

# **Economic Data Reporting (EDR) November 2020 Stakeholder Discussions**

## **Summary and Themes**

NPFMC April 2021

Presented by Katie Latanich, Facilitator

# 3 EDR Stakeholder Discussion Tasks

Task 1: Review EDR **purpose and need**

Task 2: Provide input on opportunities for **consistency** across EDRs

Task 3: Review EDR **forms and variables**

# Context and Participation

- Variable participation
- Comments in depth but not comprehensive or representative of an entire sector's view
- Comments not generalized or weighted (“the majority of participants...”) (a few exceptions)
- Participation in discussion does not indicate support for or against an alternative

# Context and Participation

- “Analysts” refers to the core group of experts who participated in all four meetings
  - Sarah Marrinan, Council Economist, SSPT Coordinator
  - Steve Kasperski, SSPT Chair, Economic Program Manager, NMFS AFSC
  - Brian Garber-Yonts, Research Economist, NMFS AFSC
  - Scott Miller, Industry Economist, NMFS ARO

# Approach for today's presentation

- Part 1: **Cross-cutting themes** across all 4 meetings
  - Task 1: Purpose and need
  - Task 2: Consistency
  - Task 3: EDR form and variables - just frequency (discussed at all 4)
- Part 2: **EDR-specific themes** by task
  - BSAI Crab EDR
  - GOA Groundfish Trawl EDR
  - Amendment 91 Chinook Salmon EDR
  - Amendment 80 EDR



*Slides will include footnote references to report page numbers*

# **Part 1: Cross-cutting themes**

# **Task 1: Review EDR purpose and need**

# **Task 1: Review purpose and need Discussion questions**

- Is the original purpose and need statement still relevant to the Council's needs today? Why or why not?
- Do you feel the information collected through your sector's EDR is responsive to the purpose and need statement? Why or why not?



# Task 1: Review purpose and need

## Cross-cutting themes

- Context and history (analysts)
  - Purpose and need statements progressively more focused in scope
  - Comprehensive socioeconomic data collection initiative considered but suspended ('06-'10)

# Task 1: Review purpose and need

## Cross-cutting themes

- Focus and scope - broadly informative or targeted?
- Drivers - why have EDRs?
  - Limited Access Privilege Programs
  - Economic impacts of bycatch management
- Responsiveness - managing expectations
- Duration of data collection

**Task 2: Provide input on opportunities to improve consistency across EDRs or holistic changes**

# “Consistency” references Draft Alternative 3

Alternative 3. Holistic changes to EDRs (reconsider existing purpose and need statements).

Option[x]. For example, if the intention is for EDR data to more routinely inform Council decision documents, an EDR that is (relatively) consistent across fisheries may increase the utility for decision-making and analytical purposes while balancing considerations of reporting burden.

## **Task 2: Consistency Discussion questions**

- What information do you think would be most valuable to gather consistently across fisheries?
- Are there attributes of your fishery that you would like the Council and analysts to better understand?
- What other ideas and options would you like the Council to consider if they choose to continue exploring the idea of a consistent EDR form?

# Task 2: Consistency

## Cross-cutting themes

- Most challenging and conceptual task
- Two themes
  - Closely linked with Task 1 and perspectives on relevance of purpose and need statements and burden and utility
  - Suggests need for simplification and consistent interpretation of the information requested

# **Task 3: Review EDR forms and variables**

# References Draft Alternative 2, Components 3 (frequency) and “x” (placeholder)

Alternative 2. Smaller changes to existing EDRs (generally, under the current purpose and need statements). Make the following revisions, where needed, in the EDR sections of the crab or groundfish FMPs. (*Components not mutually exclusive.*)

Component 3. Revise EDR collection period to every (options: 2 years; 3 years; or 5 years)

Component [x]. Any additional small changes to one or more existing EDR programs



# Task 3: EDR Forms and variables

## Discussion questions

- How would changing the **frequency** of data collection (every 2, 3, or 5 years) change the burden of data collection for you and your company? How would it impact your recordkeeping practices?

# Task 3: EDR Forms and variables

## Discussion questions

- Are there other examples of **small changes** to your sector's EDR that you think could reduce burden to you, your business, or your sector?
- Are there specific questions you find vague, or that you are concerned other respondents may be **interpreting** differently than you do?

# Task 3: Frequency

## Cross-cutting themes

- Clarification (report one year of data every 2, 3, or 5 years? Report 2, 3, 5 years of cumulative data?)
- Reduced reporting frequency would likely reduce reporting burden
- Reduced frequency could miss impacts of in-year events, e.g. Covid

# **Part 2: Themes by EDR program**

# EDR Stakeholder Discussion Tasks

Task 1: Review EDR **purpose and need**

Task 2: Provide input on opportunities for **consistency** across EDRs

Task 3: Review EDR **forms and variables**

# **1. BSAI Crab Rationalization EDR**

# Task 1: Purpose and need

- Focus: 2 purpose and need statements (2002 and 2012); 2012 focuses on concerns about data quality and excessive burden
- Analysts: EDR revision process can be an opportunity to clarify elements of original purpose and need not expressly carried forward

## Task 2: Consistency

- *Covered previously under cross-cutting themes*
  - *Closely linked to purpose and need discussion*
  - *Suggests the need for simplification and consistent interpretation of the information being requested*



# Task 3: Sector-specific considerations

Focus: Complexity of the BSAI crab rationalization program and implications for economic data reporting

- Operational complexity and alignment with EDR format
  - Example: accounting for overages and forfeitures
- Attributes of the fishery participants would like the Council and analysts to better understand
  - Example: Ownership information

## **2. Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Trawl EDR**

# Task 1: Purpose and need

*From purpose and need: “The Council is interested in developing a data collection program that can be established prior to the implementation of a trawl catch share program in the GOA.”*

- Focus: Agreement on need to revisit P&N, participants feel is no longer relevant
- Other concerns:
  - Data quality, consistency of interpretation
  - Equity - why should this fishery have an EDR?
  - Burden - not supported by cost recovery; time and opportunity cost

## Task 2: Consistency

- Complexity of the Gulf of Alaska region contributes to fragmentation, complicates the concept of consistency, and limits utility of data (e.g., establishing a baseline)

# Task 3: Sector-specific considerations

- Broader context: Stakeholder perspective that the program should be discontinued
- Two topics discussed:
  - Fuel costs - utility for understanding changes pre/post rationalization; format
  - Community and crew information - use for recent analyses; examples of valuable data

### **3. Amendment 91 Chinook Salmon EDR**

# Task 1: Purpose and need

- Agreement on need to revisit purpose and need, participants feel is no longer relevant
- 2 areas of focus
  - Relationship between EDRs and annual Incentive Plan Agreement (IPA) reports
  - Feasibility of gaining insight into complex bycatch avoidance behavior

## Task 2: Consistency

- Agreement that this program is different than other EDRs and existing purpose and need does not align with the concept of consistency
- Analysts: One interpretation of consistency - consistent economic information across catch share programs



# Task 3: Sector-specific considerations

- Broader context: Stakeholder view that purpose and need is no longer relevant and EDR should be discontinued; don't see potential for small changes to reduce burden
- Data collection has not functioned as intended; analysts felt this is due to data collection methods and not because objectives are unattainable

## **4. Amendment 80 EDR**

# Task 1: Purpose and need

2 areas of focus

- Assessing incremental economic impacts of bycatch reduction measures over time; feasibility of predicting impacts of future actions
- Focus of EDR: impacts of bycatch reduction or broader economic performance?

## Task 2: Consistency

- *Covered previously under cross-cutting themes*
  - *Closely linked to purpose and need discussion*
  - *Suggests the need for simplification and consistent interpretation of the information being requested*

# Task 3: Sector-specific considerations

Focus: In-depth discussion of opportunities for streamlining and clarifying

- Variables that change infrequently
- Capital expenditures

# Task 3: Sector-specific considerations

Topic: Fields that change infrequently

Table 1	Vessel Identification
Table 2.1	Vessel Characteristics - Survey Value
Table 2.2	Vessel Characteristics - Fuel Consumption
Table 2.3	Vessel Characteristics - Freezer Space
Table 2.4	Vessel Characteristics - Processing Capacity

Reasons for changes

- Vessel or permit changing hands
- Updated survey
- Vessel changes - e.g. repower, lengthen, changes to factory or equipment

# Task 3: Sector-specific considerations

Topic: Reporting capital expenditures

- Relates to Tables 1 and 2.1 -2.4 as well as:
  - Table 4: Capital Expenditures and Materials Usage
  - Table 5: Expenses
- Issues: Differentiating between...
  - Investment and depreciation
  - Capital expenditures and routine repair/maintenance
  - Routine and out-of-scale expenditures

# Task 3: Sector-specific considerations

## Ideas for clarifying and streamlining

- Adjust frequency (e.g. every 3 or 5 years)
- Provide additional context (e.g., optional follow-up interview)
- Pre-populating fields



**Questions?**