

**ADVISORY PANEL  
Motions and Rationale  
June 2-5, 2025 - Newport, OR**

**D1 AFA Program Review Report**

**AP Motion 1**

The AP appreciates the receipt of the AFA Program Review and the AP recommends that the Council accept the AFA Program Review.

*Main Motion passes 19-0*

***Rationale in Support of Motion***

- *The AP noted appreciation of Staff's work to conduct this Review of the fairly mature AFA program. Many of the recent challenges the BS pollock fishery has currently faced were factors outside direct control of the AFA cooperative program structure. The program review adequately captured the benefits of AFA's cooperative management of the pollock fishery in the BSAI.*
- *The cooperative participation in the fishery was stable throughout the time period despite COVID 19, global market weaknesses, increased costs, and other declining fisheries. While there was some consolidation due to factors outside of the AFA control, in general the consolidation did not impact harvest; harvest was maintained around 99% of the annual allocation and still achieved optimum yield. This stability can be partially attributed to the ability to diversify products and markets.*
- *CDQ involvement and dependence has increased over the last 7 years, especially when other fisheries have experienced declines.*
- *The AP appreciated and recognized the importance of communities, especially those that are dependent on BSAI Pollock. The AP requested that staff expand upon the importance of pollock for the dependent communities.*
- *It was noted that minimum utilization rates, as defined and required by Amendment 49, well-exceed the minimum requirement by improved recovery rates. However, the AP did have some discussion due to confusion regarding utilization rates and how they are calculated. For the next program review, the AP requested that staff describe how utilization rates are based on the total harvest weight compared to the product weight. This should include a discussion of how utilization rate and recovery rate are different, but that recovery rate drives utilization rates. For example, product recovery rates for products like meal, where the evaporation of water is a non-recoverable recovery loss, leads to lower utilization rates.*
- *The AP requested this additional detail because it was noted that processors are continuously working toward full "utilization" of pollock through development of new product forms and increased product recovery (ex: advances in protein recovery from processing wastewater*

*streams and new market development for fish meal and oil). In that interpretation, industry is approaching full or 100% "utilization" in many operations for primary catch species. The use of the word "utilization" in the processing sector which is more understood by the public, and the rates of "utilization" required by Amendment 49 and published in the AFA review can create misperceptions on how processors and industry are actually using or "utilizing" the catch.*

- *PSC has generally seen a decrease due to cooperative management and incentive measures. While it is recognized that chum psc was variable over the years, the cooperative mgmt and incentive measures have shown to be working to reduce bycatch in response to the higher years.*
- *The AP noted that vessel safety has improved since the last program review.*