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#### Abstract

Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) uses a variety of catch monitoring tools to support fisheries management efforts. These tools include fisher pre-departure and pre-arrival notifications, commercial sales slips, fisher questionnaires, effort monitoring, creel surveys, logbooks, dockside monitoring, at-sea observers, and electronic monitoring systems with video. The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of these tools in the typical contexts in which they are employed to monitor catch and to highlight their strengths and weaknesses in providing dependable catch data. The report also provides a compilation of the monitoring tools and details on their implementation (e.g., intended coverage levels) for Canada's major fisheries managed by DFO.

DFO is currently developing a national fishery monitoring policy to ensure that DFO has timely and accessible fishery-dependent information of sufficient quality to manage fisheries sustainably. This report provides information to support the implementation of this policy once it is finalized.


## INTRODUCTION

Catch monitoring provides information on catch and other details related to fishing activities. This is undertaken by Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) staff, fishers, fish buyers, or designated third-party individuals. Data from catch monitoring are used primarily to support fisheries management efforts and as critical input to resource assessments, but can also be used for other purposes such as enforcement activities and directed scientific research. Resource managers use the collected data to make ongoing management decisions, for withinseason management actions, for longer-term fisheries planning, and for national and international reporting on landings. Scientists use the collected data for directed research and to feed into stock assessments that provide an evaluation of the stock status and the risks to conservation of different management options. Fishery officers use the collected data to carry out compliance and enforcement activities. Dependable data is therefore necessary to support these efforts and contribute to the long-term sustainable management of fisheries.

In addition to having different uses, the various catch monitoring tools also provide information that differs in content, scope, resolution and data quality. For example, some tools only report on retained catch, with varying degrees of accuracy and precision, while others report on both retained and non-retained catch. Data can be collected using a variety of techniques and may be reported by resource users or independently collected. Resource user-dependent catch monitoring tools include fisher pre-departure and pre-arrival notifications, fisher questionnaires, creel surveys, and logbooks. Third-party (i.e., independent-observer) catch monitoring tools include dockside monitoring, at-sea observers, effort monitoring, and electronic monitoring systems with video. Each of these tools has benefits and limitations that impact the quality of the inferences drawn (i.e., their bias and variability) from the data they provide and the dependability of these inferences (i.e., the likelihood of drawing correct conclusions based on the data) (for additional details on quality and dependability in the fishery monitoring context see Allard and Benoît 2019).

## SCOPE

The scope of this report is national and it applies to common catch monitoring tools used in Canadian commercial, recreational, and Indigenous fisheries licensed and/or managed by DFO under the Fisheries Act. In this report, it is assumed that personnel are trained appropriately and equipment is functioning. The benefits and limitations of the various tools are discussed as they relate to the quality of the data they produce. Quality control or quality assurance of catch data is beyond the scope of this report. While other factors are important when choosing a monitoring tool, such as cost, feasibility, etc., these are beyond the scope of this report.
The monitoring tools are discussed in the contexts in which they are generally applied. The principal factors affecting the quality of the data provided by the various monitoring tools are discussed. This information should allow for a better evaluation of data quality for specific contexts as well as the identification of strategies to improve monitoring programs. While the information presented and discussed herein should cover the majority of Canadian fisheries, a detailed discussion of catch monitoring programs across the diverse range of fisheries, each with its own biological and operational characteristics, is beyond the scope of this report.

## GLOSSARY

Indigenous, in relation to a fishery (Food, Social and Ceremonial): fish is harvested by an Indigenous organization or any of its members for the purpose of using the fish as food, for social or ceremonial purposes, or for purposes set out in a land claims agreement entered into with the Indigenous organization. (Fisheries Act, Subsection 2(1))

Bycatch: a) retained catch that includes species, and specimens of the target species, such as specimens of a particular sex, size or condition, that the fisher is not licensed to direct for but may or must retain; and, b) all non-retained catch, including catch released from gear and entanglements, whether alive, injured or dead, and whether of the target species or the nontarget species. (DFO, 2013)

Commercial, in relation to a fishery: fish is harvested under the authority of a license for the purpose of sale, trade, or barter. (Fisheries Act, Subsection 2(1))

Dependability (referring to inferences drawn from data): Dependability is taken here to mean the ability of the parameter estimation process (e.g., estimating total landings of a species) to reach the objectives for which it is intended (e.g., determining whether a quota has been reached). The statistical characteristics that affect dependability are the variance and bias of the estimator.

Fishery: includes the area, locality, place or station in or on which a pound, seine, net, weir or other fishing appliance is used, set, placed or located, and the area, tract or stretch of water in or from which fish may be taken by the said pound, seine, net, weir or other fishing appliance, and also the pound, seine, net, weir, or other fishing appliance used in connection therewith.
(Fisheries Act, Subsection 2(1))
Fishing: means fishing for, catching or attempting to catch fish by any method. (Fisheries Act, Subsection 2(1))
Fishing activity: a unit of fishing that involves the deployment, retrieval and emptying of the fishing gear at a chosen fishing site. When nets, pots or traps are strung together, these are considered a single fishing activity.
Fishing trip: one or more fishing activities, along with travel to and from fishing grounds and the selection of fishing sites, which begins when a fishing vessel leaves the port and ends when the vessel returns to port to offload its catch.

Non-retained catch: consists of any species or specimens that are not retained for use and that are returned to the water. The returned catch may be alive, injured or dead. This includes catch brought on board and thrown back, catch released from gear before it is brought on board (such as catch released from a purse seine before the seine is fully pursed), and catch that becomes visibly entangled in fishing gear, such as entangled whales, birds and sea turtles. This does not include catch that escaped the fishing gear, that was removed by predators and scavengers, or that dropped out dead from the gear. (DFO, 2013)
Quality (referring to inferences drawn from data): the validity of the estimate of the parameter. The quality of the estimation will depend on its accuracy (converse: bias) and its precision (converse: variability).
Recreational, in relation to a fishery: fish is harvested under the authority of a licence for personal use of the fish or for sport. (Fisheries act, Subsection 2(1))
Retained catch: the portion of the catch that is retained for use. This includes landed catch as well as catch that is used in some way but not landed, such as catch that is used for bait. (DFO, 2013)

Species at Risk Act listed species: species listed on the List of Wildlife Species at Risk as set out in Schedule 1. A species at risk means an extirpated, endangered, or threatened species or a species of special concern. (Species at Risk Act)
Target catch: retained catch that consists of the species that the fisher is licensed to direct for, in other words, the target species of the fishery. In a multispecies fishery, this includes any species that the licence holder is licensed to direct for on a given fishing trip regardless of whether the licence holder did so or not. (DFO, 2013)
Third-party monitoring: monitoring performed by a person or group besides those primarily involved in the fishing.

## SURVEY OF CANADIAN FISHERY MONITORING

Fishery managers and stock assessment scientists were approached to provide information on the current use of fishery monitoring tools in Canada's major fisheries. The responses were collated to provide an overview of the different types of tools used in Canadian fisheries and the range of targeted coverage associated with each tool. Appendix 1 summarizes the responses that were received and is neither an official listing of all of Canada's fisheries nor is it meant to be an official source of the listed fishery's monitoring tools or coverage levels. It is presented here solely to help with putting each of the described tools in the context of Canadian fisheries.

## CENSUS AND SAMPLING

Complete coverage (i.e. 100\% coverage; a census) of a fishery provides the most comprehensive and highest quality data from a tool compared to an otherwise identical case in which coverage is below $100 \%$ (i.e., a survey). For catch monitoring, this would, for example, include complete coverage of all fleets, trips, and all activities within each trip. However, often this level of coverage is not attained and a sample is obtained instead. Survey sampling is the process of selecting a subset of elements from a target population to conduct a survey. This information is then used to draw inferences about the population as a whole.
In order to obtain a dependable estimation of catch when survey coverage is less than $100 \%$, a properly designed and implemented survey is required. Data quality is reduced if it cannot be expanded accurately to the fishery. To ensure dependable inference of a fishery's catch, it is necessary that the sampled trips be statistically exchangeable by design (e.g., sampling that is random, stratified random, systematic or proportional to size), or conditionally exchangeable using post-stratification (e.g., Rago et al. 2005) or via a model (e.g., modelling bycatch as a function of habitat and target species catch; e.g., Cosandey-Godin et al. 2015) (for an overview of sampling designs for catch monitoring see Cotter and Pilling 2007). Failure to meet this condition is often called a deployment effect, that is the trips sampled are not statistically representative of activities in the fleet (Benoît and Allard 2009; Faunce and Barbeaux 2011). (Note that in Allard and Benoît 2019 this concept is refined and the terms unintended sampling clustering, stratification, and irregular selection probabilities are used to describe what are collectively termed deployment effects here.) Deployment effects may occur due to difficulties such as incomplete knowledge of the population of trips or operational limitations. For example, global or local (e.g., in isolated locations) gluts in demand for observers that cannot be met by the companies, inability (e.g., lack of space) or refusal of vessels to accommodate an observer, or perceived lack of safety by the observer or observer company. A deployment effect may result in a biased inference for catch. The magnitude of the bias will be a function of the extent to which sampled trips are unrepresentative of all trips. Furthermore, a deployment effect may result in an incorrect characterization of precision if the properties of sampled vessels are
correlated in regards to catch such that there is pseudo replication. This lack of independence among observations, unless accounted for, typically results in an underestimate of true sampling variance. See Allard and Benoît 2019 for a detailed discussion of the expected impacts of deployment effects.

## CATCH MONITORING TOOLS

## RESOURCE USER-DEPENDENT CATCH MONITORING TOOLS

Resource user-dependent catch monitoring is performed by a person or group involved in the fishing. Therefore, this type of monitoring is limited by additional potential biases and inaccurate reporting. This can be intentional (e.g., underreporting discards or intentional misreporting of the area of catch) or unintentional (e.g., oversight or incorrect identification of a species). Although there can be limitations to using resource user-dependent catch monitoring tools, they remain extremely useful. While it may be preferable to have all catch monitoring done through a third party (ideally one that is trained and certified), this is extremely difficult in practice, if not impossible, as it would require extensive resources. Resource user-dependent tools therefore remain necessary for catch monitoring. Furthermore, some of the issues identified here can be countered or reduced through the careful design and application of these tools. For example, independent verification can increase the quality of the data and statistical techniques can, in some cases, identify biased reporting.

## FISHER PRE-DEPARTURE AND PRE-ARRIVAL NOTIFICATIONS

Fisher pre-departure and pre-arrival notifications (also referred to as hailing-in/hailing out) refer to communication between a commercial fishing vessel and a third-party monitoring company, fishery managers, or enforcement officials prior to commencing a fishing trip and at the end of a fishing trip (often prior to reaching port). Managers may require fishers to communicate before leaving port, before returning to port, at the end of a fishing day, or all three. A main purpose of the tool is to assist in planning further monitoring and enforcement activities. Fisher predeparture notifications are typically provided within a mandated pre-departure timeframe to allow observer companies to plan deployment of at-sea observers (Palmer et al. 2016). These systems have been shown to significantly increase the randomness of observer deployments (Benoît and Allard 2009). Fisher pre-arrival notifications are typically provided to dockside monitoring companies to allow them to plan their dockside verification activities; this could be to plan the arrival of dockside monitors or to plan the requested sampling scheme if coverage is not $100 \%$. In some fisheries, fisher pre-arrival notifications are used to report daily catches on multi-day (extended) trips, which allow area or individual quotas to be closely regulated. Information conveyed in fisher pre-arrival notifications can include location, intended targeted species, and approximate amounts of catch. However, these notifications usually provide limited information on catch, only reporting approximate amounts and usually only focused on target species or species which the vessel has a licence to land. Fisher notifications are therefore not usually used as a sole source of reporting catch, but rather in conjunction with other catch monitoring tools. Fisher notifications account for individual fishing trips and can therefore provide a measure of fishing effort and could be used to verify compliance with mandatory logbook reporting. This is a resource user-dependent monitoring tool and the quality of the information reported can be limited by biased or imprecise reporting as described above.

## COMMERCIAL SALES SLIPS

Commercial sales slips report on fish that are sold at the first point of sale. Commercial fishers are responsible for ensuring that what they harvest is reported and sales slips are a common
method of doing this. They are a relatively common tool with most DFO regions (Central and Arctic, Newfoundland and Labrador, Pacific, Quebec, and Gulf regions) still using sales slips and requiring them to be submitted as part of their licence conditions (Appendix 1). However, catches that are retained for personal use, private sales (e.g., restaurant), or sold to other fishers (e.g., for bait) are often not accounted for through sales slips. Therefore, the information they provide could be underestimated. This is a resource user-dependent monitoring tool and the information reported can be limited by biased or imprecise reporting as described previously. For example, there may be deliberate misreporting via commercial sales slips to hide catch or to inflate it (Bijsterveld et al. 2002). Factors that motivate hiding catch include underreporting revenue for tax purposes or to allow for continued fishing in fisheries with catch limits. Factors that motivate inflating catch include anticipation of the imposition of catch shares based on historical individual catches. This tool does not provide any information on nonretained catch. Electronic submissions of sales slips are also used which reduces opportunities for data entry errors and provides the timely transmission of information.

## FISHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Fisher questionnaires are another tool used to obtain information on fisheries. These questionnaires may be by mail, telephone, or electronic (e-mail or web/application based platform). Fisher questionnaires are often used in recreational fisheries to determine estimates of catch. This is the most common tool used in the Pacific Region of Canada to cover recreational fishing; no other region in Canada reported using recreational fishery questionnaires (Appendix 1). They are also used in commercial fisheries either during or postseason. For recreational licence holders, questionnaires are usually randomly distributed to a subset of the licensees to solicit their responses. In commercial fisheries, active licence holders that sold fish in the target season typically form the population from which participants are selected (e.g., McDermid et al. 2016). Questionnaires often collect information on the amount of effort directed at specific species (type and amount of gear used and the number of fishing units undertaken), the number/weight of species caught, and geographic regions that were targeted. Advantages of questionnaires include a lack of face-to-face bias (for example, tailoring responses based on the interviewer's reaction), more time for responses, and the ability to ask more complex questions. This is a resource user-dependent monitoring tool and the information reported can be limited by biased or imprecise reporting as described previously. Additional disadvantages include relying on recalls and non-responses, both of which can lead to increased variability. When recalls are biased toward unusual events such as large catches, or if non-responses are intentional, then bias could be introduced. Fishers may assume that they do not have to respond if they did not catch anything, generating a non-response bias. It is also not possible to clarify questions in mail or electronic questionnaires. Furthermore, unless the consistent interpretation of questions by respondents is validated, for example by using focus groups, clear-sounding questions may result in divergent answers due to misunderstanding of the questions' intent. Therefore, the quality of data provided by fisher questionnaires can be negatively affected by the lack of clarity and specificity in the questions, the elapsed time between the questionnaire and the events that are meant to be recalled, and response bias and error.

## EFFORT SURVEYS

Effort surveys may be done using aerial or on water counts which can be used to provide an estimate of total effort. Fishing effort is generally estimated from a count of buoys or anglers, vessels, or rods actively fishing throughout an area, providing an instantaneous effort count. This type of effort monitoring does not provide direct information on catch. However, the effort
estimate can be used with other tools that provide an estimate of catch per unit effort (e.g., creel surveys, fisher questionnaires) to provide an estimate of total catch.
In practice, full randomization of the effort monitoring can be impractical or even impossible which impacts the quality of the estimate. Factors that can make randomization a challenge include darkness, aircraft availability, accessibility and weather. For example, aircraft may have to follow a non-randomized flight path or may not be able to fly during some poor weather conditions. Poor weather conditions or poor visibility may also bias the estimate.

## CREEL SURVEYS

A creel survey is a tool used to obtain information on a fishery, often by interview in the field. This tool is most often used in recreational fisheries to estimate the total catch and effort to support sustainable management. Fishery technicians may interview anglers and collect information that can include location of fishing, species and amount of fish caught and released, time spent fishing, and number of anglers and lines. Fish may also be measured, weighed, and have biological materials collected. Generally, anglers are surveyed after fishing trips and this information is used to estimate total catch and effort. The information is also used to provide data on daily activity patterns. Creel surveys can report on all types of catch, both retained and non-retained. However, reporting on non-retained catch relies on the angler's recall and the angler's ability to correctly identify fish species. A recent survey of Canadian fisheries managed by DFO highlights that this tool is not widely used (Appendix 1). However, creel surveys are much more common in recreational fisheries managed by the provinces, which are not included in this report.

Using complementary surveys is a common technique for estimating catch in creel surveys with one survey to estimate catch per unit effort or catch rate, and a second to estimate total effort. These surveys can then be used together to produce an estimator for the total catch. One advantage to this method, which uses independent estimators, is that surveys can be optimally designed for what is being estimated. This is advantageous since designs that are best for estimating catch rate may not be best for estimating total effort. Fishing effort is generally estimated from effort monitoring programs (e.g., effort surveys described above). Anglers are generally surveyed to determine catch rate.
Creel surveys are often conducted over very large areas for an extended period of time. Creel survey coverage is most often less than $100 \%$ and inadequate survey design may lead to large sampling errors and high uncertainty of results. Often many assumptions need to be made to estimate total catch, which decreases the quality of the data. For example, the assumption of a constant catch rate over the duration of a fishing trip may not be suitable for some fisheries, such as a gill net fishery where net saturation can result in a declining catch rate. Alternatively, the assumption that fishing in one area is independent from fishing in another area may be violated. In other situations, the survey may not be implemented as designed. For example, when there is difficulty or inability to estimate effort during poor weather conditions or poor visibility which may bias the estimate. While obtaining a dependable estimate of total catch from creel surveys is difficult, it is one of the few tools used to estimate catch from recreational fisheries.

## LOGBOOKS

Logbooks are the fisher's account of catch and other fishing related details. Logbooks vary greatly from fishery to fishery, but can include information on total catch by species, discarded catch by species, fishing effort and location, gear used, protected species interactions, and much more. Therefore, this catch monitoring tool can provide information on retained catch
(target and non-target) and non-retained catch (target species, uncommon or rare species, and Species at Risk Act listed species). This is the most common tool used throughout Canada with most fisheries requiring logbooks to be completed and submitted. A recent survey covering many Canadian commercial fisheries indicated that only a few fisheries do not currently have logbooks as part of their monitoring tools (Appendix 1); all of those that reported using logbooks required $100 \%$ coverage. Logbooks are also required in a few recreation fisheries.
Logbooks are submitted either electronically or in paper form. Paper logbooks require the manual input of data, typically by DFO or a third-party service provider, which introduces additional opportunities for data entry errors. Fishers can be required to submit these logbooks at different times, such as when they complete a fishing trip or at the end of the season. Generally, the quality of the data is considered to be greater the earlier this information is submitted, reducing the need to recall information and enhancing the efficiency of corrective actions in cases where logbook reporting is deficient. Electronic logbooks can be submitted in close to real-time and have reduced resources required to input the data thus improving the data quality compared to paper logbooks under similar fishery scenarios.

This monitoring tool is resource user-dependent and therefore can be limited by biased or inaccurate reporting. Compared to records by at-sea observers, reports in logbooks often underreport catch amounts, overreport the frequency of zero catches and report a smaller diversity of species (e.g., Allen et al. 2002; Walsh et al. 2002; Bremner et al. 2009). There may be regulatory or economic incentives to misreport. These may include catch limits, prohibitions on catching certain species, capture of charismatic species, a desire to hide prime fishing locations or fear of enforcement actions (e.g., Stanley 1992; Metuzals et al. 2005; Rijnsdorp et al. 2007). For example, there is some evidence that misidentification of species may be deliberate to avoid or delay fishery closures (Faunce 2011) or that discards may be misreported for strategic reasons such as multispecies quotas (Branch et al. 2006). There may also be disincentives to report such as the time or effort required to complete the logbooks. In some fisheries, logbook completeness is not strictly enforced and missing data may introduce additional error or bias.

Quantification of catches reported in logbooks is typically based on a visual assessment and can therefore lack precision as a result of measurement error. This monitoring tool also relies on the fisher's ability to correctly identify taxa in the catch and therefore there may be a heightened degree of misidentification for uncommon or cryptic species. Finally, the quality of the data reported in logbooks depends on having clear, accurate, and specific instructions for completing each of the fields.

Independent verification of logbooks can minimize many of the limitations and increase the quality of the data from this tool. Independent measures of fishing activities, such as fisher predeparture or pre-arrival notifications and data from fishery enforcement overflights, can be used to ensure that logbook reporting requirements are being met. This information could also be used to post-stratify the data obtained from logbooks according to sectors in the fishery (e.g., different fishing districts or vessel classes) to correct for structural gaps or inequities in reporting when producing fishery-wide estimates (e.g., if reporting rates differ between sectors in a fishery). Boarding by fishery officers can be used to verify the accuracy of catch records in the logbooks. Similarly, catch records in logbooks and catch records provided by third-party at-sea observers can be compared to evaluate the quality of the data; however, the presence of observers can produce an invigilation effect (i.e. the act of observing ensures correct behavior) such that there is a high degree of compliance with logbook reporting requirements only when an observer is present (e.g., Benoît and Allard 2009). Strong concordance between observer and logbook records should therefore not be taken as a measure of the quality of logbook data for all fishing trips, including those without an observer. However, this is not the case for
comparisons of logbook entries and data from electronic monitoring with video where strong concordance between the two methods can be taken as a measure of quality because the nature of video monitoring is such that there is an invigilation effect at all times (e.g., Stanley et al. 2009, 2015; Further details provided below).

## DOCKSIDE MONITORING

Dockside monitoring programs provide third-party verification of fish landings, data collection, and often data entry. Dockside monitoring companies, either private companies or not-for-profit corporations, and the dockside observers they employ are designated by the Department to perform the duties related to the Dockside Monitoring Program, as indicated in the Fishery (General) Regulations and are qualified according to the Canadian General Standards Board (CGSB) Program Manual and the Dockside Monitoring Program Policy and Procedures. This ensures that each organization has a quality assurance system in place that ensures the integrity of the information and allows companies to consistently provide timely, accurate, and independent dockside monitoring services (DFO 2009). This includes proper documentation and training, established procedures and reporting standards, quality control, accountability, and internal audit. Dockside monitoring programs are commonly used in commercial fisheries across Canada. A recent survey of Canadian commercial fisheries indicated 132 of 180 responding fisheries have at least some dockside monitoring of landings as one of their monitoring tools (Appendix 1).
Dockside monitoring is used exclusively in commercial fisheries. These are different from weighstations used in recreational fishing derbies, which are not considered here. In many fisheries, dockside monitoring is the Department's primary source of verified landing information. This tool only reports on retained catch; information on non-retained catch is not reported. The data collected can include species identification, size, and weight and information on fishing activity. Catches are weighed and/or counted at the wharf providing a direct and typically accurate measurement. This is in contrast to catches recorded by at-sea observers which are often based on a visual estimation of catch weight (see below). However the condition of landed fish may vary, thereby requiring ad-hoc corrections to obtain the best estimate of the catch amount which can result in adjustment error. For example fish may be landed whole, heads-off or dressed (eviscerated), and may be mixed with ice. Ultimately the value sought is in whole or round weight equivalent. The required corrections are meant to be unbiased but do result in some error in estimated landed amounts. Measurements of individual fish lengths made by dockside monitors can be used to detect illegal length-dependent discarding (high-grading) when they are compared with measurements made by at-sea observers given that illegal activities are unlikely to occur in the presence of an observer (e.g., Allard and Chouinard 1997).
Dockside monitoring programs in Canada have been implemented as censuses in certain fisheries and surveys in others. Pre-arrival notification systems are often used in conjunction with dockside monitoring surveys. Nonetheless, such surveys may experience deployment effects. For example, deployment effects may occur due to the remoteness of certain ports that limits the ability of monitors to observe landings.

## AT-SEA OBSERVERS

At-sea observer programs (ASOP) place designated third-party observers aboard fishing vessels to monitor/verify fishing activities, collect scientific and fishing data, and monitor fisher compliance with fishing regulations and licence conditions (Kulka and Waldron 1983). Karp and McElderry (1999) provide a detailed review of ASOP in North America, including objectives, structure and procedures. Similar to dockside monitoring programs, ASOP companies and the at-sea observers they employ are designated by the Department to perform the duties related to
the At-Sea Observer Program, as indicated in the Fishery (General) Regulations and are qualified according to the CGSB Program Manual and the At-Sea Observer Program Policy and Procedures (see Canadian General Standards Board, 2012 and Corporation Designation Policy and Procedures, DFO 2014). The GCSB qualification program aims to ensure that ASOP companies have quality management systems and adequate quality management practices in place. This includes proper documentation and training, established procedures and reporting standards, quality control, accountability, and internal audit. Audits are carried out by CGSB to ensure that the companies conform to the recognized standard.

ASOP are used to varying degrees in commercial fisheries across Canada. A recent survey of Canadian commercial fisheries highlights how the requirement to use this tool varies between regions for similar stocks and species. The target coverage (or intended coverage) can vary substantially from as little as $2.5 \%$ to $100 \%$ in fisheries where observer coverage is a condition of licence (Appendix 1).
An ASOP can be used for a variety of objectives. One objective is monitoring of catch. On one hand, the composition of the catch may be monitored for in-season fishery management objectives such as triggering small fish protocols, soft-shell restrictions, sex-ratio cut-offs, or closures due to captures of species of concern. On the other hand, composition of catch may be monitored to meet post-season objectives such as quantifying the catches of different species (e.g., discards) and quantifying the demographic composition of catch for scientific purposes. There may also be monitoring of the fishing activity for enforcement objectives. For example, it can be used as a method of monitoring compliance in the fleet, and as a penalty for fishers that are known to be non-compliant to fishing regulations and to ensure they become compliant.

This tool reports on all components of catch that are brought to the vessel when the observer is present. This includes retained catch and non-retained catch, of which some species may be uncommon, rare or of conservation concern. While retained catch is quantified, observer reports are not typically used to estimate landings. However, these reports are one of the main sources of information used to quantify non-retained catch. This tool is typically used in commercial fisheries but is also used in recreational fisheries such as the recreational cod charter boat fishery in the southern Gulf of St. Lawrence.

Fishing trips are the basic sampling unit for ASOP. In some instances, all trips carry an observer (a census or 100\% coverage) whereas in other instances observers are deployed on a subset of trips. Trips may vary in length from one day to many. Observers are meant to report on catch characteristics for all fishing activities in a day or a subset of activities on vessels that operate longer than the contracted hours of the observer. The latter case results in a hierarchy of sampling; each step involves estimation and therefore contributes to uncertainty in the estimates (e.g., Tamsett et al. 1999; Rochet et al. 2002). Furthermore, observers may quantify characteristics of the catch by subsampling and often catch amounts are estimated rather than measured directly, resulting in measurement error. Results obtained from the observer may be communicated to a coordinating office on a regular basis using electronic transmission or reported at the completion of the trip. Fisher pre-departure notifications are often used to select trips on which to deploy an observer when targeted coverage of the fleet is below 100\% (e.g., Benoît and Allard 2009; Palmer et al. 2016).
An advantage of ASOP with respect to catch monitoring is that it is one of the few tools that provide a direct measurement of discarded catch provided by a third party, which, in principle, should result in more accurate reporting of the catch. In addition, for in-season fishery management actions, this is the only third-party tool that provides near instantaneous reporting on catch characteristics that may result in management actions. Examples of in-season management actions include limits on the incidental catch of non-target species, size limits for
target catch and changes in sex ratios in some decapod crustacean fisheries. Presence of an observer also means that biological sampling of the catch may be undertaken for demographic characteristics such as lengths, collecting of aging material, sex, shell condition, etc.
When coverage is $100 \%$ of both trips and activities within trips, any uncertainty with respect to catch is related to subsampling of catch. Biases with respect to catch composition are likely to be very rare and limited to cases where the subsampling design is inappropriate or where sampling and reporting protocols are not followed. In programs where target coverage is below $100 \%$ of trips, a properly designed and implemented deployment scheme is required for dependable estimation of catch to avoid a deployment effect. For characteristics of catch that are only reliably inferred from observer data (e.g., discards), it will typically be impossible to quantify the magnitude of bias and degree to which variance is underestimated in instances where there are deployment effects.

On trips with fishing activities that operate longer than the contracted hours of the observer, a subset of the activities is often used to estimate catch. If the data from the subset of activities cannot be expanded accurately to the total activities within trips, then the quality of the data is affected. For example, fishing activity or catch characteristics of a trip may be different during the day compared to the night and estimates may be biased if observers are only present during the day. Additionally, many of the same limitations and biases described above for coverage below $100 \%$ of trips also apply to coverage below $100 \%$ of activities within trips which can bias the estimates of catch (e.g., observer effect - see below).

A key challenge in observer programs with less than 100\% coverage is meeting the dual goals of monitoring for enforcement and monitoring for representative catch. These two objectives have conflicting ideal sampling schemes (discussed in Benoît and Allard 2009). On one hand, effective enforcement monitoring should be targeted to the vessels most likely to be in noncompliance (Furlong and Martin 2000). On the other hand, effective representative catch monitoring should employ a scheme that allows proper inference to the population (Cotter and Pilling 2007).
Violation of the assumption of statistical exchangeability may also result from a change in behaviour of the fishing crew when an observer is present, commonly referred to as an observer effect (Harris 1998; Benoît and Allard 2009; Faunce and Barbeaux 2011). Factors that can motivate an observer effect include the desire to avoid divulging prime fishing locations, shortening of trips to disembark the observer or to reduce the cost of the observer, fishing in areas where the likelihood of capturing restricted bycatch is lower than in an area that would otherwise be fished should an observer not be present, the capture of discards that would otherwise not be reported in logbooks, and using fishing practices that would not typically be used should an observer not be present. All else being equal, this will result in biased inference for catch commensurate to the degree to which the change in behaviour alters the characteristics of the catch. There is strong evidence that fishers can alter their fishing patterns to modify the amount and species composition of catches when there are incentives to do so, which there often are (e.g., Branch and Hilborn 2008). While it is sometimes possible to test statistically for an observer effect and to estimate its magnitude by comparing observer reports of retained catch and landings (e.g., Allard and Chouinard 1997; Liggins et al. 1997; Benoît and Allard 2009; Faunce and Barbeaux 2011), this is clearly not possible for discarded catch. Quantifying the magnitude of observer effects on discards is therefore not possible with existing technology and methods. However, it may be possible to infer whether an observer effect on discards is likely. This can be achieved by testing for an effect on retained catch (amount and size composition) and by comparing the spatial location and effort of fishing activities associated with an observer and not, provided that statistical power of those tests was sufficiently high.

Indeed the mandatory use of vessel monitoring systems may act as a deterrent for observer effects caused by changes in fishing patterns when an observer is present.
A number of studies have undertaken simulations to show how variation in catch and bycatch estimates changes as observer coverage increases from small percentages to 100\% (e.g., Dorn et al. 1997b cited in Karp and McElderry 1999; NMFS 2004; Babcock et al. 2003). The objective is typically to determine coverage levels that are optimal with respect to statistical precision of the estimators and cost. The results of these simulations follow the theoretical patterns expected for a finite population estimator: standard error decreases asymptotically as coverage levels tend to $100 \%$. However, none of these simulations have accounted for deployment and observer effects which can affect both standard error and bias in ways that are difficult to predict. For example, while the magnitude of bias resulting from observer effects is likely to decline monotonically as coverage levels increase, and reach zero at 100\% coverage, the exact shape of this relationship and the magnitude of resulting bias are not known. Simulations that ignore deployment and observer effects are therefore likely to provide misleading results for planning observer coverage levels unless these effects are believed to be small because of the procedures that are in place (e.g., mandatory fisher pre-departure notifications) and lack of incentives (or presence of strong disincentives) to modify behaviours when an observer is present.

## ELECTRONIC MONITORING SYSTEMS WITH VIDEO

Electronic monitoring systems with video use digital video-recording devices and global positioning systems (GPS) to record fishing operations and catch composition which can later be analyzed. These systems can provide independent electronic catch data and a comprehensive record of fishing activity that can be stored long-term. This allows the data to be audited or referenced at a later date to verify accuracy or clarify discrepancies if desired. In Canada, electronic monitoring with video is currently only being required in the Pacific Region's groundfish and Dungeness Crab fisheries (Appendix 1), though there are pilot projects in other fisheries across Canada.

Electronic monitoring systems with video are used in commercial fisheries. They collect data in a consistent manner and can provide data on both retained and non-retained catch. However, accurate and reliable catch data can be difficult or impossible to obtain in some instances. For example, data are difficult to capture in high volume fisheries where fish do not necessarily pass through restricted locations that are easy to record (e.g., conveyor belt) and in fisheries with species that are similar in form and colour. Electronic monitoring systems with video can provide data on the count and/or size (e.g., length) of fish but cannot directly provide data on the weight of catch, though this can be estimated from counts and sizes. Other issues that can affect data quality include changes to fishing behaviour to ensure catch is captured on video, image quality that affects species identification, image quality that varies as a function of sea conditions or weather, and inadequate camera coverage.
Data from electronic monitoring systems with video can require a lot of time to process and review and therefore an audit approach is typically used, where a predefined subset of video data is reviewed. An advantage of electronic monitoring with video is that it normally provides complete coverage of sampled trips. It is therefore possible to employ optimal sampling strategies when selecting part of the video for detailed analysis, thereby ensuring efficient and unbiased sampling of the available images. Furthermore, electronic monitoring with video allows for optimization of sampling efforts to different parts of the sampling hierarchy (e.g., vessels within the fleet, trips within vessels, and fishing sets within trips), such as to maximize precision for a given subsampling effort. In contrast, such optimization is more problematic in at-sea
observer surveys given constraints on the number of available observers and the fact that once an observer is deployed they only sample at one level of this hierarchy (sets within trips).
If all vessels in a fishery are equipped with electronic monitoring with video and the quality of the recorded images is good throughout or if images of poor quality are randomized across available trips, then catch estimates will be unbiased provided an appropriate subsampling strategy is employed. Furthermore, the amount of subsampling required to achieve desired levels of precision can be modified iteratively during the image analysis given that the population of sampled images is available. This could, in principle, be applied to reach target levels of precision in the quantification of catches for certain species. However, if certain vessels or trips do not have electronic monitoring with video, or if the occurrence of poor images varies systematically with some factor that affects catch (e.g., vessel, time of day) then derived estimates of catch may be biased. This is similar to a deployment effect.
A benefit of an electronic monitoring system with video when it is deployed on all vessels in a fishery is that it has an invigilation effect. At the time of fishing, fishers do not know which segments of video will be reviewed to quantify catch. This creates a strong disincentive to deviate from normal fishing practices. All else being equal, observer effects are therefore not expected. However, if fishers are able to alter the video monitoring records, for example by temporarily obscuring the camera view, then observer effects can be considered likely. As with at-sea observer programs, the magnitude of the bias caused by such observer effects will be proportional to both the frequency of these alterations and the degree to which catch differs between regular and altered fishing sets. Another benefit of electronic monitoring systems with video and its inherent invigilation effect is that the accuracy of logbook reporting is also likely to improve when the agreement between logbooks and video is assessed (further described in the Combining Tools section).

## FISHING LOCATION AND CATCH COMPOSITION

Fishery monitoring for both compliance and research applications often requires the collection of data for variables in addition to catch, either for ongoing management of the fishery or as an integral part of the assessment-management process. Most notable are data on the spatial locations at which fishing activities occur, whether or not there is catch, and data on the biological or demographic composition of the catch.

## FISHING LOCATION

Data on the spatial location of fishing activities are necessary when spatial approaches are used for the management or assessment of fisheries. Spatial management includes the use of closed areas for conservation reasons or to avoid conflicts among fishery sectors or with other industries. Spatial management may also be used to designate fishing areas, in which fishing effort or catch limits are set for specific areas. Information on the spatial location of fishing activities is also used for scientific purposes, including for the standardization of catch-per-unit effort indices for stock assessments, attributing catch to specific assessment/population units, and for evaluations of ecosystem effects of fishing. Fishery monitoring tools that report on fishing locations differ with respect to the spatial resolution (precision), possible inherent bias, and the timeliness of the output data. Management applications in which fishing outside of a permitted area can result in a high likelihood of conflict or ecological harm (e.g., sensitive benthic area closures) may require real-time and highly accurate spatially resolved data to ensure rapid intervention by DFO. Such data are only available from vessel monitoring systems or perhaps ongoing reporting by at-sea observers. In contrast, other applications that are based
on catch accounting in large spatial units for quota reconciliation or stock assessment purposes may require less timely and lower resolution data.
The following briefly reviews the timeliness, potential resolution (i.e., precision), and accuracy of fishing location data as provided by the main fishery monitoring tools.

## Vessel monitoring systems

A vessel monitoring system (VMS) is a satellite based, near real-time, positional tracking system used to monitor the location of vessels and movement. DFO uses VMS to improve its ability to monitor vessel positions and compliance with current fisheries regulations (such as closed areas) and to guide enforcement activities. VMS provides the latitude, longitude, date and time of vessel locations and, depending on the type of unit, course and speed. There are algorithms available which use these data to partition movement patterns into different components for a fishing trip: steaming, fishing, gear deployment/retrieval, rest (Murawski et al. 2005). In general, vessel speed and course are inferred from averages calculated from successive positions. This method has been shown to be highly accurate (up to 99\%) however in some cases it can lead to misclassification of activities and therefore inaccuracies in the estimations of effort (Mills et al. 2007). The data are received in near real-time at pre-determined time intervals and are stored in a centralized database which enables DFO to review and analyze past and current geographical positions of vessels. Unlike most of the other tools discussed in this report, VMS does not provide direct information on catch. However, VMS can be used successfully to validate logbook or other user-reported data on the position, timing, and/or effort of fishing trips (Palmer and Wigley 2009). VMS data also provides a record of vessel trips which can be used to estimate total effort. VMS is increasingly being used in commercial fisheries across Canada, with all regions reporting some commercial fisheries using the monitoring tool. When used, it is usually required on $100 \%$ of the vessels prosecuting a fishery (Appendix 1). However, there is less consistency in the type of fishing activity or target species requiring VMS, and implementation of this tool appears to be done on a case-by-case basis.

## Logbooks

Logbooks are often used as a self-reported method for the locations of fishing activities. Historically, logbook position data are known to be of low precision and may represent the average location of numerous activities as opposed to activity specific positions (e.g., Palmer and Wigley 2009). In certain circumstances, there may be incentives to misreport such as to not reveal favoured fishing areas, or when harvest activities are occurring in or near prohibited/restricted areas. To the extent that there is a high compliance with completing and returning logbooks, the spatial information for the fleet will be complete. As described in the Logbooks section of Catch Monitoring Tools above, fishers can be required to submit these logbooks at different times, such as when they complete their fishing trip or at the end of the season. Therefore, in situations where timely location data is needed, such as for in-season management measures, the timeliness of logbook information may not be sufficient.

## At-sea observers

Information on the location of fishing activity obtained from at-sea observers is likely to be highly accurate because they are generally taken from GPS. In some instances, the information may be transmitted near real time from ship to shore communication by the observer or may be reported only after the trip when the observer delivers their trip report. Assuming that at-sea observers are functioning independently while on-board the vessels and have access to reliable GPS data, their reporting of location of fishing activity should be highly dependable. Poor locational information should be restricted to recorder error, missed recording, and equipment
malfunctioning. If observed trips are not spatially representative of the fishery (a deployment effect) or if fishers alter their fishing location in the presence of an observer (observer effect), the observed positions will not reflect those of the fishery.

## Fisher questionnaires and creel surveys

Information on the location of fishing activities obtained from fisher questionnaires and creel surveys is usually of low precision. In fisher questionnaires, there may be questions about the general fishing locations that may provide an indication of broad scale fishing location, but precision is low. For creel surveys, information on location of where the survey is undertaken or questions about specific bodies of water visited that day may be recorded, also providing information with low precision. Generally, information is not reported until after the fishing activity has occurred, a delay that may be many days or even months. Timeliness of obtaining the information can also depend on the method used, with, for example, questionnaires by mail taking longer than electronic questionnaires or in-person surveys. Accuracy is limited to the fisher's recall of fishing locations. Information may be biased by intentional non-responses and the need for fisher's to rely on recall which may be biased towards their most successful outings. In most cases, spatial location obtained from fisher questionnaires and creel surveys is less dependable than the tools previously discussed in this section.

## BIOLOGICAL OR DEMOGRAPHIC COMPOSITION OF CATCH

Information on the demographic composition of catches is required for in-season fishery management approaches that aim to avoid (or target) particular subsets of targeted or incidentally captured populations, or certain stocks within stock complexes captured in a mixed fishery. Examples of such approaches include:

- spatial sectors of the southern Gulf of St. Lawrence snow crab fishery that are closed as the percentage of soft-shelled crab in the catches exceeds a particular threshold;
- DNA sampling in salmon for in-season management; and
- many groundfish fisheries that employ small fish protocols (size limits) that result in temporary fishery closures when a high proportion of small fish are captured.

These management measures are often put in place to limit the fishing mortality on a particular segment of a population that may have little commercial value (e.g., soft-shelled snow crab) or when mortality disproportionately affects stock productivity (e.g., undersized fish). Alternatively, the catches obtained in some fisheries contain a mixture of stocks or cryptic species which are difficult to attribute to a particular stock. Determining the removals by stock is required to ensure that those removals are in line with the biological productivity of the respective stocks.

Generally, finer examination, often involving sub-sampling, is used to determine the composition of the catch for regulatory or management purposes. This is typically undertaken by a third party, such as at sea-observers or dockside monitors, or by DFO. In-season management measures based on macroscopic traits such as animal length, shell condition, or sex may create an incentive for discarding if there is the potential for fishery closures when particular catch composition thresholds are attained. If such incentives occur, then catch composition determined at sea, prior to or in the absence of discarding (given an observer invigilation effect), is likely to differ from the composition determined at the point of landing, after possible discarding (Allard and Chouinard 1997). However, if the amount of at-sea coverage is small and fishers are able to avoid unwanted catches when an observer is present (i.e., an observer effect; Branch and Hilborn 2008), then the demographic composition of catch measured by observers may not be representative of the composition in the broader fishery (i.e., there is a
bias). As observer coverage increases, the magnitude of this bias is expected to decrease monotonically, but not necessarily linearly.
Genetic data has also been used to get accurate estimates of stock composition for in-season management. Microsatellite DNA-based stock identification has been used in the management of mixed stock fisheries to protect weak stocks. For example, genetic analysis of catch provides an in-season estimate of West Coast Vancouver Island (WCVI) Chinook caught and has resulted in fishery closures when the catch of WCVI Chinook met its predetermined mortality allowance (Winther and Beacham 2009).
Catch composition can also be monitored for scientific purposes, particularly when the stock assessment approaches are length or age-based. This sampling is typically undertaken by atsea observers, or when catches are landed by dockside monitors or DFO personnel, though in some instances self-sampling may be involved. Data needs for scientific purposes are not addressed in this report which instead focusses on data collection for fishery monitoring purposes.

## COMBINING TOOLS

Each of the catch monitoring tools discussed in this report has advantages and disadvantages which impact the quality of the data they provide. Combining tools can be a powerful way to maximize advantages and minimize disadvantages (Stanley et al., 2015). Tools may be combined to improve estimates, for verification, or for planning purposes.

For example, if there is complete coverage of a fishery using electronic monitoring with video, its invigilation effect would likely increase the accuracy of other catch monitoring tools when used together. This is most likely when there is either a disincentive for inaccurate reporting (possible charges for discrepancies between electronic monitoring with video and logbook records) or an incentive for accurate reporting. Tying the degree of image subsampling required (a cost to the fisher) inversely to the accuracy of logbooks creates such an incentive (Stanley et al. 2009, 2011). The use of video monitoring and observer coverage as a penalty creates a strong incentive for fishers to fish normally (Furlong and Martin 2000). For example, in the British Columbia groundfish hook-and-line and trap fishery, $100 \%$ at-sea monitoring is required however electronic monitoring with video coupled with an audit system is used to defray costs and to eliminate the need for an at-sea monitor on every vessel. These fisheries use electronic monitoring systems with video in audits of logbook data on effort, catch, and catch disposition (Stebbins et al. 2009). In these audits, a randomly selected $10 \%$ of the fishing events on the vessels have their videos independently monitored. A low level of agreement between the logbooks and videos can lead to additional audits that are directly funded by the responsible fishermen. Using the electronic monitoring system with video as a cross-reference of data against logbooks improves the level of confidence in catch data reported in logbooks, as the high costs of funding additional audits encourage honest reporting (Zollett et al. 2011).
Fisher pre-departure and pre-arrival notifications are frequently used for planning related to other monitoring tools which can improve the quality of the data obtained. For example, fisher pre-departure notifications can allow observer companies to plan deployment of at-sea observers which may reduce observer effects. As another example, fisher pre-arrival notifications can allow dockside monitoring companies to plan their dockside verification activities which may improve the sampling scheme employed.
Combining the use of at-sea observers with dockside monitoring may be used for verification and could highlight potential issues. For example, using dockside monitoring and at-sea observers may allow for detection of possible high-grading, where less valuable fish are
discarded at sea to limit landings to more valuable fish. Fish measurements made by at-sea observers can be compared to those made by dockside monitors. Discrepancies may suggest that high-grading is occurring, which may warrant additional monitoring if this is a concern.

There are many ways tools can be combined, which cannot all be discussed in this report. Using complementary tools can increase the accuracy and precision of fisheries estimates, as some examples in this report have highlighted. Where tools are used together, the dependability of the information needs to be evaluated jointly.

## PERSPECTIVES

This report provides an overview of the type and use of fishery monitoring tools in Canadian fishery monitoring programs. The characteristics of the different tools are described in general terms, as are the expected impacts on the quality of the data they produce and the dependability of the inferences that are drawn. A companion report provides a detailed assessment framework for the quality and dependability of fishery monitoring programs (Allard and Benoît 2019). It elaborates on the statistical properties of fishery monitoring censuses and surveys, as well as operational factors that affect the bias and variability of inferences made from fishery monitoring data, such as deployment and observer effects. The two reports are intended to jointly serve as the basis for the evaluation of existing monitoring programs, and the planning of new or altered programs in the future, as part of the forthcoming fishery monitoring policy. The present report provides options for catch monitoring, including associated limitations and considerations, while Allard and Benoît (2019) provide a means of quantifying whether and how existing or planned programs meet operational objectives in light of these limitations and considerations. The reports are therefore complementary.

## REFERENCES CITED

Allard, J, and Benoît, H.P. 2019. Unified framework for the statistical assessment of fishery monitoring programs. DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Res. Doc. 2019/013. In press.

Allard, J. and Chouinard, G.A. 1997. A strategy to detect fish discarding by combining onboard and onshore sampling. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 54: 2955-2963.
Allen, M., Kilpatrick, D., Armstrong, M., Briggs, R., Course, G., and Pérez, N. 2002. Multistage cluster sampling design and optimal sample sizes for estimation of fish discards from commercial trawlers. Fish. Res. 55: 11-24

Babcock, E.A., Pikitch, E.K. and C.G. Hudson. 2003. How much observer coverage is enough to adequately estimate bycatch? Oceana, Washington, D.C. Available at: http://www.oceana.org/uploads/BabcockPikitchGray2003FinalReport.pdf
Benoît, H.P. and Allard, J. 2009. Can the data from at-sea observer surveys be used to make general inferences about catch composition and discards? Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 66: 2025-2039

Bijsterveld, L., Di Novo, S., Fedorenko, A., and Hop Wo, L. 2002. Comparison of catch reporting systems for commercial salmon fisheries in British Columbia. Can. Manuscr. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2626: 44p.
Branch, A.T., and Hilborn, R. 2008. Matching catches to quotas in a multispecies trawl fishery: targeting and avoidance behavior under individual transferable quotas. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci., 65: 1435-1446.

Branch, A. T., Rutherford, K., Hilborn, R. 2006. Replacing trip limits with individual transferable quotas: implications for discarding. Mar. Policy. 30: 281-292.
Bremner, G., Johnstone, P., Bateson, T., and Clarke, P. 2009. Unreported bycatch in the New Zealand West Coast South Island hoki fishery. Mar. Policy, 33: 504-512.
Canadian General Standards Board. 2012. CGSB Qualification Program for At-sea Fisheries Observer Corporations Program Manual.
Cosandey-Godin, A., Krainski, E., Worm, B., and Mills-Flemming, J. 2015. Applying Bayesian spatiotemporal models to fisheries bycatch in the Canadian Arctic. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 72: 186-197.
Cotter, A.J.R. and Pilling, G.M. 2007. Landings, logbooks and observer surveys: improving the protocols for sampling commercial fisheries. Fish Fish. 8: 123-152.
DFO. 2009. National Dockside Monitoring Program Policy and Procedures.
DFO. 2013. Guidance on Implementation of the Policy on Managing Bycatch. (http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/fm-gp/peches-fisheries/fish-ren-peche/sff-cpd/bycatch-guide-prise-access-eng.htm)
DFO. 2014. Corporation Designation Policy and Procedures. (http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/fm-gp/sdc-cps/nir-nei/obs-dpp-eng.htm)
Fisheries Act. R.S., c. F-14, s. 1.
Faunce, C.H. 2011. A comparison between industry and observer catch compositions within the Gulf of Alaska rockfish fishery. ICES J. Mar. Sci. 68: 1769-1777
Faunce, C.H. and Barbeaux, S.J. 2011. The frequency and quantity of Alaskan groundfish catcher-vessel landings made with and without an observer. ICES J. Mar. Sci. 68: 17571763.

Furlong, W.J. and Martin, P.M. 2000. Observer deployment in the fishery and regulatory selfenforcement. In Proceedings of the 10th Biennial Conference of the International Institute of Fisheries Economics and Trade, Corvallis. Available at http://oregonstate.edu/dept/IIFET/2000/papers/furlong.pdf
Harris, L.-W.E. 1998. The quantification of perceptual and behavioural variation in commercial fishing logbooks. M.Sc. thesis, Department of Zoology, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Karp, W.A., and McElderry, H. 1999. Catch monitoring by fisheries observers in the United States and Canada. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Integrated Fisheries Monitoring, Sydney, Australia, 1-5 February 1999. Edited by C.P. Nolan. Fisheries and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Rome, Italy. pp. 261-284

Kulka, D.W. and Waldron, D. 1983. The Atlantic observer programs - a discussion of sampling from commercial catches at sea. In: Sampling commercial Catches of Marine Fish and Invertebrates (eds W.G. Doubleday and D. Rivard). Can. Spec. Publ. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 66: 255-262.

Liggins, G.W., Bradley, M.J., and Kennelly, S.J. 1997. Detection of bias in observer-based estimates of retained and discarded catches from a multi species trawl fishery. Fish. Res. 32: 133-147

McDermid, J.L., Mallet, A., and Surette, T. 2016. Fishery performance and status indicators for the assessment of the NAFO Division 4T southern Gulf of St. Lawrence Atlantic herring (Clupea harengus) to 2014 and 2015. DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Res. Doc. 2016/060. ix + 62 p.
Metuzals, K.I., Wernerheim, C.M., Haedrich, R.L., Copes, P., and Murrin, A. 2005. Data fouling in marine fisheries: findings and a model for Newfoundland. In: Sumaila UR, Marsden AD, editors. North American Association of Fisheries Economists Forum proceedings, Fisheries Centre Reports 14-1, 2005. Fisheries Centre, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. p. 87-104.

Mills, C.M., Townsend, S.E., Jennings, S., Eastwood, P.D., and Houghton, C.A. 2007. Estimating high-resolution trawl fishing effort from satellite-based vessel monitoring system data. ICES J. Mar. Sci 64:248-255.

Murawski, S.A., Wigley, S.E., Fogarty, M.J., Rago, P.J., and Mountain, D.G. 2005. Effort distribution and catch patterns adjacent to temperate MPSs. ICES J Mar Sci 62: 1150-1167.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2004. Evaluating bycatch: a national approach to standardized bycatch monitoring programs. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFSF/ SPO-66, 108 p.

Palmer, M.C., Wigley, S.E. 2009. Using positional data from vessel monitoring systems to validate the logbook-reported area fished and the stock allocation of commercial fisheries landings. N. Am. J. Fish. Manage. 29: 928-942.

Palmer, M.C., Hersey, P., Marotta, H., Shield, G.R., and Cierpich, S.B. 2016. The design and performance of an automated observer deployment system for the Northeastern United States groundfish fishery. Fish. Res. 179 :33-46

Rago, P.J., Wigley, S.E., and Fogarty, M.J. 2005. NEFSC bycatch estimation methodology: allocation, precision and accuracy. Northeast Fish. Sci. Cent. Ref. Doc. No. 05-09.

Rijnsdorp, A.D., Daan, N., Dekker, W., Poos, J.J., and van Densen, W.L.T. 2007. Sustainable use of flatfish resources: addressing the credibility crisis in mixed fisheries management. J. Sea Res. 57: 114-125.

Rochet, M.-J., Péronnet, I., and Trenkel, V.M. 2002. An analysis of discards from the French trawler fleet in the Celtic Sea. ICES J. Mar. Sci. 59: 538-552.

Species at Risk Act (S.C. 2002, c. 29)
Stanley, R.D. 1992. Bootstrap calculation of catch-per-unit-effort variance from trawl logbooks: do fisheries generate enough observations for stock assessments. N. Am. J. Fish. Manage. 12: 19-27

Stanley, R.D., Olsen, N., and Fedoruk, A. 2009. Independent Validation of the Accuracy of Yelloweye Rockfish Catch Estimates from the Canadian Groundfish Integration Pilot Project. Marine and Coastal Fisheries. 1:1, 354-362.

Stanley, R.D., McElderry, H., Mawani, T., and Koolman, J. 2011. The advantages of an audit over a census approach to the review of video imagery in fishery monitoring. ICES J. Mar. Sci. 68: 1621-1627.

Stanley, R.D., Karim, T., Koolman, J., and McElderry, H. 2015. Design and implementation of electronic monitoring in the British Columbia groundfish hook and line fishery: a retrospective view of the ingredients of success. ICES J. Mar. Sci 72: 1230-1236

Stebbins, S., Trumble, R.J., and Turris, B. 2009. Monitoring the Gulf of Mexico commercial reef fish fishery, a review and discussion. Archipelago Marine Research, Ltd., Victoria, BC. 99 pp.
Tamsett, D., Janacek, G., Emberton, M., and Course, G. 1999. Onboard sampling for measuring discards in commercial fishing based on multilevel modelling of measurements in the Irish Sea from NW England and N Wales. Fish. Res. 42: 117-126.
Walsh, W.A., Kleiber, P., and McCracken, M. 2002. Comparison of logbook reports of incidental blue shark catch rates by Hawaii-based longline vessels to fishery observer data by application of a generalized additive model. Fish. Res. 58: 79-94
Winther, I., and T.D. Beacham. 2009. Application of Chinook salmon stock composition data to management of the northern British Columbia troll fishery, 2006. American Fisheries Society Symposium 70, 2009.
Zollett, E. et al. 2011. Guiding Principles for Development of Effective Monitoring Programs. Report prepared for Environmental Defense Fund. MRAG Americas, Essex, MA. 59 pp.

## APPENDICES

Table A1. Survey of Canadian fishery monitoring in the Central and Arctic Region. Note: this table is a summary of responses received and is neither an official listing of all of Canada's fisheries nor is it meant to be an official source of the listed fishery's monitoring tools or coverage levels. (VMS = vessel monitoring system, ASOP = at-sea observer program)

| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online/paper survey | Purchase slips | Hailin | Hailout | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Greenland Halibut NAFO OA | -- | 100\% | 100\% | -- | 100\% | 100\% (in Canada) | -- | -- | -- | Yes |  | Yes | -- |
| Greenland Halibut NAFO OB | -- | 100\% | 100\% | -- | 100\%Mobile gear, 20\%Fixed gear | 100\% (in Canada) | -- | -- | -- | Yes |  | Yes | -- |

Table A2. Survey of Canadian fishery monitoring in the Gulf Region. Note: this table is a summary of responses received and is neither an official listing of all of Canada's fisheries nor is it meant to be an official source of the listed fishery's monitoring tools or coverage levels. (VMS = vessel monitoring system, ASOP = at-sea observer program)

| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online / paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{gathered} \text { Hail } \\ \text {-in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-out } \end{aligned}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Herring 4T <br> (Fall <br> Spawner) | Fixed gear / Gillnet | -- | -- | -- | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |
| Herring 4T (Fall Spawner) | Mobile gear | 100\% | 100\% | -- | 20\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Herring 4T (Spring Spawner) | Fixed gear | -- | -- | -- | ${ }^{--}$ | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |
| Lobster Prince Edward Island trap Fishery | Trap | 100\% | -- | -- | 0\% * | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | Science ASOP run by Province of PEI; no set coverage |
| Lobster Southern Gulf - LFA $23,24,25,26 \mathrm{~A}$ 26B | Trap | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | No | No | -- |
| Plaice (American ), Southern Gulf of St. Lawrence 4T | Mobile gear | 100\% | -- | -- | 25\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |
| Rock crab 23, 24, 25, 26A | Trap | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | No | No | -- |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online / paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{gathered} \text { Hail } \\ \text {-in } \end{gathered}$ | Hail -out | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scallop South Gulf of St. Lawrence (SFA 21a, b, c, 22-24) | Drag | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | No | No | Recreational Scallop Report sent to DFO |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Snow Crab - } \\ & \text { CFA 12, 12E, } \\ & \text { 12F, } 19 \end{aligned}$ | Trap | 100\% | 100\% | -- | 20\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |
| Winter \& Witch Flounders 4RST | Mobile gear | 100\% | -- | -- | $\begin{gathered} 5- \\ 25 \% \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |

Table A3. Survey of Canadian fishery monitoring in the Maritimes Region. Note: this table is a summary of responses received and is neither an official listing of all of Canada's fisheries nor is it meant to be an official source of the listed fishery's monitoring tools or coverage levels. (VMS = vessel monitoring system, ASOP = at-sea observer program)

| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online / paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-in } \end{aligned}$ | Hail -out | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Atlantic Bluefin Tuna | Rod and reel/ trolling \& Offshore /pelagic longline | 100\% | -- | -- | 5\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Atlantic Bluefin Tuna | Trap | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | -- |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Online / } \\ & \text { paper } \\ & \text { survey } \end{aligned}$ | Purchase slips | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-out } \end{aligned}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Atlantic <br> Canada Dogfish 4VWNX -5 | Fixed gear <45' (longline) | 100\% | Most | -- | $\begin{gathered} 5- \\ 10 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \% \text { most } \\ \text { areas; } \\ \text { (except } \\ 100 \% \\ 4 \mathrm{VTn} \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | VMS: <br> required for fixed gear <45'; required for all except handlineonly vessels or vessels restricted to 35 '. |
| Atlantic Cod 5Zjm | Fixed gear <65' (longline, gillnet) | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | $\begin{gathered} \hline 25 \%, \\ (100 \% \\ \text { in } \\ \text { June) } \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | yes | -- |
| Atlantic Cod - $4 X 5 Y$ | Fixed gear <45' (Longline, gillnet, handline ) | 100\% | Most | -- | $\begin{gathered} 5- \\ 10 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \% ; 100 \% \\ \text { if } \geq 150 \mathrm{lbs} \\ \text { Atlantic } \\ \text { halibut } \end{gathered}$ | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | VMS as for Dogfish; |
| Atlantic Halibut 3NOPs4VWX +5 | Fixed gear <45' (longline) | 100\% | Most | -- | 5-10\% | most* | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | VMS as for Dogfish; DMC: 100\% for 4TVn; 100\% in 4 VsW if $\geq 500 \mathrm{lbs}$ of Halibut onboard; 100\% in 4 X 5 Y if $\geq$ Halibut is onboard; all other trips 25\% |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online / paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-out } \end{aligned}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Atlantic Halibut 3NOPs4VWX $+5$ | Fixed <br> Gear 45'- <br> 65' <br> (longline) | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | $\begin{gathered} 5- \\ 10 \% \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | yes | -- |
| Atlantic Halibut 3NOPs4VWX $+5$ | Fixed Gear > 65' (longline) | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | $\begin{aligned} & 10- \\ & 20 \% \end{aligned}$ | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | Hail-outs are required 24 h in advance in NL Region, prior to departure in MAR; |
| Eel (Large) | -- | 100\% | N/A | N/A | N/A | -- | -- | -- | -- | No | No | No | VMS/ASOP <br> - N/A, not a non-vesselbased fishery |
| Elvers | -- | 100\% | N/A | N/A | N/A | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes; } \\ \text { variable* } \end{gathered}$ | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | VMS/ASOP <br> - N/A, not a non-vesselbased fishery. DMP: 100\% sold from holding facilities; each licence has 3 monitored offloads (river holding facility) |
| Flounders 4VW | Groundfis h Mobile Gear | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | $\begin{gathered} 5- \\ 10 \% \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | yes | Yes | -- |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Online / } \\ & \text { paper } \\ & \text { survey } \end{aligned}$ | Purchase slips | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-out } \end{aligned}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gaspereau | Gill nets, trap nets, dip nets | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | No | No | No | -- |
| Haddock 4X5Y | Fixed Gear < 45' (longline) | 100\% | Most | -- | $\begin{gathered} 5- \\ 10 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \% ; 100 \% \\ \text { if } \geq 150 \mathrm{lbs} \\ \text { Atlantic } \\ \text { halibut } \end{gathered}$ | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | VMS as for Dogfish; DMC requirement s-25\%; $100 \%$ if $\geq$ 150lb Atlantic Halibut is onboard |
| Haddock 4X5Y | Groundfis h Mobile Gear | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | $\begin{gathered} 5- \\ 10 \% \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | observer coverage targets are $5-10 \%$ at minimum, temporarily at $33 \%$ due to concerns about Pollock bycatch |
| Haddock 5Zjm | Fixed Gear <45' (longline) | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | $\begin{gathered} \text { Min } \\ 25 \% ; \\ (100 \% \\ \text { in } \\ \text { June }) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | -- |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online / paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{gathered} \text { Hail } \\ \text {-in } \end{gathered}$ | Hail <br> -out | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Haddock 5Zjm | Groundfis h Mobile Gear | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | Min $25 \%$ (in CHP), usually $50-$ $100 \%$ Winter $\&$ Summ er | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Herring 4VWX | Purse Seine | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 5\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | VMS: 15 min reporting from Oct 1Oct 14, hourly reporting rest of the year |
| Herring 4VWX | Gillnet | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | $\begin{gathered} 20 \% ; \\ (100 \% \text { if } \\ \text { roe } \\ \text { present }) \end{gathered}$ | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Herring 4VWX | Weir, Trapnet | 100\% | N/A | N/A | N/A | 20\%* | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | VMS, at-sea observers N/A, this is a non-vesselbased fishery; DMP 20\% of weir catch that is landed by herring carrier |


| Stock |  | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online / paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{gathered} \text { Hail } \\ \text {-in } \end{gathered}$ | Hail -out | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Herring 5Y, $5 Z$ (weirs) | Weir | 100\% | N/A | N/A | N/A | 10\%* | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | VMS, at-sea observers N/A, this is a non-vesselbased fishery; DMP 10\% of weir catch that is landed by herring carrier |
| Lobster Inshore LFA 28, 29, 30, 33, 34, 35-38 | Trap | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | No | no | no | Re column N : base-line at-sea sampling related to bycatch monitoring conducted in LFAs 29 \& 30 |
| Lobster Inshore LFA 38B (Grey Zone) | Trap | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | -- | 20\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | yes | -- |
| Lobster Inshore LFAs 27, 31A, 31B, 32 | Trap | 100\% | -- | -- | Variabl $e^{*}$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | No | no | no | ASOP: <br> industry- <br> funded <br> science <br> technicians <br> conduct at- <br> sea <br> observation <br> s |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online / paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-out } \end{aligned}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lobster Offshore LFA 41 | Trap | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 6 trips | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | yes | -- |
| Pollock 4X5 (West Comp. 4Xopqrs5 + Eastern Comp. 4Xmn) | Fixed Gear < 45' (gillnet, handline ) | 100\% | Most | -- | $\begin{gathered} 5- \\ 10 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \% ; 100 \% \\ & \text { if } \geq 150 \mathrm{lbs} \\ & \text { Atl halibut } \end{aligned}$ | -- | -- | -- | No | yes | Yes | VMS as for Dogfish; DMC requirement s-25\%; $100 \%$ if $\geq$ 150lb Atlantic Halibut is onboard |
| Pollock 4X5 <br> (West Comp. <br> 4Xopqrs5 + <br> Eastern <br> Comp. 4Xmn) | Fixed <br> Gear 45'- <br> 65' <br> (gillnet) + <br> Groundfis <br> h MG | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | $\begin{gathered} 5- \\ 10 \% \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | yes | Yes | for <br> groundfish <br> mobile gear <br> fishery observer coverage target is temporarily set to 33\% |
| Redfish Unit 2 | Groundfis h Mobile Gear | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | $\begin{gathered} 5- \\ 20 \% \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Redfish Unit 3 | Groundfis h Mobile Gear | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | $\begin{aligned} & 10- \\ & 20 \% \end{aligned}$ | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | yes | -- |
| Sea Scallop Inshore SFA 28 (Bay of Fundy) | Drag | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | -- | $\begin{gathered} \text { 100\% and } \\ 20 \%^{*} \end{gathered}$ | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | Full Bay fleet-100\%; Upper Bay fleet 100\%; Mid Bay fleet 20\% |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online / paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-out } \end{aligned}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sea Scallop Inshore SFA 29W | Drag | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 1 sea day per active vessel | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Sea Scallop Offshore SFA 26 German, Browns | Drag | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 1 trip per year per bank | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Sea Scallop Offshore SFA <br> 27, Georges | Drag | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 2 trips per month | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Shrimp (Scotian Shelf) - SFA 13-15 | Mobile | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 1 per area (3 trips per season ) | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | yes | -- |
| Shrimp (Scotian Shelf) - SFA 13-15 | Trap | 100\% | -- | -- | $1 \text { per }$ area | 20\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | yes | -- |
| Silver Hake 4VWX | Groundfis h Mobile Gear | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | $\begin{gathered} 5- \\ 10 \% \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Snow Crab (Scotian Shelf ) 4X, ENS-S | Trap | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 5\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Snow Crab (Scotian Shelf ) ENS-N | Trap | 100\% | -- | -- | 5\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | -- |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online / paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-out } \end{aligned}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Surf Clam Banquereau \& Grand Bank | Dredge | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | ~10\%* | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | No | No | ASOP <br> deployed "as required"; recently about 10\% of trips |
| Swordfish (Atlantic) | Harpoon | 100\% | -- | -- | 5\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Swordfish (Atlantic) | Longline | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 5\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Winter Flounder 4X5Y | Groundfis h Mobile Gear | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5- \\ 10 \% \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | -- |

Table A4. Survey of Canadian fishery monitoring in the Pacific Region. Note: this table is a summary of responses received and is neither an official listing of all of Canada's fisheries nor is it meant to be an official source of the listed fishery's monitoring tools or coverage levels. (VMS = vessel monitoring system, ASOP = at-sea observer program)

| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online/paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-out } \end{aligned}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clam, Geoduck | Dive | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Clam, Intertidal (Manila, Littleneck, Butter and Razor clams) | Rake | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | No | No | -- |
| Dungeness Crab CMA A, B, E, G, H, I, J | Trap | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} \hline 100 \\ \% \\ \text { when } \\ \text { no } \\ \text { ASO } \\ \text { P } \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ \text { (when } \\ \text { no } \\ \text { EM) } \end{gathered}$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | Red Rock and King crabs can be retained |
| Dogfish | Groundfi sh Trawl - Option A | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 100\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Dogfish | Groundfi sh Trawl - Option B | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Dogfish | Groundfi sh* | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | Hook and Line and Trap: Halibut, Sablefish, Rockfish, Lingcod and Dogfish Hook and Line and Trap fisheries |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online/paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Hail } \\ \text {-in } \end{gathered}$ | Hail <br> -out | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Euphausiid <br> s | Trawl | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Hake, Pacific | Groundfi sh Trawl - Option A * | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | Freezer trawlers must have ASOP, others can use EM |
| Hake, Pacific | Groundfi sh Trawl - Option B | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Halibut, Pacific | Groundfi sh Trawl - Option A * | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 100\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | Prohibited species |
| Halibut, Pacific | Groundfi sh Trawl - Option B * | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | Prohibited species |
| Halibut, Pacific | Groundfi sh * | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | Hook and Line and Trap: Halibut, Sablefish, Rockfish, Lingcod and Dogfish Hook and Line and Trap fisheries |
| Herring, Pacific | Roe Seine \& Gillnet | -- | -- | -- | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Herring, Pacific | Food \& Bait - <br> Seine | 100\% | -- | -- | 100\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Herring, Pacific | SOK | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | Ponded \& Unponded |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online/paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-in } \end{aligned}$ | Hail -out | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Herring, Pacific | Special Use ZX | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | No | No | No | -- |
| Herring, Pacific | Special Use ZY | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | Yes | For landings of $<50 \mathrm{t}$ \& < 500 pieces |
| Herring, Pacific | Special Use ZY over 50 tons | 100\% | -- | -- | 50\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Lingcod, Pacific | Groundfi sh Trawl - Option A | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 100\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Lingcod, Pacific | Groundfi sh Trawl - Option B | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Lingcod, Pacific | Groundfi sh * | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | Hook and Line and Trap: Halibut, Sablefish, Rockfish, Lingcod and Dogfish Hook and Line and Trap fisheries |
| Spot Prawn | Trap | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | - |
| Rockfish | Groundfi sh Trawl - Option A | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 100\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online/paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-in } \end{aligned}$ | Hail -out | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rockfish | Groundfi sh Trawl - Option B | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Rockfish | Groundfi sh * | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | Hook and Line and Trap: Halibut, Sablefish, Rockfish, Lingcod and Dogfish Hook and Line and Trap fisheries |
| Sablefish | Groundfi sh Trawl - Option A | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 100\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Sablefish | Groundfi sh Trawl - Option B | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online/paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Hail } \\ \text {-in } \end{gathered}$ | Hail -out | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sablefish | Groundfi sh * | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | Hook and Line and Trap: Halibut, Sablefish, Rockfish, Lingcod and Dogfish Hook and Line and Trap fisheries |
| Salmon, Chinook NC AABM | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | Some* | Area F Troll Demo Chinook ITQ: 100\%; 0\% (others) | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | ASOP: Area A Seine derby: 8 observer days for 60 observed sets; "No" for the others |
| Salmon, Chinook WCVI AABM | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Salmon, Chinook Yukon River | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | - | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Salmon, Chum Southern Inside | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | --* | Area H troll - ITE: 100\% <br> No for the others | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes |  <br> "Area B Seine - derby" |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online/paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-in } \end{aligned}$ | Hail -out | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salmon, <br> Coho - <br> North <br> Coast | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | Some* | Area F Troll Demo Chinook ITQ: 100\%; 0\% (others) | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | ASOP: Area A <br> Seine derby: <br> 8 observer <br> days for 60 <br> observed <br> sets; "No" for the others |
| Salmon, Coho Southern Inside | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Salmon, Pink Fraser River | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | Some* | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Vari able | Vari able | ASOP: No for Lower Fraser gillnet fisheries; Yes for the others |
| Salmon, Pink North Coast | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | Some* | Area F Troll Demo Chinook ITQ: 100\%; 0\% (others) | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | ASOP: Area A <br> Seine derby: <br> 8 observer <br> days for 60 <br> observed <br> sets; "No" for the others |
| Salmon, Sockeye Fraser River | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | Some* | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Vari able | Vari able | ASOP: No for Lower Fraser gillnet fisheries; Yes for the others |
| Salmon, Sockeye Skeena and Nass Rivers | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | No | No | -- |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online/paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-out } \end{aligned}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salmon, Sockeye Somass River | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Salmon, Sockeye Stikine River | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Spiny and Pink scallop (areas 1229) | Trawl | 100\% | -- | -- | * | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | *Only if compliance with landing hails is poor |
| Sea Cucumber | Dive | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Sea <br> Urchin, <br> Green | Dive | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Sea Urchin, Red | Dive | 100\% | Pilot | -- | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Shrimp | Trawl | 100\% | -- | -- | Var. | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Shrimp | Trap | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Tuna, Albacore | -- | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CND / USA } \\ & \text { EEZ and } \\ & \text { offshore } \end{aligned}$ |

Table A5. Survey of Canadian fishery monitoring in the Quebec Region. Note: this table is a summary of responses received and is neither an official listing of all of Canada's fisheries nor is it meant to be an official source of the listed fishery's monitoring tools or coverage levels. (VMS = vessel monitoring system, ASOP = at-sea observer program)

| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online/paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-out } \end{aligned}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crabe commun Souszones 17AC \& 12D-Z | Trap | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | variable | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | No | -- |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Snow Crab } \\ & -12 F \end{aligned}$ | Trap | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | $\begin{gathered} 4,5- \\ 20 \% \text { * } \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | * selon \% crabe blanc |
| Snow Crab - 13 | Pêche index /Trap | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2,5\% } \\ & \text { min. } \end{aligned}$ | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | * selon \% crabe blanc |
| Snow Crab - 17 | Trap | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \% \\ & \text { min. } \end{aligned}$ | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | 1: pour le SSN, le délai de transmission du signal a été indiqué dans la colonne Q lorsque disponible |
| Snow Crab 16 | Trap | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | $\begin{gathered} 7- \\ 15 \% \text { * } \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Herring 16A, 16B, 16D | filet <br> maillant, seine bourse, trappe | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | 25\% | -- | -- | -- |  | Yes | No | -- |
| Herring 15 4S | Gillnet | 100\% | -- | -- | 25\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |
| Herring 15 4S | Seine | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 25\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online/paper survey | Purchase slips | Hail -in | Hail -out | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lobster Gaspé Zones 1921 et I.M. Zone 22 | Trap | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | No | No | -- |
| Lobster HMCN -17A-B, 18B-D, 18G-H | Trap | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | No | SSN: 17A-B seulement |
| Northern Shrimp Fishery SFA 8, 9 , 10, 12 | Shrimp trawl | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 5\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Phoque du Groënland CN et Phoque gris | Strike* | 100\% | -- | -- | On dema nd | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | App el jour nali er | No | * Commercial fishery only |
| Phoque du Groënland IDLM | Strike* | 100\% | -- | -- | On dema nd | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | App el jour nali er | Yes | * Commercial fishery only |
| Lumpfish 4S EF CN | A-52 <br> vessel class in 4S (<45'), FG GN | 100\% | -- | -- | 10\% * | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | No | Yes | ASO put in place in 2010. <br> Very few fishing activities since and no activity has ever been cover by ASO |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online/paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-in } \end{aligned}$ | Hail -out | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Redfish Unit 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (G+I.M.) } \\ & -4 R S T \\ & \text { MG } \end{aligned}$ | 100\% | Optio nal | -- | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25\% } \\ & \text { (no- } \end{aligned}$ VMS); 10\% (w/VM S) | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | Fishery under moratorium; has a $2,000 \mathrm{t}$ index fishery |
| Redfish Unit 1 | (Madelip êche) 4RST | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | $\begin{gathered} \hline 25 \% \\ (10 \% \\ \text { pour } \\ \text { SSN) } \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | Fishery under moratorium; has a $2,000 \mathrm{t}$ index fishery |
| Thon rouge 4RST | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Vessel } \\ & <65^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | 100\% | -- | -- | Var. | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Greenland Halibut 4RST | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Que FG } \\ & <65 \text { ', } \\ & \text { ITQ } \end{aligned}$ | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 5\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Greenland Halibut 4RST | Gaspe Lower StL FG $\geq 45^{\prime}$ ITQ LL, grp 1\&2 | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 15\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Greenland Halibut 4RST | Lower North shore, FG, ITQ | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 5\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Greenland Halibut 4RST | GaspeLower StL, FG, <45' | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 5\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online/paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-in } \end{aligned}$ | Hail -out | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cod 3Pn, } \\ & \text { 4RS } \end{aligned}$ | FG, Que <br> North <br> Shore, <br> Competi <br> tif <br> vessel <br> <50' | 100\% | -- | -- | 5\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | There is a recreational fishery for 3Pn 4RS cod but not by this fleet. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cod 3Pn, } \\ & \text { 4RS } \end{aligned}$ | Gaspe Lower StL FG $\geq 45^{\prime}$ ITQ | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 20\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | There is a recreational fishery for 3Pn 4RS cod but not by this fleet. |
| Atlantic Halibut 4RST | Que Gaspe Lower StL FG $\geq 45^{\prime}$ ITQ LL | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 20\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Atlantic Halibut 4RST | Gaspe Lower StL, FG<45', Lobster group A125 \& Competi tive A127; | 100\% | -- | -- | 10\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online/paper survey | Purchase slips | Hail -in | Hail -out | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Atlantic Halibut 4RST | Lower <br> North <br> shore <br>  <br>  <br> M.I. <br> RPPUM <br> \& Upper <br> Middle <br> North <br> Shore <br> <65' <br> competit ive | 100\% | -- | -- | 10\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Atlantic Halibut 4RST | Gaspe Lower StL, FG <45', Turbot A124 \& IQ AMTG | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 10\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Capelin 4S zone 15 | comp. Purse seine | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | spora dic | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | No | No | -- |
| Capelin 4S zone 15 | Beach seine / comp. Trap | 100\% | -- | -- | spora dic | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | No | No | -- |
| Mackerel | Qc fleet, zone 15 \& 16 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 25\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | No | -- |
| Scallop IM <br> - Zone 20 | drag | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | no | -- |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online/paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{gathered} \text { Hail } \\ \text {-in } \end{gathered}$ | Hail -out | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scallop - <br> Zones <br> 16A1, 16C | drag | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 5\% | $\begin{gathered} 100(16 \mathrm{C}) \\ 0-16 \mathrm{~A} \end{gathered}$ | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Scallop - } \\ & \text { Zones } \\ & \text { 16A2, } \\ & \text { 16B,16D, } \\ & \text { 16G, 18D } \end{aligned}$ | drag | 100\% | ${ }^{--}$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |
| Scallop - <br> Zones <br> 17,18B-C, <br> 19 | drag | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | $\begin{gathered} 5 \% \\ (17 \mathrm{~A} 1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & (18 C) \end{aligned}$ | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { (17 } \\ & \text { A1) } \end{aligned}$ | -- |
| Scallop Zone 16E, 16F, 18A | drag | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Scallop - } \\ & \text { Zones } 15 \text {, } \\ & 16 \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{I} \end{aligned}$ | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |
| Stimpson's surfclam IM - Zone 5 | Hydrolic dredge | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | sporadic | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |
| Atlantic surfclam IM zone 5 | Hand tools | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Call | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Atlantic surfclam IM zone 5 | ITQ, Dredge | 100\% | -- | -- | 5\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Whelk Zone 8 | Comp. | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | - | -- | Yes | No | No | -- |
| Whelk Gaspésie Zones 1114 | Comp. | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |
| Whelk HMCN | Comp. | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ -Z . \\ 1-2 \end{gathered}$ | No | -- |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online/paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-in } \end{aligned}$ | Hail -out | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Zones 1-7 } \\ & \& 9 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sea urchin CN Zone 91 | -- | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | Yes | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | yes | no | -- |
| Sea cucumber | CN | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | No | NO | -- |
| Sea cucumber | Gaspési e | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | $\begin{gathered} 30 \% \\ \text { min } \\ \text { with } \\ \text { SSN } 5 \\ \text { min. } \\ \text { or } \\ 100 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | DMP 100\% but 10\% weighted |
| Toad crab CN Zone CN1 -CN4 | Trap | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | no | -- |
| Toad crab IM Zone 12 | Trap | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | 25\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | no | -- |
| Greenland Halibut NAFO 0A | -- | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | 100\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 100\% (in } \\ & \text { Canada) } \end{aligned}$ | -- | -- | -- | Yes | -- | Yes | -- |
| Greenland Halibut NAFO OB | -- | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | -- | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ \mathrm{MG}, \\ 20 \% \mathrm{~F} \\ \mathrm{G} \end{gathered}$ | $100 \% \text { (in }$ Canada) | -- | -- | -- | Yes | -- | Yes | -- |

Table A6. Survey of Canadian fishery monitoring in the National Capital Region. Note: this table is a summary of responses received and is neither an official listing of all of Canada's fisheries nor is it meant to be an official source of the listed fishery's monitoring tools or coverage levels. (VMS $=$ vessel monitoring system, ASOP = at-sea observer program)

| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online / paper survey | Purchase slips | Hailin | Hailout | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N. Shrimp (Borealis \& montagui) - EAZ \& SFA 1 | Trawl | 100\% | 100\% | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | -- | -- |
| N. Shrimp SFA 4 | Offshore <br> - Trawls | 100\% | 100\% | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | -- | -- |
| N. Shrimp SFA 4 | Inshore | 100\% | 100\% | -- | 10\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | No | No | -- |
| N. Shrimp SFA 4 montagui | Offshore <br> - Trawls | 100\% | 100\% | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | -- | -- |
| N. Shrimp SFA 5 | Offshore <br> - Trawls | 100\% | 100\% | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | No | Yes | -- | -- |
| N. Shrimp SFA 5 | Inshore | 100\% | 100\% | -- | 10\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | No | No | -- |
| N. Shrimp SFA 6 | Offshore <br> - Trawls | 100\% | 100\% | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | -- | -- |
| N. Shrimp SFA 6 | Inshore | 100\% | 100\% | -- | 10\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | No | No | -- |
| N. Shrimp WAZ borealis \& montagui | Offshore <br> - trawl | 100\% | 100\% | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | -- | -- |

Table A7. Survey of Canadian fishery monitoring in the Newfoundland and Labrador Region. Note: this table is a summary of responses received and is neither an official listing of all of Canada's fisheries nor is it meant to be an official source of the listed fishery's monitoring tools or coverage levels. (VMS = vessel monitoring system, ASOP = at-sea observer program)

| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online / paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-in } \end{aligned}$ | Hail -out | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Capelin: } \\ & \text { 4RST, } \\ & \text { SA2+3KLPs } \end{aligned}$ |  <br> mobile gear) <br> Gillnet, barr siene, purse seine | 100\% | MG only | -- | Var. | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |
| Cod - 2J3KL (Northern) | gillnets, Iongline, handline and traps | 100\% | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Vesse } \\ & \text { I >35' } \end{aligned}$ | -- | 5\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |
| Cod-3Ps <br> (Atlantic) | Longline \& mobile gear bottom | 100\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Vesse } \\ & \text { I }>35^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | -- | 10\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |
| Greenland Halibut 23KLMNO | Fixed gear Gillnet, longline, pots; Mobile Gear Trawl | 100\% | 100\% | -- | 5\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | Yes | inshore |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online / paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-out } \end{aligned}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Herring 2J3IKLPs | (Fixed <br>  <br> mobile <br> gear) <br> Gillnet, <br> barr <br> siene, <br> purse <br> seine | 100\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 100\% } \\ & \text { MG; } \\ & \text { ? FG } \end{aligned}$ | -- | Var. | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |
| Herring 4R <br> (Spring <br> Spawner)/ <br> Herring 4R <br> (Fall <br> Spawner) | (Fixed <br>  <br> mobile <br> gear) <br> Gillnet, <br> barr <br> siene, <br> purse <br> seine | 100\% | MG | -- | Var. | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lobster - LFA } \\ & 3-14 C \end{aligned}$ | -- | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | No | No | -- |
| Queen / Snow Crab 2GHJ3KLNO Ps, 4R3Pn | Trap | 100\% | * | -- | No target | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | No | No | 100\% midoffshore; inshore 0\% |
| Redfish: 3LN, 3O, Unit 2 | Mobile gear Bottom | 100\% | 100\% | -- | 5\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |
| Skate 3LNO | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fixed } \\ & \text { gear } \\ & \text { Gillnets } \end{aligned}$ | 100\% | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Vesse } \\ & I>35^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | -- | 5\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |
| Skate 3LNO | Mobile gear Bottom | 100\% | 100\% | -- | 5\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Whelk - } \\ & \text { 2J3K3L4R } \end{aligned}$ | Trap | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | No | No | -- |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online / paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-in } \end{aligned}$ | Hail -out | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Whelk - 3PS | Trap | 100\% | 100\% | -- | No target | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | No | No | -- |
| White Hake 3NOPs | Fixed gear Gillnet, Longline | 100\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Vesse } \\ & \text { I >35' } \end{aligned}$ | -- | 5\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |
| Witch <br> Flounder - 3NO | Mobile gear Bottom | 100\% | 100\% | -- | 5\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |
| Yellowtail Flounder | Mobile gear Bottom | 100\% | 100\% | -- | 25\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | No | -- |
| Lumpfish 3Pn 4R | Fixed gear, Vessel > 35' | 100\% | -- | -- | 5\% | 0\%; DMP bycatch landed | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | -- | -- |
| Lumpfish 3Pn 4R | Fixed gear, Vessel < 35' | 0\%* | -- | -- | 5\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 0\%; DMP } \\ & \text { bycatch } \\ & \text { landed } \end{aligned}$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | No | -- | *Science specific logbook returned to DFO science |
| Greenland Halibut 4RST 3Pn 4R | Fixed gear. Vessel class A283 and $\geq 35^{\prime}$ | 100\% | 100\% | -- | 10\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | -- |
| Greenland Halibut 4RST 3Pn 4R | Fixed Gear NL fisher, < 35' | 0\%* | -- | -- | 10\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | *Science specific logbook returned to DFO science |
| Cod 3Pn, 4RS | NL Fixed Gear | 100\% | -- | -- | 5\% |  | -- | -- | -- | -- |  |  | -- |


| Stock | Fleet or fishing method | Logbook | VMS | Camera | ASOP | Dockside monitoring | Creel | Interviews | Online / paper survey | Purchase slips | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Hail } \\ & \text {-out } \end{aligned}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Atlantic Halibut 4RST 3Pn 4R | Fixed Gear, Vessel < 35' | 0\%* | -- | -- | 10\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | * Science specific logbook returned to DFO science |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Atlantic } \\ & \text { Halibut 4RST } \\ & \text { 3Pn 4R } \end{aligned}$ | Fixed Gear, Vessel < 45' | 100\% | -- | -- | 10\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | *fishing trips in 4RST \& 3Pn > 24 hrs and/or landing in ports outside the N\&L, fishers required to hail in to DFO on the 2nd and each subsequent day. |
| Atlantic <br> Halibut 4RST <br> 3Pn 4R | Fixed Gear, Vessel > 45' | 100\% | -- | -- | 15\% | 100\% | -- | -- | -- | -- | Yes | Yes | *fishing trips in 4RST \& $3 \mathrm{Pn}>24 \mathrm{hrs}$ and/or landing in ports outside N\&L, fishers required to hail in to DFO on the 2nd and each subsequent day. |

