly improved stock assessments.

<b>Other Factors</b>	<b>Point Range</b>	<b>Description of Ranking Consideration</b>
Innovative	0 – 3	Rank based on new technology, methodology, financial savings, etc.
Properly Prepared	-1 – 1	Meets requirements as specified in funding decision document Step 2b and Guidelines
Merit	0 – 3	Ranked based on subjective worthiness



# Biological Sampling Priority Matrix

Created in February 2019  
For FY2021

*Our vision is to be the principal source of fisheries-dependent information  
on the Atlantic coast through the cooperation of all program partners.*

# Biological Review Panel Recommends:

- Species in the upper 25% of the priority matrix should be considered for funding.
- Sampling projects which cover multiple species within the upper 25% are highly recommended.



\* UPPER 25% OF MATRIX

# Biological Review Panel Recommendations Based on Matrix\*:

Species	Overfished	Overfishing	Most Recent Stock	Current/Next Stock Assessment	Council Priority	ASMFC Priority	State Priority	NMFS Priority	Fishery Managed	Sig. change in landings	Sig. change in mgmt w/in	Adequacy of level of sampling	Stock Resilience	Seasonality of Fishery	Average Priority	TOTAL
Black Sea Bass <i>Centropristis striata</i>	N: MA N: SA	N: MA N: SA	2018	2019	5.0	5	3.4	5.0	5	1	1	3	3	1	4.3	32.43
Gray Triggerfish <i>Balistes capriciscus</i>	U	U	2016		5.0	0	1.1	4.0	3	5	5	4	2	3	2.8	32.14
Atlantic halibut <i>Hippoglossus hippoglossus</i>	Y	N	2018		4.0	0	1.1	4.0	3	5	1	4	5	3	2.6	30.14
Snowy Grouper <i>Epinephelus niveatus</i>	Y	N	2013	2019	5.0	0	1.1	5.0	3	1	3	4	5	3	3.0	30.14
Sandbar Shark <i>Carcharhinus plumbeus</i>	Y	N	2011	2017	0.0	1	1.0	5.0	5	5	5	2	3	3	1.8	30.00
American Shad <i>Alosa sapidissima/mediocris</i>	D	N	2007	2019	0.0	3	3.9	0.0	5	3	3	4	5	3	2.2	29.86
Red Snapper <i>Lutjanus campechanus</i>	Y	Y	2016	2020	5.0		0.7	5.0	3	4	1	1	5	5	2.9	29.71
River Herring <i>Alosa</i>	D	U	2017		0.0	4	3.2	0.0	5	3	3	4	4	3	2.2	29.21
Tilefish <i>Lopholatilus chamaeleonticeps</i>	N: MA N: SA	N: MA Y: SA	2017	2019	5.0	0	1.7	4.0	5	1	1	4	4	3	2.9	28.71
Bluefin Tuna <i>Thunnus thynnus</i>	Y	N	2014	2017	0.0	0	1.6	5.0	5	5	5	3	3	1	1.9	28.64
Cobia <i>Rachycentron canadum</i>	N	N	2012	2019	0.0	5	1.4	3.0	3	5	1	4	3	3	2.7	28.36
Blueline Tilefish <i>Caulolatilus microps</i>	U	U	2017		3.0	0	1.2	5.0	3	3	3	4	3	3	2.6	28.21
Horseshoe Crab <i>Limulus polyphemus</i>	U	U	2013	2019	0.0	4	2.8	0.0	5	3	3	3	4	3	2.0	27.79
American Eel <i>Anguilla rostrata</i>	D	U	2017	2020	0.0	5	3.5	0.0	5	3	1	4	5	1	2.5	27.50
Dolphin <i>Coryphaena hippurus</i>	U	U			5.0	0	1.3	3.0	5	3	3	3	1	3	2.5	27.29
Ocean Pout <i>Macrozoarces americanus</i>	Y	N	2017	2019	0.0	0	0.2	1.0	3	5	5	5	5	3	1.2	27.21
Red Drum <i>Sciaenops ocellatus</i>	U	N	2017		0.0	3	1.2	1.0	3	5	5	3	3	3	1.6	27.21
Atlantic Smooth Dogfish <i>Mustelus canis</i>	N	N	2015		0.0	3	1.6	3.0	5	3	3	3	2	3	2.1	26.57
American Lobster <i>Homarus americanus</i>	D	N	2015		0.0	5	2.6	3.0	3	4	1	3	4	1	2.7	26.57
Winter Flounder <i>Pleuronectes americanus</i>	N: GB U: GOM Y: SNE/MA	N: GB N: GOM N: SNE/MA	2016	2019	0.0	2	2.4	5.0	3	3	3	2	5	1	2.3	26.43
Red Grouper <i>Epinephelus morio</i>	Y	Y	2017	2021	5.0	0	1.0	4.0	3	1	1	4	4	3	2.8	26.00
Whelk Channeled, Knobbed, Lightning	U	U			0.0	0	1.9	0.0	5	5	5	4	4	1	1.2	25.93
Lane Snapper <i>Lutjanus synagris</i>	U	U			0.0	0	0.4	3.0	3	5	5	5	3	1	1.7	25.36
Gag Grouper <i>Mycteroperca microlepis</i>	N	N	2014	2020	5.0	0	0.9	4.0	3	1	1	3	4	3	2.6	24.93
Weakfish <i>Cynoscion regalis</i>	D	N		2019	0.0	3	2.9	0.0	5	3	3	4	3	1	2.0	24.93
Finetooth Shark <i>Carcharhinus isodon</i>	N	N	2007		0.0	1	0.9	3.0	5	3	3	3	3	3	1.6	24.86
Scamp <i>Mycteroperca phenax</i>	U	U		2021	5.0	0	0.9	3.0	3	1	1	4	4	3	2.6	24.86

# Bio-sampling Priority Matrix

- Grouping of species in upper 25% of total matrix score, based on sampling adequacy and average priority (average of ASMFC, Council, NMFS and State priorities).
- Red Snapper and Sandbar Shark are being sampled adequately and have low priority so additional sampling is not needed.
- Projects that target multiple upper quartile species should be given a higher priority.

		Biological Sampling Adequacy	
		Adequate ( 0 - 2 )	Inadequate ( 3 - 5 )
Averaged Priority Columns	High ( $\geq 3.0$ )		Black Sea Bass, Snowy Grouper
	Low ( $< 3.0$ )	Sandbar Shark, Red Snapper	Gray Triggerfish, Atlantic halibut, American Shad, River Herring, Tilefish, Bluefin Tuna, Horseshoe Crab, American Eel, Dolphin, Ocean Pout, Red Drum, Atlantic Smooth Dogfish, American Lobster, Winter Flounder, Red Grouper, Whelk, Lane Snapper, Gag Grouper, Weakfish, Finetooth Shark, Scamp, Winter Skate, Atlantic Menhaden





# Bycatch Sampling Priority Matrix

Created in February 2019  
For FY 2021

*Our vision is to be the principal source of fisheries-dependent information  
on the Atlantic coast through the cooperation of all program partners.*



# New Bycatch Matrix

- This is the first year the updated Bycatch Sampling Priority Matrix was completed by committee members
- The matrix is sent to committee members to review, changes are listed on the changes tab of the matrix, all changes are reviewed by full committee, changes are discussed and accepted, staff updates matrix to include all changes then ranks fleets by scoring protected species interactions, amount of regulatory discards, amount of non regulatory discards, significant changes in management in past 36 months, total number of trips and total landings
- The new matrix is a fleet based approach which differs from the previous species based approach
- Overwhelmingly positive feedback regarding ease of updating the matrix
- Staff understands the amount of time and work put into the update and appreciates the efforts put forth by committee members



# Top Quartile of Bycatch Matrix Suggestions

	<u>Sig. Change in mgmt w/in past 36 mo</u>	<u>Amt of reg discards</u>	<u>Amt of non reg discards</u>	<u>Prot Spp Interactions</u>	<u>Score</u>
<b>Combined Fleets</b>					
Mid-Atlantic Gillnet	3	4	2	5	14
Mid-Atlantic Pound Net	1	4	2	5	12
American lobster Pots GOM	1	4	1	5	11
American lobster Pots SNE	1	4	1	5	11
Snapper grouper H&L Fleet	3	4	1	3	11
New England Extra-Large-Mesh Gillnet	0	4	2	5	11
South Atlantic shrimp Trawl	0	4	2	5	11
Mid-Atlantic Small-Mesh Otter Trawl, Bottom	1	4	1	5	11
New England Mid-Water Otter Trawl	3	4	1	3	11
South Atlantic, black sea bass Pot	3	2	1	5	11
South Atlantic Large Mesh Gillnet	0	4	2	5	11
Southeastern, Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico HMS Pelagic Longline	1	4	1	5	11
New England Crab Pots	3	2	1	5	11
New England Otter Trawl	1	4	2	3	10
Southeastern, Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico HMS Shark Bottom Longline	0	4	1	5	10
Pelagic H&L Fleet (North)	1	4	1	3	9
New England Gillnet	1	2	1	5	9
South Atlantic Deep Water shrimp Trawl	3	2	1	3	9



# Additional Fleets of Importance

- Mid-Atlantic Purse Seine: Menhaden
- HMS species not included in Trips dataset
- Pelagic Longline Fleet reports via logbooks which are not in the Trips data





## Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program

1050 N. Highland Street, Suite 200A-N | Arlington, VA 22201

703.842.0780 | 703.842.0779 (fax) | [www.accsp.org](http://www.accsp.org)

### **ACCSP Funding Prioritization of the Recreational Technical Committee**

*July 2017*

The Recreational Technical Committee sets the recreational data collection priorities for inclusion in ACCSP's annual request for proposals (RFP). In 2017, the committee opted to use its Atlantic Coast Recreational Implementation Plan priorities as the recreational data priorities for ACCSP's annual funding process. The prioritized list of data needs, which were reviewed and approved by the ACCSP Coordinating Council, is provided below:

- 1. Improve precision (PSE) of MRIP catch estimates**
- 2. (t) Comprehensive for-hire data collection and monitoring**
- 2. (t) Improved recreational fishery discard and release data**
- 4. Biological sampling for recreational fisheries separate from MRIP APAIS**
- 5. Improved spatial resolution and technical guidance for post-stratification of MRIP estimates**
- 6. Improved timeliness of recreational catch and harvest estimates**

*Our vision is to be the principal source of fisheries-dependent information on the Atlantic coast through the cooperation of all program partners.*

## Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program

# SOCIOLOGICAL AND ECONOMIC DATA

The Committee on Economics and Social Sciences (CESS) developed a list of priority socioeconomic data elements for coastwide collection. The list is not exhaustive; it represents key elements that can serve as a baseline of fundamental socioeconomic information to support management decisions. The list of priority data elements includes:

1. Trip-level information (to be collected through voluntary or mandatory reporting, for all or a subset of participants)
2. Data elements for an owner/operator survey (to be collected through an annual or semiannual survey)\*

The CESS identified these priority data elements with the understanding that data would be collected in the aforementioned methods and would be linked to other ACCSP data through identifiers. Alternative collection methods or the inability to link data with identifiers may require changes to the priority data elements list in order to ensure the utility of the data.

Note: Priorities for standalone surveys will differ from the priorities identified below due to their distinct methodologies and inability to leverage other ACCSP data. The CESS should be consulted when identifying data elements for standalone socioeconomic surveys to ensure their utility and, where practical, consistency across studies.

\*The ACCSP recognizes the analytic value of collecting the data elements below. We recommend that partners be aware of and take into account the reporting burden to industry, the sensitivity and at times confidentiality of socioeconomic information, and other relevant perspectives when determining which data elements to collect and set as optional or mandatory.

## A. COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

**Table 1:  
TRIP LEVEL INFORMATION**

DATA ELEMENT	DESCRIPTION / CRITERIA
<b>Trip Information</b>	
<b>Vessel Identifier</b>	-Unique vessel identifier (e.g., US Coast Guard, state registration number, etc.) -These identifiers must be trackable through time and space.
<b>Trip Identifier</b>	- Unique identifier assigned to the trip
<b>Labor Cost Information</b>	
<b>Total Crew Cost</b>	- Total monetary amount that was given to the crew for this trip

<b>Total Captain Cost (If other than owner)</b>	- Total monetary amount that was given to the captain for this trip
<b>Owner Share</b>	- Total monetary amount the vessel (or permit) owner received for this trip
<b>Other Trip Cost Information</b>	
<b>Fuel &amp; Oil Costs</b>	- Cost for all fuel and oil used on this trip
<b>Bait Costs</b>	- Cost for all bait used on this trip
<b>Ice Costs</b>	- Cost for all ice used on this trip
<b>Grocery Costs</b>	- Cost for all groceries used on this trip
<b>Miscellaneous Costs</b>	- Cost of any other expenses specific to this trip (not including wages, overhead, or fixed costs) E.g., offloading/non-crew labor costs, packaging costs, etc.

**Table 2:  
DATA ELEMENTS FOR OWNER/OPERATOR SURVEY**

<b>DATA ELEMENT</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION / CRITERIA</b>
<b>Vessel Identification*</b>	-Unique vessel identifier (e.g., US Coast Guard, state registration number, etc.) -These identifiers must be trackable through time and space.
<b>Fishermen Identification</b>	-Unique ACCSP Identifier for fishermen
<b>Labor Cost Information</b>	
<b>Crew Payment System</b>	- Code to identify crew & captain payment system (e.g. share system, per day, per trip)
<b>Percentage Share Crew</b>	- Percentage share to crew (if applicable)
<b>Percentage Share Captain</b>	- Percentage share to captain (if applicable)
<b>Percentage Share Boat/Owner</b>	- Percentage share to boat/owner (if applicable)
<b>Crew Wages</b>	- Average crew wages for the year (crew payment system indicates whether by hour, trip, day, etc.) (if applicable)
<b>Captain Wages</b>	- Average captain wages for the year (crew payment system indicates whether by hour, trip, day, etc.) (if applicable)
<b>Annual Costs (Most Recent Year)</b>	
<b>Labor costs (captain and crew not in household)</b>	- Total costs of labor for captain and crew outside the owner/operator's household
<b>Labor costs (to people within owner/operator household)</b>	- Total costs of labor for captain and crew within the owner/operator's household
<b>Annual Insurance Costs</b>	- Hull, health, protection and indemnity, mortgage, etc.
<b>Dockage</b>	- Total cost for vessel dockage, home port and transient dockage
<b>Loan Payments</b>	- Principal and interest
<b>New Gear/ Equipment</b>	- Total cost of new gear or equipment acquired
<b>Repairs &amp; Maintenance</b>	- Total cost of repairs & maintenance of vessel and gear that were conducted in the previous year
<b>Permits &amp; Licenses</b>	- Total cost of fishing permits / licenses for the previous year

<b>Leased Quota Cost</b>	- Total cost of leased quota for the previous year
<b>Other Professional Expenses</b>	- Professional expenses not otherwise itemized
<b>Demographic Information</b>	
<b>Household Size</b>	- # of individuals in the household (including respondent)
<b>Employment Status</b>	- Current employment status (e.g., employed fulltime, part-time, unemployed, retired, etc.)
<b>Education</b>	- Highest level of education completed
<b>Marital/Cohabital Status</b>	- Current marital or cohabitational status of respondent
<b>Age</b>	- Age of the respondent
<b>Gender</b>	- Gender of the respondent
<b>Ethnicity</b>	- Ethnic background
<b>Total Annual Household Income</b>	- Total annual household income
<b>Number of Household Individuals Involved in Commercial Fishing</b>	- Total number of household individuals involved in commercial fishing (including respondent)
<b>Percent of Annual Household Income from Commercial Fishing</b>	- Percent of household income that is generated through commercial fishing or support activities
<b>County of Residence</b>	- County of residence
<b>Years in Community</b>	- Years in county of residence
<b>Fishing Activity Information</b>	
<b>Fishermen status</b>	- Fishermen status (e.g. full time, part time, not actively fishing)
<b>Years in Commercial Fishing</b>	- Number of years participating in commercial fishery
<b>Permits held</b>	- fishing permits held (by permit type)
<b>Permit use</b>	- Were all permits used within the last year
<b>Reason for Latency</b>	- Reason for not using permit within the last year
<b>Primary Species Landed by Month</b>	- Primary species landed by month
<b>Primary Gears Used by Month</b>	- Primary gears used by month

\*Vessel Identifier is needed to link trip-level data to survey results





# Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program

1050 N. Highland Street, Suite 200A-N | Arlington, VA 22201  
703.842.0780 | 703.842.0779 (fax) | [www.accsp.org](http://www.accsp.org)

This list includes dates for fiscal year 2020, including ACCSP committee meetings, relevant dates of the funding cycle, as well as meetings or conferences ACCSP typically attends or which may be of interest to our partners. If you have any questions or comments on this calendar please do not hesitate to contact the ACCSP staff at [info@accsp.org](mailto:info@accsp.org).

Jan 21-23:	APAIS South Atlantic Training – Wilmington, NC
Jan 28-30:	APAIS Mid-Atlantic Training – Dover, DE
Jan 28-30:	NEFMC Meeting – Portsmouth, NH
Feb 4-6:	ASMFC Meeting/Coordinating Council Meeting – Arlington, VA
Feb 4-6:	APAIS North Atlantic Training - Gloucester, MA
Feb 11:	Biological Review Panel Annual Meeting – Webinar
Feb 12:	Bycatch Prioritization Committee Annual Meeting –Webinar
Feb 11-13:	MAFMC Meeting – Duck, NC
Feb 26-28:	APAIS New England Training – New Bedford, MA
<b>Mar 1:</b>	<b>Start of ACCSP FY20</b>
Mar 2-6:	SAFMC Meeting – Jekyll Island, GA
Week of Mar 23:	Commercial Technical Committee Annual Meeting – TBD
Week of Mar 23:	Information Systems Committee Annual Meeting – TBD
Apr 7-9:	MAFMC Meeting – Galloway, NJ
Week of April 13:	Operations and Advisory Committees Spring Meeting – Webinar
Week of Apr 13:	Recreational Technical Committee – Webinar
Apr 14-16:	NEFMC Meeting – Mystic, CT
May 4-7:	ASMFC/Coordinating Council Meeting – Arlington, VA
<b>May 11:</b>	<b>ACCSP issues request for proposals</b>
Jun 8-12:	SAFMC Meeting – Key West, FL
<b>Jun 15:</b>	<b>Initial proposals are due</b>
Week of Jun 15:	APAIS Wave 2 Meeting - Webinar
Jun 16-18:	MAFMC Meeting – Virginia Beach, VA
<b>Jun 22:</b>	<b>Initial proposals are distributed to Operations and Advisory Committees</b>
Jun 23-25:	NEFMC Meeting – Freeport, ME
July 6:	Any initial written comments on proposals due
<b>Week of Jul 13:</b>	<b>Review of initial proposals by Operations and Advisory Committees – Webinar</b>
July 20:	If applicable, any revised written comments due
<b>Week of Jul 27:</b>	<b>Feedback submitted to principal investigators</b>
Aug 4-6:	ASMFC Meeting/Coordinating Council Meeting – Arlington, VA
Aug 10-13:	MAFMC Meeting – Philadelphia, PA
<b>Aug 17:</b>	<b>Revised proposals due</b>
Aug 15:	APAIS Wave 3 Meeting – Webinar


*Our vision is to produce dependable and timely marine fishery statistics for Atlantic coast fisheries that are collected, processed, and disseminated according to common standards agreed upon by all program partners.*

Aug 24:	Revised proposals distributed to Operations and Advisory Committees
Week of Sep 7:	Preliminary ranking exercise for Advisors and Operations Members – Webinar
Sep 14-18:	SAFMC Meeting – Charleston, SC
Sep 22-23:	Annual Advisors/Operations Committee Joint Meeting (in-person; location TBD)
Sep 29-30- Oct 1:	NEFMC Meeting – Gloucester, MA
Oct 6-8:	MAFMC Meeting – Riverhead, NY
Oct 18-22:	ASMFC Annual Meeting/Coordinating Council Meeting – New Jersey
Late Oct:	APAIS Wave 4 Meeting (In person – TBD)
Dec 1-3:	NEFMC Meeting – Newport, RI
Dec 7-11:	SAFMC Meeting – Wrightsville Beach, NC
Dec 15-17:	MAFMC Meeting – Baltimore, MD

*Our vision is to produce dependable and timely marine fishery statistics for Atlantic coast fisheries that are collected, processed, and disseminated according to common standards agreed upon by all program partners.*

**Ranking Guide – Maintenance Projects:**

Primary Program Priority	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Catch and Effort	0 – 10	Rank based on range within module and level of sampling defined under Program design. When considering biological, bycatch or recreational funding, rank according to priority matrices.
Biological Sampling	0 – 10	
Bycatch/Species Interactions	0 – 6	
Social and Economic	0 – 4	
Data Delivery Plan	+ 2	Additional points if a data delivery plan to Program is supplied and defined within the proposal.

Project Quality Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Multi-Partner/Regional impact including broad applications	0 – 5	Rank based on the number of Partners involved in project OR regional scope of proposal (e.g. geographic range of the stock).
> yr 2 contains funding transition plan and/or justification for continuance	0 – 4	Rank based on defined funding transition plan away from Program funding or viable justification for continued Program funding.
In-kind contribution	0 – 4	1 = 1% - 25% 2 = 26% - 50% 3 = 51% - 75% 4 = 76% - 99%
Improvement in data quality/quantity/timeliness	0 – 4	1 = Maintain minimum level of needed data collections    4 = Improvements in data collection reflecting 100% of related module as defined within the Program design. Metadata is provided and defined within proposal if applicable.
Potential secondary module as a by-product (In program priority order)	0 – 3 0 – 3 0 – 3 0 – 1	Ranked based on additional module data collection and level of collection as defined within the Program design of individual module.
Impact on stock assessment	0 – 3	Rank based on the level of data collection that leads to new or greatly improved stock assessments.


Other Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Properly Prepared	-1-1	Meets requirements as specified in funding decision document Step 2b and Guidelines
Merit	0 – 3	Ranked based on subjective worthiness

**Ranking Guide – Maintenance Projects: (to be used only if funding available exceeds total Maintenance funding requested)**

<b>Ranking Factors</b>	<b>Point Range</b>	<b>Description of Ranking Consideration</b>
Achieved Goals	0 – 3	Proposal indicates project has consistently met previous set goals. Current proposal provides project goals and if applicable, intermediate metrics to achieve overall achieved goals.
Data Delivery Plan	0 – 2	Ranked based if a data delivery plan to Program is supplied and defined within the proposal.
Level of Funding	-1 – 1	-1 = Increased funding from previous year 0 = Maintained funding from previous year 1 = Decreased funding from previous year
Properly Prepared	-1 – 1	-1 = Not properly prepared 1 = Properly prepared
Merit	0 – 3	Ranked based on subjective worthiness

**Ranking Guide – New Projects:**

Primary Program Priority	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Catch and Effort	0 – 10	Rank based on range within module and level of sampling defined under Program design. When considering biological, bycatch or recreational funding, rank according to priority matrices.
Biological Sampling	0 – 10	
Bycatch/Species Interactions	0 – 6	
Social and Economic	0 – 4	
Data Delivery Plan	+ 2	Additional points if a data delivery plan to Program is supplied and defined within the proposal.

Project Quality Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Multi-Partner/Regional impact including broad applications	0 – 5	Rank based on the number of Partners involved in project OR regional scope of proposal (e.g. fisheries sampled).
Contains funding transition plan / Defined end-point	0 – 4	Rank based on quality of funding transition plan or defined end point.
In-kind contribution	0 – 4	1 = 1% - 25% 2 = 26% - 50% 3 = 51% - 75% 4 = 76% - 99%
Improvement in data quality/quantity/timeliness	0 – 4	1 = Maintain minimum level of needed data collections    4 = Improvements in data collection reflecting 100% of related module as defined within the Program design. Metadata is provided and defined within proposal if applicable.
Potential secondary module as a by-product (In program priority order)	0 – 3 0 – 3 0 – 3 0 – 1	Ranked based on additional module data collection and level of collection as defined within the Program design of individual module.
Impact on stock assessment	0 – 3	Rank based on the level of data collection that leads to new or greatly improved stock assessments.

Other Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Innovative	0 – 3	Rank based on new technology, methodology, financial savings, etc.
Properly Prepared	-1 – 1	Meets requirements as specified in funding decision document Step 2b and Guidelines
Merit	0 – 3	Ranked based on subjective worthiness

## ACCSP Coordinating Council

May 5, 2020

### MRIP Update

Earlier this year the MRIP staff and Regional Implementation Council discussed an initial draft of the below plan to establish "a partnership with a state" as required by the Modern Fish Act. Please note the intent is to describe and build upon current partnerships and separately update the individual state by state MOU's on NSAR data. Comments on the current draft are due to MRIP in Mid-May. The ACCSP Operations Committee was briefed on April 15<sup>th</sup> and you are welcome to provide comments to me via email through Monday May 11<sup>th</sup>. We will have opportunity to discuss this during your meeting as well.

Two Additional Items of Note:

On March 16-17, the **National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine: Ocean Studies Board kicked off a study with MRIP on "Data and Management Strategies for Recreational Fisheries with Annual Catch Limits"**. There will be 3 regional meetings over the next year with opportunities for stakeholders to participate. A link to the study, and a summary of the task are noted below:

: <https://www8.nationalacademies.org/pa/projectview.aspx?key=51788>.

A 2017 report, *Review of the Marine Recreational Information Program* discusses the difficulty of collecting necessary data on recreational fisheries. In some cases, enforcement of catch limits requires short recreational fishing seasons, further complicating data collection, monitoring, and management. The Modernizing Recreational Fisheries Management Act of 2018 called for a National Academies study on how well the Marine Recreational Information Program meets the needs of in-season management of fisheries with annual catch limits (ACLs). This study will also consider how survey methods or management strategies might be modified to better meet those needs.

**Recreational Electronic Reporting Task Force:** NOAA Fisheries and MAFAC are pleased to announce the establishment of a new Recreational Electronic Reporting Task Force. This Task Force will provide expert advice to MAFAC, and subsequently NOAA Fisheries Leadership, on the generation, delivery, and use of electronically reported data from private recreational anglers to assist NOAA Fisheries in fulfilling its mission activities. The list of Task Force members will be posted on the MAFAC page [here](#).

**Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP) Implementation Plan for §202 of the Modernizing Recreational Fisheries Management Act (MFA): Develop a plan for establishing state partnerships, in consultation with states, Fishery Information Networks (FINs), and MRIP Regional Implementation Teams by 12/31/20**

**I. Introduction**

Section 202 of the MFA provides that, “The Secretary shall establish a partnership with a State [sic] to develop best practices for implementing the State program established under paragraph (2)” which refers to a state program that provides, “data that meets the Secretary’s needs” per §401(g)(2) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA).

Section 202 further states that,

- “The Secretary shall develop guidance, in cooperation with the States, that details best practices for administering State programs pursuant to paragraph (2), and provide such guidance to the States.”
- “The Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress and publish biennial reports that include: (1) the estimated accuracy of state registry information and the information from each State program that is used to assist in completing surveys or evaluating effects of conservation and management measures; (2) priorities for improving recreational fishing data collection; and (3) an explanation of any use of information collected by such State programs and by the Secretary...”
- “The Secretary may make grants to States to—  
(I) improve implementation of State programs consistent with this subsection; and  
(II) assist such programs in complying with requirements related to changes in recreational data collection under paragraph (3).” (Note: this reference is to MSA Sec. 402(g)(3), which required NOAA to “establish a program to improve the quality and accuracy of information generated by” the Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey, or MRFSS.” The program established by NOAA to address this requirement is MRIP).
- “Any funds awarded through such grants shall be used to support data collection, quality assurance, and outreach to entities submitting such data. The Secretary shall prioritize such grants based on the ability of the grant to improve the quality and accuracy of such programs.”

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), through MRIP and the Fisheries Information System (FIS) programs, has established and long maintained partnerships with states and other regional partners in fisheries data collection. This plan for implementation the provisions of MFA §202 utilizes these existing programs as the foundation of the required state partnership program and adds new program components as needed to address all MFA requirements . The current state programs are primarily derived from regional FIN programs for the principal fisheries regions: Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program (ACCSP) for the Atlantic Coast; Gulf Fisheries Information Network (FIN) for the Gulf Coast; Pacific Recreational Fisheries Information Network (RecFIN) for the Pacific Coast of California through Washington; Western Pacific Fisheries Information Network (WPacFIN) for Hawaii and the Territories of Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI). Through ACCSP, FIN and RecFIN, NMFS provides funding support to states for MRIP recreational survey work as specified in Cooperative Agreements (CAs). In addition,

**Commented [GW1]:** Note intent is to reconfirm and potentially extend existing state partnerships within established MRIP framework of Regional Plans, NSAR MOU, and MRIP Strategic plan. Note important areas with comments, and state partnership section starting on page 8.

NMFS has established partnerships, including funding recreational data collection, via CAs with FIN for Puerto Rico and directly with Hawaii.

In addition, MRIP has established Regional Implementation Teams consisting of all primary partners in each region, to assess partner data collection needs and priorities. The Regional Implementation Teams consist of the FINs for the Atlantic, Gulf, and West Coast regions, and ad hoc teams for the Alaska, Pacific Islands, Caribbean, and Atlantic Highly Migratory Species (HMS) regions. The ad hoc teams include all regional partners, including states and territories, regional fisheries management councils, interstate marine fisheries commissions, NMFS Headquarters Offices of Sustainable Fisheries (OSF) and Science and Technology (OST), Regions and Science Centers. The MRIP Regional Implementation Teams have prepared, and will update periodically as necessary, MRIP Regional Implementation Plans that define regional recreational catch and effort data needs, preferred survey methods, and priorities for data collection improvements.

It is therefore intended that this plan for establishing state partnerships will incorporate and build on the existing CAs and Regional Implementation Plans, in consultation with states, FINs, and MRIP Regional Implementation Teams. The Plan: (1) reinforces and expands as necessary existing Memorandum of Agreement (MOAs) with states and FINs; (2) describes “best practices for implementing the State program” and “guidance...that details best practices for administering State programs” based on applicable provisions of the existing Final Rule for the National Saltwater Angler Registry and State Exemption Program (NSAR) (for state registries) and MRIP Standards (for surveys and estimation).

To assure we are able to address the required content of the biennial reports to Congress, the Plan also addresses: (1) the methods NMFS will use to assess the accuracy of state registry data and state survey catch and effort estimates; (2) the priorities for recreational data collection, including both regional priorities as set forth in Regional Implementation Plans and national priorities derived by MRIP annually; (3) an inventory of the uses to which state registry and survey data are used by NMFS/NOAA. These plan provisions, set forth in Appendix 3, have been developed in consultation with the states through the MRIP Regional Implementation Teams.

## **II. Description of existing state partnership programs**

A. ACCSP: ACCSP is a comprehensive fisheries statistics program partnership established by Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) among the East Coast data collection partners: Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission and its 15 state members; New England, Mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic Fishery Management Councils; NMFS OSTOSF, Greater Atlantic and Southeast Regional Offices, and Northeast and Southeast Fisheries Science Centers; and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The ACCSP [guiding documents](#) include the updated MOU and its Strategic Plan, which is updated approximately every five years. ACCSP has also developed comprehensive Atlantic Coast Fisheries Data Collection [Standards](#) that provide “detailed information on standards, policies, reporting requirements, quality control and assurance documentation, and processes necessary for adjustments and modification.” The Standards are intended to be followed as fully as possible by all of the partners actively engaged



in fishery-dependent data collection to ensure effective and consistent implementation of data collection and data management models.

NMFS provides annual funding support for ACCSP operations and partner project funding, including state partner projects, via appropriated funds allocated by OST and OSF. In addition, OST and ACCSP have entered into a five-year CA through which ACCSP administers three MRIP surveys—the Access Point Angler Intercept Survey (APAIS); the Head Boat Sea Sampling Survey; and the For-Hire Survey (FHS)—conducted by the states from Maine through Georgia. This CA also funds catch card census programs for Atlantic Highly Migratory Species in North Carolina and Maryland. [Some components of the Large Pelagics Survey are covered through ACCSP, including the For-Hire-Telephone Large Pelagic add-on from Maine to Virginia, the intercept \(LPIS\) component in Maine and biological \(LPBS\) component in North Carolina.](#) Pursuant to the CA, ACCSP passes funds through to each of the states to conduct the sampling work as specified in the CA, and ACCSP engages in certain data processing, training and, related program administration functions. Annual funding under this CA for FY 20 is \$4.9 M.

B. FIN: Like ACCSP, FIN is a comprehensive fisheries data collection program that is primarily centered on the Gulf of Mexico fisheries, with components that collect data for Florida’s east coast and in the Caribbean. FIN is a partnership among the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission (GSMFC), its five member states, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands; the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council; NMFS OST and OSF, Southeast Regional Office (SERO), and Southeast Fisheries Science Center; and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. FIN was established by a 1993 MOU among the GSMFC, the five Gulf States, and NMFS. The purpose, organizational structure and activities of FIN are described [here](#). The Gulf partners have adopted a program design document to include, “detailed information on the program standards and policies, reporting requirements and sampling programs, quality control and assurance documentation, and processes necessary for program adjustments and modification.” The program design states that, “requirements should be followed by all participating agencies as fully as possible to ensure effective implementation of the commercial and recreational data collection and data management systems.” As of December, 2019, FIN was in the process of developing a five-year Strategic Plan.

NMFS provides annual funding support to FIN through OST-budgeted funds administered via a five-year CA by SERO. MRIP funds earmarked for recreational data collection for FY 20 are \$4.258M. The annual FIN work plan adopted per the CA specifies that the states of Florida (both Atlantic and Gulf coasts), Alabama, and Mississippi will conduct sampling under the MRIP APAIS and FHS surveys, and Louisiana under the LA Creel state survey. Texas funds and administers its own programs and does not participate in MRIP, nor receive FIN funds for its recreational surveys. FY 20 funds may also be provided to Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi for support for state-administered specialized surveys for red snapper and other reef fish (Florida).

C. RecFIN: Pacific RecFIN was established by the West Coast region data collection partners in 1992 to provide recreational catch and effort statistics that met the specific needs of the region. The program replaced the OST-funded MRFSS for Washington, Oregon, and

California with a combined OST and state-funded suite of state surveys that include: the California Recreational Fisheries Survey (CRFS), the California Ocean Salmon Project, the Oregon Ocean Recreational Boat Survey (ORBS), the Oregon Shore and Estuarine Boat Survey (SEBS), the Washington Ocean Sampling Program (OSP), and the Washington Puget Sound Recreational Fishery Estimation Procedure (PSRFEP).

RecFIN is designed to integrate state and federal marine recreational sampling efforts into a single database to provide biological, social, and economic data for Pacific coast fishery scientists, fishery managers, and recreational fishing stakeholders. The primary partners are the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission and its member states of California, Oregon, and Washington, the Pacific Fishery Management Council; NMFS OST, West Coast Regional Office, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, and the Northwest Fisheries Science Center. At present, the program does not operate under a comprehensive MOU, and there is not a program-wide program design document. However, RecFIN maintains detailed documentation of the survey and estimation methods for each of the included state surveys. As of December, 2019, RecFIN was in the process of adoption a data-sharing MOA with the member states.

MRIP funds are provided to RecFIN by OST through the Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC) and directly by the NWFSC. A CA with the center provides for allocating the funds to the three states to carry out specified components of CRFS, ORBS, and OSP. FY 20 funding from MRIP to the three states was \$1.2M, and an additional \$1.0 M was allocated from the NWFSC.

The Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission also coordinates additional state-federal data collection programs in the region, including the Pacific Fishery Information Network (PacFIN) and the Alaska Fishery Information Network (AKFIN), both of which collect commercial fishery data. Recreational data collection in Alaska is conducted by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and is not currently incorporated into, or funded by, either AKFIN or RecFIN.

D. WPacFIN: WPacFIN is a data collection and data management agreement among the NMFS Science Center (PIFSC) and the natural resource agencies of Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, and CNMI. For non-commercial fisheries, the territorial partners conduct roving creel surveys to produce estimates of effort and catch, and the PIFSC provides technical support and data management services to the partnership. At present, NMFS does not contribute direct funding support to the WPacFIN non-commercial surveys. Hawaii's non-commercial surveys are funded separately from WPacFIN, as described below.

E. Hawaii: In the past, Hawaii's Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of Aquatic Resources (HDAR), has conducted a modified version of APAIS pursuant to CAs with OST. The intercept survey, referred to as the Hawaii Marine Recreational Fisheries Survey (HMRFS) collects fishing catch data for shore and private boat modes of fishing in the state. MRIP funds are allocated by OST to HDAR to perform work as specified in the CA. FY 20 funding under this CA is \$285,000.

Data collection partners in Hawaii are considering proposing changes to survey designs and conduct following an MRIP-sponsored workshop held in 2019. This may result in changes to the work proposed and funded to be conducted via CA with HDAR in the future.

F. Puerto Rico: Recreational sampling in Puerto Rico has been suspended due to the disruption to fishing activity and fishing sites resulting from Hurricane Maria. Prior to the suspension, funds had been provided to the Puerto Rico Department of Natural and Environmental Resources (DNER) to conduct intercept sampling via CA through the RecFIN process. In 2020 a dialog with DNER will be initiated to plan for reassessment of recreational fishing access sites, updated data needs of PR DNER for fisheries monitoring and management, and updated data needs of the Caribbean Fisheries Management Council. It is expected that initial site assessments may be funded in 2020 via CA with PR DNER.

### III. National Saltwater Angler and State Registry Program (NSAR) **Data Sharing** Agreements

**Commented [GW2]:** Atlantic NSAR exemptions based on license holder lists, ACCSP provided updated state contact lists to MRIP. Clarifications requested on timing and use of NSAR data for survey purposes.

Section 401(g)(1) of the MSA establishes a requirement for individuals who engage in recreational fishing in the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), or for anadromous species in any waters, or for Continental Shelf fishery resources beyond the EEZ, to register with the Dept. of Commerce. In addition, §401(g)(2) provides that the Secretary shall exempt from that registration requirement those anglers and charter vessels that are licensed or registered by states, “if the Secretary determines that information from the State program is suitable for the Secretary’s use or is used to assist in completing marine recreational fisheries statistical surveys, or evaluating the effects of proposed conservation and management measures for marine recreational fisheries.”

In 2008, NMFS adopted the [final rule](#), 50 CFR 600, Subpart P, for NSAR, the program established under MRIP to administer the provisions of §§ 401(g)(1) & (2). The rule has been amended once, in 2012. Subpart P establishes the detailed requirements and procedures for anglers and for hire fishing vessels to register with NMFS. It also establishes the provisions for designating states as Exempted States pursuant to MSA §401(g)(2). Under Subpart P, States may be designated as Exempted States in two ways: (1) states agree to provide NMFS at least annually with a list of state-licensed or registered anglers and for hire vessels that meet specified requirements (see 50 CFR 600.1416); (2) states that participate in a qualifying regional survey of recreational fishing catch and effort agree to provide specified catch and effort data to NMFS, meeting [Preliminary National Standards for Recreational Survey Coverage and Basic Data Elements](#) (see 50 CFR 600.1417). To complete the Exempted State designation process, the appropriate state or territorial government agency enters into an MOA with NMFS. The MOA specifies the data the state or territory will provide, the schedule and format for its delivery, and any agreed-upon schedule of improvements.

As of December, 2019, each Atlantic and Gulf coast state from Florida to Texas entered into an MOA with NMFS and agreed to provide at least annual updates of the lists of names, addresses, telephone numbers, dates of birth, and, for for-hire vessels, vessel identification numbers, and NMFS had designated those states as Exempted States.

Also, the West Coast States of California, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska, and the western Pacific Island Territories of Guam, American Samoa, and CNMI had entered into MOAs agreeing to annually provide catch and effort data to NMFS under their qualifying regional surveys.

As of December, 2019, only Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the U.S Virgin Islands were not designated as Exempted States. In each of those three jurisdictions, the state/territorial natural resources management agency was actively pursuing either a saltwater fishing license, or a qualifying regional survey design to replace or supplement current data collection, or both.

(NOTE: Placeholder here for Registry MOA Review process, in development.)

#### IV. MRIP Regional Implementation Plans

In 2013, the MRIP Executive Steering Committee (ESC) conducted a workshop to plan for transitioning from a program primarily concerned with developing new survey designs to one focused on implementing the improved program nationally. The workshop participants concluded that, in the future, MRIP should operate as a hybrid program, with overall program management, budgeting and research and development work coordinated centrally through OST, and survey implementation and operations managed regionally, designed to meet individual regions' needs and priorities. The workshop resulted in establishment of seven MRIP [Regional Implementation Teams](#): Atlantic, Caribbean, Gulf, Atlantic HMSs, Pacific, Alaska, and Pacific Islands. The established FINs were identified to serve as the teams for the Atlantic, Gulf and Pacific regions. Ad hoc teams were established for the remaining regions.

Subsequent to the workshop, the MRIP Operations Team (OT) and ESC developed and adopted the *MRIP Implementation Funding Process* (Appendix I). The Funding Process document incorporated national guidelines for the prioritization of NMFS' investments in implementation of new survey methods as developed at the workshop:

"MRIP has established National guidelines for the prioritization of NMFS' investments in implementation of new survey methods. Specifically, funding priority will be based upon the extent to which surveys, alone or in combination with other surveys being implemented in a region:

- Utilize MRIP-certified survey designs or methodologies;
- Achieve MRIP standards for survey coverage and basic data elements, as well as any future standards adopted by the [program](#) ([http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/Assets/recreational/pdf/National\\_Standards\\_for\\_Survey\\_Coverage\\_and\\_Data\\_Elements.pdf](http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/Assets/recreational/pdf/National_Standards_for_Survey_Coverage_and_Data_Elements.pdf));
- Provide recreational (or non-commercial) catch estimates for fisheries managed under Magnuson-Stevens Act (MSA)—including Atlantic HMS—or jointly by the states and NMFS that are sufficient to
  - Contribute to reliable stock assessments;

**Commented [GW3]:** MRIP requested comment: Does this sufficiently include state roles for a report to Congress?

**Commented [GW4]:** Potential to include a table of priorities from each regional plan. Atlantic priorities (2017-22) are:  
1 – Improve Precision  
2 – Develop Comprehensive for-Hire reporting program  
2 (tied) – Improved release and discard data  
4 – Develop biological sampling program separate from MRIP general survey  
5 - Improved spatial resolution and technical guidance for post-stratification of MRIP estimates  
6 – Improved timeliness of catch estimates

- Support development of acceptable biological catch recommendations, annual catch limits (ACLs), and accountability measures that meet MSA requirements; and
- Support development of recreational regulations that minimize triggering of accountability measures.
- Allow reasonably precise tracking of recreational catch against ACLs.”

The document further provides that each Regional Implementation Team is responsible for identifying regional needs and developing MRIP [Regional Implementation Plans](#) to implement improved data collection designs that address both regional and national needs. Specifically, the plans are to include:

- Descriptions of regional needs for recreational fishing statistics, including needs for coverage, resolution, precision, and timeliness of survey estimates;
- A baseline assessment of current data collection programs, including the extent to which current programs satisfy needs and identification of data collection gaps;
- Recommendations and justification for a sequential, prioritized approach for implementing improved methods that address national and regional needs that are currently unmet;
- A proposed process for combining statistics derived from multiple sources<sup>1</sup>; and
- Estimated costs, overall and for individual survey components.

In summary, it is NMFS’ expectation that future investment in state and other partner recreational catch and effort data collection and estimation programs will be based on needs and priorities identified through the MRIP regional implementation planning process.

As of December, 2019, MRIP Regional Implementation Plans have been developed and approved for each region except Alaska, for which a plan is in development by the regional partners. In addition, MRIP has adopted the following MRIP Regional Implementation Plan update schedule:

1. Full updates:
  - a. To consist of a complete, objective re-visitation of the region’s data needs, preferred survey methods, and priorities for expansion and improvement, informed by the updated goals and objectives of the MRIP Strategic Plan;
  - b. At least every fifth year, one year following updates to the MRIP Strategic Plan; OR
  - c. If and when the Regional Implementation Team determines that there has been a significant change in priorities.
2. “Addendums” to address new or revised national priorities or opportunities: scheduled as requested by MRIP’s ESC.

**Commented [GW5]:** Note: ACCSP will review the Atlantic Implementation Plan in 2020-2021 through Committees.

<sup>1</sup> For example, regions may implement data collections that are specific to a sector or species. Implementation plans should describe how information generated from these sources will be integrated with more generalized data collections to either supplement or replace alternative estimates.

- a. These updates would not modify existing plan content, but simply add or revise projects, surveys in use, or priorities based on the revised national priorities and opportunities.
  - b. In general, there should be a payoff to the Regional Implementation Team to justify the effort to prepare the addendum.
3. Abbreviated or partial updates to address revised Regional Implementation Team preferences for data collection methods, priorities, new or revised funding, etc.
- a. These updates would be primarily self-generated by the Regional Implementation Teams to address significant changes in a part of the regional program.
    - i. For example, if a Regional Implementation Plan had identified a sample based survey as the standard/preferred design for for-hire mode, but the Regional Implementation Team decided to change over to a mandatory logbook as its preferred design, but not to change other priorities or methods, a partial update would be required.

Several of the initial MRIP Regional Implementation Plans identified expansion of current state sampling effort as a priority to: (1) restore sampling to a level conducted previously that has been cut back due to long term level funding of the state program; (2) a desire to increase survey coverage to include areas, fisheries, or time periods not sufficiently covered at present; or (3) to increase sample size to improve precision or other properties of the catch estimates. To assist in determining how to prioritize such needs, MRIP developed the *Methodology for ranking partner proposals for increasing sample size or scope of current regional survey(s)* (Appendix II).

## V. Strategic Plan

The MRIP [Strategic Plan](#), adopted in 2017, incorporated and built on the Regional Implementation Plan process for identifying regional needs and priorities. Strategic Plan Goal 5, Operate Collaboratively, states that it is MRIP’s goal to, “Maintain effective collaborations with state, interstate, regional, and national partners for cost effective and responsive recreational data collection and catch estimation.” Under Goal 5, several strategies and tactics address the MRIP Regional Planning process, and expansion of collaborative work with states:

Insert Goal 5 Strategies & Tactics Table

## VI. Opportunities to Improve State-Federal Partnership State Data Collection Programs

In consultation with the MRIP Regional Implementation Teams through the [MRIP Regional Implementation Council](#), NMFS identified the following measures that provide potential opportunities to improve the state-federal partnerships for recreational catch and effort data collection, building on the current FIN and state CAs, and the Regional Implementation Plan process in which both the states and NMFS play pivotal roles. Collectively, these measures constitute the best practices for implementing and administering state programs.

**Commented [GW6]:** How evaluate the “accuracy” of state provided data –intended to evaluate and address the process and points of interaction (vice for species x in state y)

**Commented [G7]:** Note: This section will be more fully developed following consultation with Regional Implementation Council and State Partners

A. State-Federal Program Administration: Measures to improve the performance of the state-federal recreational data collection partnerships under the current FIN and CA programs in place may include the following:

- Assure that FINs have current Strategic Plans or equivalent policy-level measures in place that reflect priorities of MRIP Regional Implementation Plans.
- Assure that FIN governing documents make clear the roles of each partner in data collection, estimation, information management, quality assurance and quality control, and data confidentiality.
- Streamline annual funding distribution to FINs under five-year CAs by moving funds during the first quarter of each Fiscal Year, as possible.
- Compile and publish an inventory of survey improvement needs, including estimated cost, from MRIP Regional Implementation Plans.
- Establish formal MOA to establish cooperative statistics programs among all partners in non-FIN regions (or add states and territories to current FINs, e.g. add Hawaii to RecFIN).
- Data sharing agreements to protect the confidentiality of raw data prior to quality control and estimate generation. Support prioritization of direct electronic sharing of data sets and survey deliverables in compatible formats to NOAA, and partner access to MRIP estimates.

**Commented [GW8]:** Note: Current Atlantic plan would benefit by adding consensus solutions and cost estimates.

B. State-Conducted Catch and Effort Surveys: Measures to improve the quality of data provided by state survey contributions include the following:

- Implement the provisions of the MRIP Data Standard.
- Establish regional goals for estimate precision and coverage and expand data collection to address them.
- Comprehensive Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) measures.
- Where MRIP general surveys do not meet more rigorous or timely needs for catch estimates, evaluate implementation of certified specialized survey designs to supplement the general survey.
- Assure that state surveys address priority needs as reflected in MRIP Regional Implementation Plans.
- Assure that state surveys meet the MRIP Preliminary Standards for Recreational Survey Coverage and Basic Data Elements.
- Assure that all components of state-conducted surveys have been certified consistent with NMFS [Policy Directive 04-114](#).

**Commented [GW9]:** Re-ordered from broad to more specific scope for MRIP consideration.

**Commented [G10]:** Note: Add Data Standard as an Appendix when adopted.

**Commented [GW11R10]:** Precision standards may include not publishing data higher than a cutoff PSE (TBD).

C. State Saltwater Angler Registries: Data quality for registry data can be expressed in two ways: as completeness of the registry, and as the degree to which the database is error-free and free of non-angler entries.

With respect to completeness, the following can be undertaken to improve the state registry data:

- Timeliness of submission: Exempted states are required to submit their registry updates at least annually in January. In addition, those states in which the MRIP Fishing Effort Survey is conducted (Maine through Mississippi) have been asked to submit updated current license holder lists electronically each month to assure the survey performs as designed. Most states have met this request; some have not. [Timely submission allows](#)

for adjustment of the related FHTS, LPTS, and APAIS sampling frames.

- State license exceptions: Many states provide exceptions to license or registration requirements for certain anglers. The fewer such exceptions, the more complete the database.
- Non-compliant anglers and for-hire vessel operators: Non-compliance with state licensing and registration requirements is a major source of incompleteness of the state registries. Improving compliance through more effective education and enforcement is an important measure necessary to significantly improve the completeness of state registries.
- 

With respect to the reduction of error rates and non-angler entries in the state databases, the following measures would be helpful:

- Reduce or eliminate inclusion of saltwater privileges in state combination licenses. Also, eliminate general fishing licenses or require a saltwater stamp or endorsement for general fishing license holders who wish to fish in salt water. These measures will reduce the large number of persons who purchase combination licenses or general fishing licenses to cover desired privileges, but do not fish in saltwater.
- Add QA/QC measures states can do to reduce error rates in registry databases.

**Commented [G12]:** To be developed with advice from ST 6.

Specific components of required Reports to Congress:

- Inventory and explanation of any use of information collected by such State programs and by the Secretary. Compile from results of pending customer satisfaction survey.
- Priorities for improving recreational fishing data collection. Compile from current summary of Regional Implementation Plan and national priorities.
- Description of the estimated accuracy of state registry information and the information from each State program that is used to assist in completing surveys or evaluating effects of conservation and management measures.
- Describe measures by which accuracy and completeness of registry data will be described, including: extent of license exemptions; address error/returned mail rates; performance in database screening, etc. For FES states, consider reporting on (1) percent of persons in non-matched frame (those that do not have licenses) who reported fishing; (2) the rate at which NSAR addresses match to the address frame by state and sub-state, which provides a measure of errors in the registry addresses.
- Describe measures by which accuracy of state components of qualifying regional surveys will be evaluated, including: use of certified survey designs/degree to which state surveys meet certification ToR; state use of QA/QC; state survey conformity with MRIP Data Standard.

**Commented [GW13]:** Note: State partnerships components should be noted that will support each bullet.



## Appendix I MRIP Implementation Funding Process

To address MRIP’s focus on implementation, the ESC charged the MRIP OT with the “development of recommendations for NMFS/MRIP to make additional investments in survey implementation and operations” of recreational survey methods. The goals of this process are to 1) support implementation of certified methods that satisfy the *minimum* needs for management and science, and result in regional survey programs that achieve at least the *minimum* MRIP standards for coverage, resolution, and data elements, and 2) establish a consistent, priority-based foundation for investment of available funds for data collections that exceed minimum needs.

Implementation funds will be allotted from “new” MRIP funding, as current funding allocations (e.g. FIN funding) will likely remain level. Additionally, funding will not be used to replace existing partner funds for recreational fisheries data collection.

### *National Guidelines*

MRIP has established national guidelines for the prioritization of NMFS’ investments in implementation of new survey methods. Specifically, funding priority will be based upon the extent to which surveys, alone or in combination with other surveys, are being implemented in a region:

- Utilize MRIP-certified<sup>2</sup> survey designs or methodologies;
- Achieve MRIP standards for survey coverage and basic data elements, as well as any future standards adopted by the program ([http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/Assets/recreational/pdf/National\\_Standards\\_for\\_Survey\\_Coverage\\_and\\_Data\\_Elements.pdf](http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/Assets/recreational/pdf/National_Standards_for_Survey_Coverage_and_Data_Elements.pdf));
- Provide recreational (or non-commercial) catch estimates for fisheries managed under MSRA—including Atlantic HMS—or jointly by the states and NMFS that are sufficient to
  - Contribute to reliable stock assessments;
  - Support development of acceptable biological catch recommendations, annual catch limits (ACLs), and accountability measures that meet MSRA requirements; and
  - Support development of recreational regulations that minimize triggering of accountability measures.
  - Allow reasonably precise tracking of recreational catch against ACLs

---

<sup>2</sup> MRIP certification is granted after the proposed method has undergone MRIP-led internal and external peer review and has been determined to be a statistically sound and credible method for estimating catch and effort data.

### ***Regional Planning***

Each Regional Implementation Team<sup>3</sup> is responsible for identifying regional needs and developing a plan to implement improved data collection designs that address both regional and national needs. Regional implementation plans, which will be reviewed and approved by the OT and ESC, will provide estimated implementation costs, and will reflect consensus among partners within a region with respect to regional needs and implementation priorities.

Regional implementation plans will include:

- Descriptions of regional needs for recreational fishing statistics, including needs for coverage, resolution, precision and timeliness of survey estimates;
- A baseline assessment of current data collection programs, including the extent to which current programs satisfy needs and identification of data collection gaps;
- Recommendations and justification for a sequential, prioritized approach for implementing improved methods that address national and regional needs that are currently unmet;
- A proposed process for combining statistics derived from multiple sources<sup>4</sup>;
- Estimated costs, overall and for individual survey components.

Each year, NMFS OST will review Regional Implementation Plans and establish agency funding priorities across regional programs. OST will develop metrics, based on the above national guidelines and subject to ESC review and approval, for assessing the Regional Implementation Plans and setting OST priorities. To the extent possible, funding for improved survey methods will be permanent, and funded survey components will not be subjected to prioritization and evaluation in subsequent years. Evaluation and prioritization in subsequent years will be limited to unfunded data collections described in the implementation plans. Exceptions will be made in the event of reduced and/or insufficient funding to cover the costs of approved data collections and/or changes to regional priorities, which will be reassessed at a minimum of every five years, coincidental to NMFS' science program review cycle<sup>5</sup>. Funding may also be reallocated, if it is determined by the ESC or OST that expenditures are inconsistent with the approaches described in the Regional Implementation Plans.

---

<sup>3</sup> The MRIP ESC determined that regional FINs and their equivalents will serve as the MRIP Regional Implementation Teams (<http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/Assets/recreational/pdf/2013-2014%20Implementation%20Plan%20Update.pdf>)

<sup>4</sup> For example, regions may implement data collections that are specific to a sector or species. Implementation plans should describe how information generated from these sources will be integrated with more generalized data collections to either supplement or replace alternative estimates.

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/science-program-review/index>

### *Program Reporting*

Regional implementation Teams are expected to submit annual reports describing progress in executing Regional Implementation Plans. Annual reports will describe MRIP data collection activities, document expenditures, and assess the extent to which regional goals and needs for recreational fisheries statistics have been satisfied. For regional partnerships currently funded through a NMFS grant (e.g., ACCSP, FIN, Pacific RecFIN), MRIP program updates can be incorporated into existing reporting requirements (e.g., annual grant reports).

### **Appendix II**

#### **Methodology for ranking partner proposals for increasing sample size or scope of current regional survey(s):**

- Scope of applicable projects:
  - Expansions of existing surveys to assess partner needs for general survey:
    - Sampling levels (i.e. to increase the number of samples broadly to improve precision of estimates generally, or for a selected component of the fishery, such as a rare event species group or the offshore fisheries); and/or
    - Coverage (i.e. adding sampling to include catch of invertebrates, sampling in Waves not currently sampled, and expanding geographic coverage to include tidal rivers upstream of current sampling).
  - New surveys that replace components of current general surveys, but only to the extent that sampling levels/coverage exceeds the current survey.
- Initial screening questions (must answer yes to all for a proposal to be eligible to be ranked and considered for funding):
  - Does the project or survey expansion meet the objectives of the Regional Implementation Plan as determined by the applicable Regional Implementation Team?
  - Is the survey proposed for expansion MRIP certified? If not, is there a plan in progress and on track to achieve certification?
  - Does the requested increase fully describe the current sampling baseline, and the estimated cost of the proposed enhancement?
  - Does the request include specific measures of improvement to be achieved?
  - Project narratives should discuss the potential for improvements promised by a proposed project to be offset by reductions in data quality elsewhere. (For example, will the benefits of efforts to increase the timeliness of estimates by going to monthly waves be offset by reductions in precision due to lower sample size per estimate?)
- Criteria for ranking proposals:
  - Determine whether, and if so to what extent, the proposed sampling level relates to specific survey objectives (High (H)/Medium (M)/Low (L)).

- Quantify the increment of improvement the proposed expansion would achieve for one or more of the following (scoring is additive) with respect to recreationally significant managed species or species groups:
  - If the proposal is to increase sample size to improve overall survey precision, then include a quantitative assessment of the expected improvement in Percent Standard Error (PSE) or other measure of precision (H = achieving annual PSE of 30% for targeted managed species; M = achieving annual PSE of 50% for targeted managed species; L = reduction of lesser magnitude).
  - If the proposal is to extend the survey's coverage in time or space, then estimate the proportion of catch that will be added to the overall estimate (> 15% = H; 5-15% = M; <5% = L) derived from the expanded survey, as compared to the current condition.
  - If the proposal is to add targeted sampling to improve precision of a species or species group, then include an assessment of the expected improvement in the PSE or other measure of precision. (H = achieving annual PSE of 30% for targeted species; M = achieving annual PSE of 50% for targeted species; L = reduction of lesser magnitude)
- Determine whether a proposed expansion will address specific findings of a fisheries stock assessment or assessments that have determined that the properties of current estimates fail to fully meet assessment requirements. If this criterion is part of the project justification, the proposal must include a specific characterization of the scientific uncertainty it will address and the likelihood of success in doing so, including addressing the questions:
  - Will proposed expansion fully or partially resolve the deficiency? (Fully = H; Partially = M; Not = L)
  - Will it address deficiencies for a single or multiple species? (Multiple = H; Single = M; None = L)
- Determine whether a proposed expansion will result in a quantifiable reduction in management uncertainty associated with a fishery's ACL reduction to an Annual Catch Target or "buffer".
  - Proportionate reduction in the size of the buffer. Include current baseline, estimated reduction in size of buffer, and basis for the estimated reduction. (H/M/L)
  - Number of recreationally-significant managed fisheries for which management uncertainty is reduced (fisheries may be single species or species groups, when managed as such). (H/M/L)
- Importance of the fishery(ies) for which the targeted specified improvements will be achieved, as measured by:
  - The economic importance of the targeted fishery(ies) to the region (H/M/L based on how targeted fisheries compare to others in the region), using an

initial proxy<sup>6</sup> for economic importance (see footnote) for the targeted fisheries and seasons<sup>7</sup>:

- Estimates of number of directed fishing trips for targeted species (H = 5% or greater of total trips in project period/region; M = 3-5% of trips; L = less than 3% of trips).
- The vulnerability of the targeted fishery(ies) to overfishing (H/M/L based on the status of the targeted stock(s): (H = exceeding overfished or overfishing threshold; M = exceeding overfished or overfishing target; L = not exceeding overfished or overfishing indicators).
- The contribution of the recreational fishery to the stock status using percent recreational and commercial mortality (H = > 50%; M = 30-50%; L = < 30%).
- The extent to which the expansion would disrupt ongoing data collection efforts. i.e. the ease of implementation. (H = proposals that would require minimal effort to implement, e.g., sample size increases within framework of existing survey; M = proposals that would require moderate effort, e.g. proposed work might be new but would be closely integrated within framework of existing surveys - minimizing transition and calibration efforts; L= proposals that would require extensive effort to implement, e.g., separate surveys intended to replace or be completely independent of existing survey framework - requiring considerable transition and calibration efforts).
- Cost effectiveness, measured as score from above divided by total cost

### **Appendix III State Program Information Required for Report to Congress**

(1) Estimated accuracy of state registry information and the information from each State program that is used to assist in completing surveys or evaluating effects of conservation and management measures;

(a) Registry data

- Error rates for names and addresses in state registry databases;
- The presence of one or more major exceptions to state saltwater licensing requirements;
- The timeliness of state license database submission to NMFS for annual and monthly (where relevant) submission; and

---

<sup>6</sup> For future development: work with economists to develop a direct indicator of economic benefit, e.g. level of expenditures, employment, or other available economic indicators associated with targeted fisheries.

<sup>7</sup> This comparison could be based on current directed effort, or historic directed effort patterns, if it has been reduced in recent years due to management restrictions implemented to address overfishing. For seasonally restricted fisheries, the comparison could also focus on directed effort proportions during that seasonal period, if the proposed project will only run during the season.

- License non-compliance rates as measured by the proxy: proportion of persons who report fishing to the FES who are not matched in the state license database.

(b) Survey data

- Conduct of non-certified surveys; and
- Degree to which MRIP standards are met. Including standards for coverage and data gaps.

(2) Priorities for improving recreational fishing data collection;

- This will be derived by compiling the priorities from MRIP Regional Implementation Plans as of the beginning of FY21.

(3) Explanation of any use of information collected by such state programs and by the Secretary

- This information will be derived from the MRIP Communications and Education Team's ongoing customer satisfaction survey, results of which are pending as of Dec. 2019.

**Appendix IV**

Hold for FIN governing docs?

**Appendix V**

Hold for RecFIN governing docs?