

# Consideration of “Hybrid” OFD SSC Meeting – 02/06/09

- Scallop PDT considered an additional OFD alternative on Dec 16
- Scallop Committee included in A15 for consideration on Jan 22
- Scallop Committee requests SSC input before final inclusion by Council on Feb 11

# Status Quo Overfishing Definition

$F_{\text{threshold}} = F_{\text{max}}$ , currently estimated at 0.29

$F_{\text{target}} = 0.8 F_{\text{threshold}}$  BUT see below

**Main problem: Spatially averaged fishing mortalities average between closed and fished areas, so that fishing at the target can result in growth overfishing of open areas**

For this reason, Amendment 10 has a provision that allows the PDT to recommend a lower target if it anticipates that serious growth overfishing would otherwise occur – it was used to reduce the target in both F18 and F19. However, the targets set by this method are set in an *ad-hoc* manner which lacks an objective criterion for the target level.

# A10 proposed OFD

- In setting  $F_{\text{threshold}}$  it takes the status of all areas into account. Closed areas (GF, EFH and closed access areas) are not included in calculation of  $F$ .
- $F$  for access areas set using time-average approach
- $F$  for open areas set using conventional  $F_{\text{max}}$  approach
- Overfishing if  $F$  in non-closed areas higher than number-weighted average of  $F_{\text{target}}$ s for access and open areas

# Pros of A10 proposed OFD

- Sets F target in more systematic fashion compared to SQ – which is more ad hoc
- Overall YPR increased compared to SQ
- Considers F across time and space – optimum yield from all AVAILABLE areas
- Prevents growth overfishing in open areas
- Incorporated diff growth rate data for MA and GB – which generates different target Fs per area
- Target can be set closer to threshold if significant portion of resource in closed areas

## Cons of A10 proposed OFD

- It has been discussed at recent meetings that one drawback of proposed OFD in A15 is that  $F_{\text{threshold}}$  would vary each year and the status determination of overfishing would be difficult/confusing to determine because the areas used would vary per year

# Hybrid Alternative

- Marriage or compromise of SQ and A10 proposed OFD
- Pro of SQ – maintain method for setting  $F_{\text{threshold}}$  – simple to assess each year
- Pro of A10 OFD – systematic way to set  $F_{\text{target}}$  that is consistent with area rotation

# Hybrid Alternative

- F threshold would be spatial average of all areas
  - same as SQ –  $F = 0.29$
- F target for open areas would be 80-90% of  $F_{msy}$  (0.23 to 0.26)
- F target for access areas would generally be higher using time-averaging principle
- In theory, F threshold of 0.29 could still lead to localized overfishing in open areas, however  $F_{target}$ s in this method would take spatial variation into account – minimizing risk of localized overfishing

2008	Open area F	Total F	Overall F	OF Threshold	DAS allocated	Projected Catch
Status Quo	0.29	0.29	0.22	0.29	35	43650
A10 Proposed	0.26	0.28	0.21	0.34	32	42011
Hybrid	0.26	0.28	0.21	0.29	32	42011
2009	Open area F	Total F	Overall F	OF Threshold	DAS allocated	Projected Catch
Status Quo	0.26	0.22	0.18	0.29	42	46294
A10 Proposed	0.26	0.22	0.18	0.34	42	46294
Hybrid	0.26	0.22	0.18	0.29	42	46294

Open area = just open areas  
Total F = excludes closed areas, including open and access areas only  
Overall F = includes all areas, including closed, access and open