



Report of the 91st Session of the IPHC Conference Board (CB091)

Meeting held in Seattle, WA U.S.A. (electronically), 26-28 January 2021

Commissioners

Canada	United States of America
Paul Ryall	Glenn Merrill
Neil Davis	Robert Alverson
Peter DeGreef	Richard Yamada

Executive Director

David T. Wilson, Ph.D.

DISTRIBUTION:

Participants in the Session
Members of the Commission
IPHC Secretariat

BIBLIOGRAPHIC ENTRY

IPHC 2021. Report of the 91st Session of the IPHC Conference Board. Electronic meeting, 26-28 January 2021.
IPHC-2021-CB091-R, 22 pp.



INTERNATIONAL PACIFIC
HALIBUT COMMISSION

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication and its lists do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

This work is protected by copyright. Fair use of this material for scholarship, research, news reporting, criticism or commentary is permitted. Selected passages, tables or diagrams may be reproduced for such purposes provided acknowledgment of the source is included. Major extracts or the entire document may not be reproduced by any process without the written permission of the Executive Director, IPHC.

The IPHC has exercised due care and skill in the preparation and compilation of the information and data set out in this publication. Notwithstanding, the IPHC, its employees and advisers, assert all rights and immunities, and disclaim all liability, including liability for negligence, for any loss, damage, injury, expense or cost incurred by any person as a result of accessing, using or relying upon any of the information or data set out in this publication, to the maximum extent permitted by law including the International Organizations Immunities Act.

Contact details:

International Pacific Halibut Commission
2320 W. Commodore Way, Suite 300
Seattle, WA, 98199-1287, U.S.A.
Phone: +1 206 634 1838
Fax: +1 206 632 2983
Email: secretariat@iphc.int
Website: <https://www.iphc.int/>

ACRONYMS

AM	Annual Meeting, of the IPHC
CB	Conference Board
FCEY	Fishery Constant Exploitation Yield
FISS	Fishery-independent setline survey
IPHC	International Pacific Halibut Commission
SPR	Spawning Potential Ratio
TCEY	Total Constant Exploitation Yield
WPUE	Weight Per Unit Effort

DEFINITIONS

A set of working definitions are provided in the IPHC Glossary of Terms and abbreviations: <https://www.iphc.int/the-commission/glossary-of-terms-and-abbreviations>

HOW TO INTERPRET TERMINOLOGY CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT

This report has been written using the following terms and associated definitions so as to remove ambiguity surrounding how particular paragraphs should be interpreted.

- Level 1: RECOMMENDED; RECOMMENDATION; ADOPTED** (formal); **REQUESTED; ENDORSED** (informal): A conclusion for an action to be undertaken, by a Contracting Party, a subsidiary (advisory) body of the Commission and/or the IPHC Secretariat.
- Level 2: AGREED:** Any point of discussion from a meeting which the Commission considers to be an agreed course of action covered by its mandate, which has not already been dealt with under Level 1 above; a general point of agreement among delegations/participants of a meeting which does not need to be elevated in the Commission's reporting structure.
- Level 3: NOTED/NOTING; CONSIDERED; URGED; ACKNOWLEDGED:** General terms to be used for consistency. Any point of discussion from a meeting which the Commission considers to be important enough to record in a meeting report for future reference. Any other term may be used to highlight to the reader of an IPHC report, the importance of the relevant paragraph. Other terms may be used but will be considered for explanatory/informational purposes only and shall have no higher rating within the reporting terminology hierarchy than Level 3.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REPORT OF THE 91ST SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB091)	1
TABLE OF CONTENTS	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1. OPENING OF THE SESSION	7
1.1 <i>Election of Co-Chairpersons</i>	7
1.2 <i>Accreditation of CB Membership (2021-25)</i>	7
2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION	7
3. IPHC SECRETARIAT INFORMATIONAL SESSION	7
3.1 <i>Definition of Mortality Limits and TCEY</i>	7
3.2 <i>MSE update</i>	8
3.3 <i>Pacific Halibut Multiregional Economic Impact Assessment (PHMEIA): summary of progress</i>	8
4. FISHING PERIODS: SEASON OPENING AND CLOSING DATES	8
5. MORTALITY LIMITS	8
5.1 <i>Coastwide perspectives</i>	9
5.2 <i>Regulatory Area perspectives</i>	9
5.2.1 <i>IPHC Regulatory Area 2A (U.S.A.)</i>	9
5.2.2 <i>IPHC Regulatory Area 2B (Canada)</i>	9
5.2.3 <i>IPHC Regulatory Area 3A (U.S.A.)</i>	10
5.3 <i>TCEY Recommendations</i>	10
6. IPHC FISHERY REGULATIONS: PROPOSALS FOR THE 2020-21 PROCESS	11
6.1 <i>IPHC Secretariat fishery regulation proposals</i>	11
6.2 <i>Contracting Party fishery regulation proposals</i>	12
6.3 <i>Other Stakeholder fishery regulation proposals</i>	12
7. INCIDENTAL CATCH (BYCATCH)	13
8. OTHER BUSINESS	13
9. REVIEW OF THE DRAFT AND ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE 91TH SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB091)	15
APPENDIX I LIST OF PARTICIPANTS FOR THE 91ST SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB091)	16
APPENDIX II AGENDA FOR THE 91ST SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB091)	19
APPENDIX III PACIFIC HALIBUT MORTALITY PROJECTED FOR 2021 BASED ON THE CB RECOMMENDED TCEY MORTALITY LIMITS	20
APPENDIX IV CONSOLIDATED SET OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND REQUESTS OF THE 92ST SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB091) (26-28 JANUARY 2021)	21

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 91st Session of the International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC) Conference Board (CB091) was held electronically from 26-28 January 2021. A total of 66 (55 in 2020) members attended the Session from the two (2) Contracting Parties. The meeting was opened by Mr. Jim Lane (Canada) and Ms. Linda Behnken (U.S.A.) (Co-Chairpersons), who welcomed participants.

The following are a subset of the complete recommendations and requests for action from the CB091, which are provided at [Appendix IV](#).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Election of Co-Chairpersons

CB091–Rec.01 ([para. 4](#)) **NOTING** the issue identified whereby the Co-Chairpersons may change at the start of the CB meeting, which limits the degree of preparedness for a meeting by incoming chairs, the CB **RECOMMENDED** that the IPHC Rules of Procedure be modified so that the tenure of the CB Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson ends at the close of the applicable CB meeting. The intention is to ensure continuity between meetings and allow the IPHC Secretariat to work with, and prepare the Co-Chairpersons leading into a meeting of the CB. [**Canada:** In favour=13; against=0; abstain=1][**U.S.A.:** In favour=27; against=1; abstain=0].

Definition of Mortality Limits and TCEY

CB091–Rec.02 ([para. 9](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission request the IPHC Secretariat and the IPHC Management Strategy Advisory Board examine the potential impacts of eliminating, reducing or maintaining the 32 inch minimum size limit in the directed commercial fishery. Analysis should include potential effects such as fishing intensity, yield at the coast wide and individual IPHC Regulatory Area scale, fishery limit distribution, economic yield, effects on other sectors and possible shifts in fishing behaviour. [**Canada:** In favour=15; against=1; abstain=0;][**U.S.A.:** In favour=28; against=1; abstain=2]

Fishing periods: season opening and closing dates

CB091–Rec.03 ([para. 18](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** the following fishing period dates for 2021:

- a) Opening: 4 March [in favour=37; against=2; abstain=13]
- b) Closing: 31 December [in favour=37; against=2; abstain=13]

Mortality limits

CB091–Rec.04 ([para. 21](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** the Commission adopt an F43 for the 2021 harvest rate along with the corresponding coastwide TCEY of 39 million pounds. [**Canada:** In favour=22; against=0; abstain=0;][**U.S.A.:** In favour=25; against=5; abstain=5].

IPHC Fishery Regulations: Mortality and Fishery Limits (Sect. 5)

CB091–Rec.05 ([para. 39](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal [IPHC-2021-AM097-PropA1](#), with the addition of the mortality limits for each Contracting Party, by sector, as detailed in [Section 5.3](#). [**Canada:** In favour=17; against=0; abstain=1][**U.S.A.:** In favour=23; against=0; abstain=1].

IPHC Fishery Regulations: minor amendments

CB091–Rec.06 ([para. 45](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal IPHC-2021-AM097-PropA3 as written in Appendix I. [**Canada:** unanimous; **U.S.A.:** unanimous].

Charter management measures in IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C and 3A (Sect. 29)

CB091–Rec.07 ([para. 47](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal [IPHC-2021-AM097-PropB1](#). [**Canada:** In favour=0; against=0; abstain=18][**U.S.A.:** In favour=19; against=0; abstain=8].

Commercial Fishing Period (Sect. 9)

CB091–Rec.08 ([para. 49](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** the Commission move to a year-round directed commercial fishery. [**Canada:** In favour=9; against=2; abstain=6][**U.S.A.:** In favour=22; against=1; abstain=5].

Incidental catch (Bycatch)

CB091–Rec.09 ([para. 55](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission request the IPHC Secretariat and MSAB further examine the potential impacts of bycatch of Pacific halibut on the resource and directed commercial and recreational fisheries coastwide. Analysis should include potential effects to yield at the coastwide, regional and individual IPHC Regulatory Area scale, fishery limit distribution and economic yield. [**Canada:** In favour=17; against=0; abstain=0] [**U.S.A.:** In favour=25; against=4; abstain=3]

REQUESTS**TCEY Recommendations**

CB091–Req.01 ([para. 31](#)) The CB members from the USA **REQUESTED** the following 2021 TCEYs for Alaska IPHC Regulatory Areas based on SPR 43 resulting in a Coastwide TCEY of 39 million pounds ([Table 1](#)). TCEYs for IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C and 3A include an adjustment for unguided angler estimates using a midpoint between ADFG high and low values, where the reference mortality table uses high values. An increase to IPHC Regulatory Area 2C from the reference TCEY is offset by reducing increases to IPHC Regulatory Areas 3A, 4A, and 4B in relative proportion to their increases from 2020 adopted values. TCEY for IPHC Regulatory Areas 3B and 4CDE stay at reference values ([Appendix III](#)).

Table 1. Conference Board (CB) recommended TCEY mortality limits for 2021. See previous paragraphs for voting.

IPHC Regulatory Area	Mortality limit (TCEY) (mlb)
2C	5.66
3A	13.79
3B	3.12
4A	2.38
4B	1.44
4CDE	3.98
Total (IPHC Convention Area)	39.00

Canada: In favour=0; against=0; abstain=19

U.S.A.: In favour=21; against=7; abstain=6

1. OPENING OF THE SESSION

1. The 91st Session of the International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC) Conference Board (CB091) was held electronically from 26-28 January 2021. A total of 66 (55 in 2020) members attended the Session from the two (2) Contracting Parties. The list of participants is provided at **Appendix I**. The meeting was opened by Mr. Jim Lane (Canada) and Ms Linda Behnken (U.S.A.) (Co-Chairpersons), who welcomed participants.

1.1 *Election of Co-Chairpersons*

2. In accordance with Appendix IV, Section III of the IPHC Rules of Procedure (2020), the CB **NOTED** the requirement to elect Co-Chairpersons, and the option to elect up to two (2) Vice-Chairpersons, of the CB until the beginning of the Session in 2023.
3. The CB **CALLED** for nominations for the positions of Co-Chairpersons of the CB until the opening of the session in 2023. Mr Jim Lane (Canada) and Ms Linda Behnken (United States of America) were nominated, seconded and elected as Co-Chairpersons.
4. **NOTING** the issue identified whereby the Co-Chairpersons may change at the start of the CB meeting, which limits the degree of preparedness for a meeting by incoming chairs, the CB **RECOMMENDED** that the IPHC Rules of Procedure be modified so that the tenure of the CB Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson ends at the close of the applicable CB meeting. The intention is to ensure continuity between meetings and allow the IPHC Secretariat to work with, and prepare the Co-Chairpersons leading into a meeting of the CB. [**Canada**: In favour=13; against=0; abstain=1][**U.S.A.**: In favour=27; against=1; abstain=0].

1.2 *Accreditation of CB Membership (2021-25)*

5. Canada accredited 26 new members and the USA accredited 40 new members, for participation in the 2021 Conference Board proceedings.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION

6. The CB **ADOPTED** the Agenda as provided at [Appendix II](#), with the addition of a size limit discussion under agenda item 3.1 and the timing of Co-Chairpersons elections under agenda item 8. The documents provided to the CB091 are those submitted for the 97th Session of the IPHC Annual Meeting (AM097). To assist the CB in navigating its meeting, all documents relevant to the agenda were posted as links on the CB webpage: <https://www.iphc.int/venues/details/91st-session-of-the-iphc-conference-board-cb091>.
7. The CB **NOTED** that it will convene on Thursday (28 January) morning to adopt the report of the CB091, for presentation to the Commission on Thursday afternoon.

3. IPHC SECRETARIAT INFORMATIONAL SESSION

3.1 *Definition of Mortality Limits and TCEY*

8. The CB **NOTED** the informal presentation by Dr Ian Stewart (IPHC Quantitative Scientist), which included outlining the IPHC definitions of total mortality and TCEY as follows:
 - a) **Total mortality**: Consists of all sources and sizes of dead Pacific halibut in two categories - 1) the TCEY and 2) U26 discard mortality in non-directed fisheries;
 - b) **Total Constant Exploitation Yield (TCEY)**: The current basis for Commission mortality limits. Includes all sources and sizes of mortality, except U26 discards in non-directed fisheries.
9. The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission request the IPHC Secretariat and the IPHC Management Strategy Advisory Board examine the potential impacts of eliminating, reducing or maintaining the 32 inch minimum size limit in the directed commercial fishery. Analysis should include potential effects such as fishing intensity, yield at the coast wide and individual IPHC Regulatory Area scale, fishery limit distribution, economic yield, effects on other sectors and possible shifts in fishing behaviour. [**Canada**: In favour=15; against=1; abstain=0;][**U.S.A.**: In favour=28; against=1; abstain=2]

10. The CB **NOTED** an amendment to the above motion which failed requesting the MSAB also consider impacts of establishing a maximum size limit. Some CB members noted that conserving large females may provide benefits to the stock and that MSAB should consider both minimum and max size limits at the same time. Other CB members noted the lack of relationship between spawning biomass size and recruitment; also mortality associated with measuring large fish prior to release. [**Canada:** In favour=0; against=17; abstain=1;][**U.S.A.:** In favour=2; against=23; abstain=4]
11. The CB members from Canada **NOTED** their support of the MSAB looking at removing/reducing the size limit to determine long-term implications but are concerned the removal of the size limit may create an incentive to high grade catch. The members from Canada understand comments about the public perception of the fishery if fish are released at-sea; however, for this to work there needs to be improved monitoring in directed fishery to address the issues of potential high grading.

3.2 MSE update

12. The CB **NOTED** the review of the MSE process and MSAB reports provided by Dr Allan Hicks (IPHC Quantitative Scientist).
13. The CB **NOTED** the completion of the IPHC MSE and delivery of results at AM097 investigating Scale and Distribution components of management procedures, as presented in [IPHC-2021-AM097-11](#) and reported in [IPHC-2021-MSAB015-R](#) and [IPHC-2021-MSAB016-R](#).
14. The CB **ACKNOWLEDGED** and appreciates the work and commitment of the IPHC Secretariat and the MSAB members which went into producing these MSE results.
15. The CB **ENDORSED** the work of the IPHC MSE and finds the results useful for the specification of an IPHC harvest strategy policy. [Canada: In favour=15; against=1; abstain=1;][USA: In favour=32; against=0; abstain=1]

3.3 Pacific Halibut Multiregional Economic Impact Assessment (PHMEIA): summary of progress

16. The CB **NOTED** the information presentation by Dr Barbara (Basia) Hutniczak (IPHC Fisheries Economist) which included a broad overview of her current work to better understand the economic contribution of Pacific halibut and the connectivity to the supply chain with initial focus on the commercial fishery.
17. The CB **NOTED** their appreciation for an excellent presentation and that the information will be very useful and should be provided to the NPFMC and the PFMC to inform their management process.

4. FISHING PERIODS: SEASON OPENING AND CLOSING DATES

18. The CB **RECOMMENDED** the following fishing period dates for 2021:
- Opening: 4 March [in favour=37; against=2; abstain=13]
 - Closing: 31 December [in favour=37; against=2; abstain=13]
19. The CB **AGREED** that, for both opening and closing, the dates should allow the longest fishing period possible. The following reasons were given for this rationale:
- Maximize time to catch quota particularly given challenges with COVID;
 - Longer season to increase competitiveness in the market;
 - Increase time Pacific halibut retention is allowed in other fisheries ;
 - Minimize whale depredation.

5. MORTALITY LIMITS

20. The CB **NOTED** the IPHC's web-based mortality projection tool for use in the CB091 and AM097 (<https://www.iphc.int/data/projection-tool>).

5.1 *Coastwide perspectives*

21. The CB **RECOMMENDED** the Commission adopt an F43 for the 2021 harvest rate along with the corresponding coastwide TCEY of 39 million pounds. [**Canada:** In favour=22; against=0; abstain=0;][**U.S.A.:** In favour=25; against=5; abstain=5].
22. The CB **NOTED** that recruitment from 2006 to 2010 was below average (AM 097-08 slide 30) and further declines in spawning biomass are expected over the next 3 years until 2011/2012 year classes begin to substantially contribute to the spawning biomass.
23. The CB **NOTED** that while Pacific halibut spawning biomass/recruit relationships remain uncertain, some of the largest recruitment events have occurred during times of low spawning biomass.
24. The CB **NOTED** the 2021 Decision Table shows only a minor difference in probability that spawning biomass will decrease by more than 5% over the next 3 years when comparing an F46 SPR (representative of maintaining 2020 coastwide TCEY) with the target F43 SPR. This indicates that minor changes in fishing intensity have a relatively a small effect on project spawning biomass declines but can have a large effect on 2021 yield.
25. The CB **NOTED** that there was a less than an 8% chance of the stock status being below the B20 threshold in the next 3 years at an F43 harvest rate, and that there was a roughly 50/50 chance that the fishery TCEY would decline by more than 10% over the same time period at F43. (slide 46)
26. The CB **NOTED** that F43 SPR was evaluated by MSE process, deemed robust across a range of stock sizes and uncertainty, and recommended by consensus agreement of the MSAB.
27. The CB **NOTED** the following from some (minority) USA CB members expressing the following concerns regarding F43 TCEY:
 - a) Concerns that adopting the 39 million pound TCEY resulting from the F43 reference level is too risky;
 - b) Slide 40 show that the result of a 39 million pound TCEY is a further decline in spawning biomass that has been ongoing for two decades;
 - c) Slide 33 notes that the spawning biomass has declined an additional 17% since 2016;
 - d) The “3 year surplus” is TCEYs for the next three years that would give a 50% chance of being at exactly the same spawning biomass at the end of the three year period;
 - e) The aggregate three year surplus is 75 million pounds. A TCEY of 39 million pounds burns through over half of the three year surplus in year one and results in a two out of three chance of further stock declines and more than four out of 10 chance of dropping below SB30%;
 - f) The spawning biomass is our capital account and adopting a 39 million pound TCEY for 2021 is an explicit choice to spend down that capital while praying to win the recruitment lottery;
 - g) F43 is a reference, not a recommendation;
 - h) The proximity to the SB30 line indicates now is not the time to increase the harvest level.

5.2 *Regulatory Area perspectives*

5.2.1 **IPHC Regulatory Area 2A (U.S.A.)**

28. The CB **NOTED** the following from IPHC Regulatory Area 2A CB members:
 - a) As part of the interim agreement, a fixed TCEY for IPHC Regulatory Area 2A of 1.65 million pounds is intended to apply for a period from 2019-2022, subject to any substantive conservation concerns (ref. para. 97 of [IPHC-2020-AM096-R](#));

5.2.2 **IPHC Regulatory Area 2B (Canada)**

29. The CB **NOTED** the following from IPHC Regulatory Area 2B CB members:
 - a) A share-based allocation for IPHC Regulatory Area 2B was adopted in 2019;

- b) The share is based on a weighted average that assigns 30% weight to the current interim management procedure's target TCEY distribution and 70% on IPHC Regulatory Areas 2B's recent historical average share of 20%;
- c) This formula for defining IPHC Regulatory Areas 2B's annual allocation is intended to apply for a period of 2019 to 2022;
- d) For 2020, this equated to a share of 18.2% before accounting for U26 (ref. para. 97 of [IPHC-2020-AM096-R](#)).

5.2.3 IPHC Regulatory Area 3A (U.S.A)

30. The CB **NOTED** the following from IPHC Regulatory Area 3A CB members:

- a) 3A stakeholders are concerned about consistent shifts in allocation between IPHC Regulatory Areas for socioeconomic needs that deviate from stock assessment FCEY recommendations, and the long term effects of this practice.
- b) 3A is shouldering the majority of the quota redistribution to IPHC Regulatory Area 2C adopted in 5.3, in addition to compensating IPHC Regulatory Areas 2A and 2B under the interim agreement.
- c) These quota shifts need to be adopted on a year-to-year basis, and not be adopted as a common practice or policy.
- d) While the goal of the CB is to weigh socioeconomic needs along with stock assessment recommendations to develop FCEY distributions, 3A CB members expressed a desire for returning to a science based distribution of the FCEY and a renegotiation of the interim agreement as soon as possible.

5.3 TCEY Recommendations

31. The CB members from the USA **REQUESTED** the following 2021 TCEYs for Alaska IPHC Regulatory Areas based on SPR 43 resulting in a Coastwide TCEY of 39 million pounds ([Table 1](#)). FCEYs for IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C and 3A include an adjustment for unguided angler estimates using a midpoint between ADFG high and low values, where the reference mortality table uses high values. An increase to IPHC Regulatory Area 2C from the reference TCEY is offset by reducing increases to IPHC Regulatory Areas 3A, 4A, and 4B in relative proportion to their increases from 2020 adopted values. TCEY for IPHC Regulatory Areas 3B and 4CDE stay at reference values ([Appendix III](#)).

Table 1. Conference Board (CB) recommended TCEY mortality limits for 2021. See previous paragraphs for voting.

IPHC Regulatory Area	Mortality limit (TCEY) (mlb)
2C	5.66
3A	13.79
3B	3.12
4A	2.38
4B	1.44
4CDE	3.98
Total (IPHC Convention Area)	39.00

Canada: In favour=0; against=0; abstain=19

U.S.A.: In favour=21; against=7; abstain=6

32. The CB members from the USA **NOTED** that the 39 mlb coastwide TCEY results in a 6.5% increase in Coastwide TCEY, and that the reference TCEY for IPHC Areas result a 12% drop in 2C TCEY while all other IPHC Regulatory Areas of the Convention are flat or increasing. U.S.A.

33. The CB members further **NOTED** there are likely proximity effects of interim agreement on 2C, that the FISS showed a 5% drop in 2C survey O32 WPUE, but that 2C still has the highest FISS WPUE of all IPHC Regulatory Areas and its Fishery WPUE is flat. The motion provides a decrease/increase from 2020 adopted TCEYs to the following Alaska IPHC Regulatory Areas: 2C (-3.2%), 3A (13%), 4A (35.7%), 4B (9.9%). Changes to FCEY for the same IPHC Regulatory Areas are: 2C (0%), 3A (21%), 4A (39%), 4B

(15%). FCEYs for IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C and 3A include an adjustment for unguided angler estimates using a midpoint between ADFG COVID-unadjusted and COVID adjusted values.

34. The CB members from the USA **NOTED** some stakeholders in the USA expressed that the proposal to help temper 2C reductions this year with small reallocations from other Alaska IPHC Regulatory Areas was a reasonable approach and stated that if the Commission was going to provide additional quota to 2C it should not come out of the resource. However, many expressed significant concerns about the negative distributional impacts on Alaska IPHC Regulatory Areas resulting from the interim agreement between Canada and the US, and the zero sum scenario it presents. This impact has been highlighted through the MSAB's work, as was the importance of the survey as the most scientifically robust tool in determining distribution. While there was general understanding that the Commission wishes to honor the interim agreement through this year, US stakeholders have significant concerns about the impacts of cementing the agreement as a long term harvest policy of the Commission.
35. The CB members from the USA **NOTED** the following perspectives from IPHC Regulatory Area 4CDE members:
- a) In the absence of the FISS data in the Bering sea, anecdotal information provided by 4CDE stakeholders will be important to capture.
 - b) Fishing for the larger boats in IPHC Regulatory Area 4D around St. Matthew was excellent in 2020. There wasn't a local small boat fishery around St. Paul, but subsistence fishing around the island was very good with high catch rates.
 - c) IPHC Regulatory Area 4CDE is concerned with the practice of moving fish from western to eastern IPHC Regulatory Areas or randomly moving fish from one IPHC Regulatory Area to another. IPHC Regulatory Area 4CDE representatives would prefer the implementation of a more robust management procedure to address inter-annual stability, such as a three year rolling average of FISS data for calculating TCEY's.
36. The CB members from the USA **NOTED** the failed motion for an amendment requesting to modify the IPHC Regulatory Area 2C amount from 5.66 million pounds to 5.5 million pounds and increase IPHC Regulatory Area 3A from 13.79 million pounds to 13.95 million pounds [**Canada:** In favour=0; against=0; abstain=20;][**U.S.A.:** In favour=11; against=12; abstain=10].
37. The CB members from Canada **NOTED** the unguided recreational mortality projections presented by the USA members. The Canada members expressed reservations and concerns with the proposal for dealing with unguided recreational mortality projections in IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C and 3A in the context of COVID-19. The Canada members understand what the USA members are trying to do but do not think they have the data to support the proposal. The Canada members are concerned that catch estimate are generated in September of the following year and it is all self-reporting with limited independent verification. The non-guided recreational fishery in both IPHC Regulatory Areas does not have a limit and there are no in-season management measures to rein things in if the projections are wrong. The Canada members advise precaution and note they cannot support the proposal as presented but the Commissioners may be able to reach a compromise.

6. IPHC FISHERY REGULATIONS: PROPOSALS FOR THE 2020-21 PROCESS

6.1 IPHC Secretariat fishery regulation proposals

6.1.1 IPHC Fishery Regulations: Mortality and Fishery Limits (Sect. 5)

38. The CB **NOTED** fishery regulation proposal [IPHC-2021-AM097-PropA1](#), which provides the mortality and fishery limits framework for population at AM097.
39. The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal [IPHC-2021-AM097-PropA1](#), with the addition of the mortality limits for each Contracting Party, by sector, as detailed in [Section 5.3](#). [**Canada:** In favour=17; against=0; abstain=1][**U.S.A.:** In favour=23; against=0; abstain=1].

6.1.2 IPHC Fishery Regulations: Commercial fishing periods (Sect. 9)

40. The CB **NOTED** fishery regulation proposal [IPHC-2021-AM097-PropA2](#), which specified fishing periods for the commercial Pacific halibut fisheries. See [Section 4](#) for a summary of discussions and recommendations.
41. The CB **NOTED** proposal [IPHC-2021-AM097-PropA2](#), with the addition of the fishing periods as detailed in [Section 4](#)).
42. The CB **NOTED** a suggestion from IPHC Regulatory 2A stakeholders and Mr Phil Anderson, PFMC representative regarding [IPHC-2021-AM097-PropA2](#) and that PFMC indicated they held meetings and outreach with stakeholders regarding the season with a minor difference of one day.
43. The CB **NOTED** the IPHC Rules of Procedure were not followed to allow for a proposal to be provided with supporting details, hence the CB did not take action other than to recommend the IPHC Secretariat work with the PFMC to resolve season dates.

6.1.3 IPHC Fishery Regulations: minor amendments

44. The CB **NOTED** fishery regulation proposal [IPHC-2021-AM097-PropA3](#), which proposed amendments to ensure clarity and consistency in the IPHC Fishery Regulations, with minor modification as identified during AM097.
45. The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal IPHC-2021-AM097-PropA3 as written in Appendix I. [**Canada:** unanimous; **U.S.A.:** unanimous].

6.2 Contracting Party fishery regulation proposals

6.2.1 Charter management measures in IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C and 3A (Sect. 29)

46. The CB **NOTED** fishery regulation proposal [IPHC-2021-AM097-PropB1](#), which proposed IPHC Regulation changes for charter recreational Pacific halibut fisheries in IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C and 3A, in order to achieve the charter Pacific halibut allocation under the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council's (NPFMC) Pacific halibut Catch Sharing Plan.
47. The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal [IPHC-2021-AM097-PropB1](#). [**Canada:** In favour=0; against=0; abstain=18][**U.S.A.:** In favour=19; against=0; abstain=8].

6.3 Other Stakeholder fishery regulation proposals

6.3.1 Commercial Fishing Period (Sect. 9)

48. The CB **NOTED** fishery regulation proposal [IPHC-2021-AM097-PropC1 Rev_1](#), which proposed an extension of the directed commercial Pacific halibut season to year-round (1 January to 31 December).
49. The CB **RECOMMENDED** the Commission move to a year-round directed commercial fishery. [**Canada:** In favour=9; against=2; abstain=6][**U.S.A.:** In favour=22; against=1; abstain=5].
50. The CB **NOTED** that an early March opening is preferable with a March to March season or accounting year noting the concerns in the USA regarding Contracting Party implementation and that proposed rules must be posted in the US Federal Register and urge the Contracting Party managers to overcome these obstacles.
51. The CB **NOTED** that an increasing competitive market is affecting the Canadian and American Pacific halibut industries. Trade data show that for 2019 through February 2020, total Atlantic Canadian halibut imports to the U.S. topped 15.3 million pounds, total global production of farmed halibut is only 4.4 million pounds, of which 3.5 million comes from three farms in Norway. In 2019, two million pounds of frozen Russian caught Pacific halibut were imported into the U.S.A. The year prior it was 140,000 pounds. A new report shows that Russia has harvested 24 million pounds of Pacific halibut in 2020.
52. The CB **NOTED** since COVID-19 happened this spring the price has fallen, some commercial fishermen have started developing their own local markets by doing dock sales to the public. The sales have been a

success for those that have done it and the public would like to be able to buy more fresh fish year-round but are unable to do so because of the seasonal closure.

53. The CB **NOTED** that Canadian vessels that are licensed to fish for sablefish, rockfish by hook and line, lingcod and dogfish are accountable for all the Pacific halibut that they encounter and release. For example, in Canada, if a vessel is out fishing for rockfish and encounters 100 Pacific halibut during the closed season, they must all be released, and the vessel will be charged a mortality on those fish released. The mortality rate is 16% for longlined Pacific halibut and the average weight for a legal sized Pacific halibut is 21 pounds. That works out to 3.36 pounds of Pacific halibut mortality for each fish encountered so those 100 fish the vessel releases is 336 pounds of Pacific halibut that must be accounted. That is a significant cost that is born by fishermen fishing for other species of fish when there is no biological reason to have a closed season.
54. The CB **NOTED** earlier this year the Commission held a special session regarding a proposal that Canada put forward to have an extended season for 2020. The IPHC Secretariat prepared a paper [IPHC-2020-SS08-PropA1](#) with the following excerpts.

'The best scientific information available suggests that there is no biological basis for assuming an increased risk to the stock by allowing a fishing period extension to 31 December 2020, or to 20 February 2021.'

The stock assessment process can easily adjust to accommodate an extension to the 2020 directed commercial fishing period to 31 December 2020 recognizing any removals after this date would be attributed to 2021 removals.'

7. INCIDENTAL CATCH (BYCATCH)

55. The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission request the IPHC Secretariat and MSAB further examine the potential impacts of bycatch of Pacific halibut on the resource and directed commercial and recreational fisheries coastwide. Analysis should include potential effects to yield at the coastwide, regional and individual IPHC Regulatory Area scale, fishery limit distribution and economic yield. [**Canada:** In favour=17; against=0; abstain=0] [**U.S.A.:** In favour=25; against=4; abstain=3]
56. The CB **NOTED** that a future review of bycatch by the MSAB had been anticipated by the CB and is not currently scheduled.

8. OTHER BUSINESS

57. The CB members from the U.S.A. **NOTED**, through a motion, the MSE model results represent new information indicating the IPHC Regulatory Area 2B portion of the Interim Agreement causes significant negative impacts on U.S.A. IPHC Regulatory Areas. These impacts include:
- The ongoing transfer of yield generated by Pacific halibut residing in US waters to Canada. This transfer of yield is caused by including a percentage of coastwide TCEY in IPHC Regulatory Area 2B's apportionment formula which is greater than the relative abundance of the Pacific halibut resource in 2B, and results in TCEY reductions in all Alaska IPHC Regulatory Areas. MSE Model results indicate that the reductions in Alaska TCEYs will become more pronounced as Pacific halibut abundance shifts back to more historical patterns with relative increases in Region 3.
 - A significant decrease in Region 2 spawning biomass resulting from increased fishing pressure in IPHC Regulatory Area 2B under the Interim Agreement. MSE results establish a 17% relative decrease in the Region 2 long-term spawning biomass metric under the Interim Agreement (MP B) vs. a FISS based distribution approach (MP J), which more closely follows local abundance trends. Slide 26 of AM097-09 also depicts this effect;
 - Since spawning biomass is closely related to O32 biomass distribution, IPHC Regulatory Area 2C receives a reduced base share of the overall TCEY and is further impacted by an additional TCEY deduction driven by compensation for the IPHC Regulatory Area 2B interim agreement apportionment formula.

-
58. The CB members from the U.S.A. **NOTED** that the MSE Model was based on the best available science with development guided by the SRB and MSAB, and subject to an external peer review.
59. The CB members from the U.S.A. **NOTED** that the MSAB Report (MSAB-016 paragraph 37 identifies the IPHC Fishery-Independent Setline Survey (FISS) is currently the best scientific method for estimating stock distribution among Biological Regions and IPHC Regulatory Areas.
60. The CB members from the U.S.A. **NOTED** that most MP's ranked Tier 1 by the MSAB use the FISS modeled stock distribution estimates as the basis for distribution.
61. The CB members from the U.S.A. **REQUESTED** the Commission initiates a process to modify the Interim Agreement to more closely track Regional/ IPHC Regulatory Area abundance trends and the available yield of the Pacific halibut resource surveyed by the FISS within each contracting parties' waters. Modification to the Interim Agreement should be completed prior to setting 2022 Catch limits. [**Canada:** In favour=0; against=21; abstain=2][**U.S.A.:** In favour=19; against=3; abstain=8]
62. The CB members from Canada **NOTED** that the MSE data utilizes apportioning by bottom area as its basis when running the simulations of the Management Procedures. The Contracting Party of Canada has never agreed with this methodology to distribute the TACs to the IPHC Regulatory Areas.
63. The CB members from Canada **NOTED** that Apportionment has never been accepted as the way to allocate the coastwide TCEY. They noted the Contracting Parties have deviated, and agreed to deviate, from apportionment when determining IPHC Regulatory Area TCEYs since apportionment was introduced as the CB has. These members note it is not the only scientifically defensible way to distribute the available harvest and that there are many scientifically defensible ways to distribute the available harvest.
64. The CB members from Canada **NOTED** that the CB members from the USA presented the premise that apportionment (O32 distribution) is the status quo, that it is the starting point and the CB members from Canada note that it is not. They note that the assertion that MP-E does not impact Canada is not true and that it significantly impacts Canada compared to the interim agreement.
65. The CB members from Canada **NOTED** that estimating how the stock is distributed is one thing; distributing the coastwide TCEY (the available harvest) is something else. They noted that the two are separate; they are related but they are separate. They note that biomass distribution is a science exercise, but TCEY distribution is a policy decision that is informed by science and socio-economic considerations. They note that this is consistent with the conclusion of the IPHC Secretariat in IPHC-2018-SS01-02, which states that TCEY is a management/policy decision where other objectives are considered (e.g., economic, social, etc.,).
66. The CB members from Canada **NOTED** that at the MSAB the agreement was that MPs for distributing the coastwide TCEY may be data-driven, policy-driven or some combination [Paragraph 40]. They note that the interim agreement combines data-driven and policy driven elements and is scientifically defensible – as proven by the MSE process and evaluations.
67. The CB members from Canada **NOTED** that the agreement reached in 2019 reflects the parties' objectives for sharing the resource (IPHC-2019-AM-095-R, paragraph 69). They note that the agreement includes specific allocation for IPHC Regulatory Area 2A and Canada and that it takes into account both Contracting Parties' interests, including meeting Indigenous obligations in IPHC Regulatory Area 2A.
68. The CB members from Canada **NOTED** that as shown in the MSE process, it is about making trade-offs. They note that the interim agreement may reduce the biomass in Region 2, but it increases it in other Regions and that the same is true for any MP, they have different implications in different IPHC Regulatory Areas.
69. The CB members from Canada **NOTED** the interim agreement defines a way for sharing the resource that provides stability of access for the Contracting Parties and reflects recent historical shares of the coastwide TCEY.

-
70. The CB members from Canada **NOTED** that the CB should note that most MPs in Tier 1 use the FISS modelled stock distribution but that the best performing MP was an iteration of the interim agreement.
71. The CB members from Canada **NOTED** that the interim agreement does not save Canadian TAC harmless to the variability in biomass; as does include “apportionment” as part of the component for distribution.
72. The CB members from Canada **NOTED** that it has to be pointed out that; the MSE process has determined that all 11MPs met the conservation objective of maintaining the female stock biomass above the biomass reference point at least 95% of time. This includes four management procedures that include the interim agreement, including one providing the greatest coast-wide catch and the lowest coast-wide catch variability.
73. The CB members from Canada **NOTED** just as important, the interim agreement included language stating that each country would be responsible for including its U26 mortality against its collective total mortality.
74. The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the IPHC Secretariat report all weights primarily in terms of pounds. [Canada: In favour=14; against=3; abstain=1][U.S.A.: In favour=22; against=3; abstain=3].
75. The CB **RECOMMENDED** the Commission host the 98th Session of the Annual Meeting (AM098) in Victoria, BC, Canada. [Canada: In favour=19; against=0; abstain=0][U.S.A.: In favour=14; against=7; abstain=6].
76. The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission continue to rotate the Chair between the Contracting Parties on an annual basis. [Canada: In favour=5; against=0; abstain=12][U.S.A.: In favour=24; against=1; abstain=5].
77. The CB **EXPRESSED** its appreciation for the assistance provided by the IPHC Secretariat, and for in-session presentations and support by Dr Ian Stewart, Dr Allan Hicks, Dr Barbara (Basia) Hutniczak, Ms Lara Erikson and Ms Monica Thom, Ms Lauri Sadorus and the Secretariat support behind the scenes.

9. REVIEW OF THE DRAFT AND ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE 91TH SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB091)

78. The report of the 91st Session of the IPHC Conference Board (IPHC-2021-CB091-R) was **ADOPTED** on 28 January 2021, including the consolidated set of recommendations and requests arising from CB091, provided at [Appendix IV](#) [Canada: In favour=unanimous][U.S.A.: In favour=unanimous].

APPENDIX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS FOR THE 91ST SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB091)

Officers

Co-Chairperson	Co-Chairperson
Mr. Jim Lane (Canada)	Ms. Linda Behnken (United States of America)

CB Members

Canada		
Member	Representative	Email
Annieville Halibut Association (AHA)	Terry Henshaw	tonic1949@gmail.com
A-Tlegay Fisheries Society (AFS)	Christa Rusel	atlegay@shawcable.com
BC Commercial Integrated Groundfish Society (CIGS)	David Boyes	mcboyes@icloud.com
BC Halibut Longliner's Association (HLA)	Lorne Iverson	lorneiverson@telus.net
BC Northern Trollers Association (NTA)	Robert Hauknes	aftadirectors@northerntrollers.bc.ca
BC Tuna Fishermen's Association (TFA)	Tiare Boyes	tiare@leewardltd.com
BC Wildlife Federation (WF)	Ted Brookman	bcwf@bc.ca
Canadian Sablefish Association (CSA)	Rob Kronlund	info@canadiansablefish.com
Council of the Haida Nation (CHN)	Shawn Cowpar	chn.masset@haidanation.com
Dididaht First Nation (DFN)	Darryl Tate	dtate@dididaht.ca
Halibut Advisory Board (HAB)	Jordan Belveal	Maureen.Finn@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Hook and Line Groundfish Association (HLGA)	Ken Wing	ken.wing@hotmail.com
Island Marine Aquatic Working Group (IMAWG)	Donald Victor Isaac	nfrederickson.imawg@gmail.com
Northern Halibut Producers Association (NHPA)	Alan Carl	porchers@citytel.net
Nuu-Chah-Nulth Tribal Council (NTC)	Cliff Atleo	dtate@ditidaht.ca
Pacific Coast Fishing Vessel Owners Guild (PCFVOG)	Quinton Sample	quintonsample@gmail.com
Pacific Halibut Management Association of BC (PHMA)	Chris Sporer	chris.sporer@phma.ca
Sport Fishing Advisory Board (SFABM) - Main Board	Gerry Kristianson	gerrykr@telus.net
Sport Fishing Advisory Board (SFABN) - North Coast Region	Mike Fowler	midon@protonmail.ch
Sport Fishing Advisory Board - South Coast Region (SFABS)	Chuck Ashcroft	chuckashcroft@telus.net
Steveston Halibut Association (SHA)	Angus Grout	rommel@telus.net
Sport Fishing Institute of BC (SFI)	Owen Bird	birdo@sportfishing.bc.ca
South Vancouver Island Anglers Coalition (SVIAC)	Christopher Bos	chris@anglerscoalition.com
The United Fishermen And Allied Workers' Union – Unifor (UFAWU/UNIFOR)	Russell Cameron	president@ufawu.org
Vancouver Island Longline Association (VILA)	Lyle Pierce	Lyle_p@shaw.ca
West Coast Fishing Guides Association (WCFGA)	Pat Ahern	pat.ahern@shaw.ca

United States of America		
Member	Representative	Email
Adak Community Development Corporation (ACDC)	Layton Lockett	ljlockett@gmail.com
Alaska Charter Association (ACA)	Jim Martin	jim@alaskacharter.org
Alaska Longline Fisherman's Association (ALFA)	Dan Falvey	alfafishak@gmail.com
Alaska Whitefish Trawlers Association (AWTA)	Rebecca Skinner	execdir@alaskawhitefishtrawlers.org
APICDA	Angel Drobnica	adrobnica@apicda.com
Aleut Corporation (AC)	George Pollock	Gpollock@aleutenterprise.com
Area 4 Concerned Harvesters	Lenny Herzog	Herzog.lenny@gmail.com
Bristol Bay Economic Development Corporation (BBEDC)	Gary Cline	gary@bbedc.com
Cape Barnabas, Inc (CB)	Duncan Fields	dfields@ptialaska.net
CATCH Association (CA)	Brian Richie	russellt@aseresorts.com
Central Bering Sea Fishermen's Association (CBSFA)	Ray Melovidov	plestenkof@cbsfa.com
Coastal Conservation Association (CCA)	Dave Croonquist	dcroonquist@gmail.com
Coastal Trollers Association (CTA)	Joel Kawahara	joelkaw@earthlink.net
Coastal Villages Region Fund (CVRF)	Paul Wilkins	paul_w@coastalvillages.org
Cordova District Fishermen United (CDFU)	Marc Carrel	director@cdfu.org
Deep Sea Fishermen's Union of the Pacific (DSFU)	Shawn McManus	jj.deepseafishermensunion@gmail.com
Edmonds Veteran Independent Longliners (EVL)	Michael Offerman	longlinr@gmail.com
Fishing Vessel Owners Assoc. (FVOA)	Per Odegaard	roberta@fvoa.org
Freezer Longline Coalition (FLC)	Chad See	chadsee@freezerlongline.biz
Halibut Coalition Inc.(HC)	Tom Gemmell	Halibutcoalition@gmail.com
Homer Charter Association (HCA)	Ben Martin	HCA99603@gmail.com
Humbolt Area Saltwater Anglers (HASA)	Mary Marking	Hasa6191@gmail.com
K-Bay Fisheries Association (KBAY)	Kiril Basargin	wildlegacyseafoods@gmail.com
Kodiak Vessel Owners Association (KVOA)	Linda Kozak	lkozak@gci.net
Kruzof Fisheries (KRUZOF)	Jim Hubbard	jim@kruzoffisheries.com
Next Generation Fishermens Association (NGFA)	Garrett Elwood	fvwesternfreedom@gmail.com
North Pacific Fisheries Association (NPFA)	Malcolm Milne	npfahomer@gmail.com
Petersburg Vessel Owners Association (PVOA)	Megan O'Neil	pvoa@gci.net
Recreational Fishing Alliance - National (RFAN)	Garrett Lambert	DGCharters@icloud.com
Recreational Fishing Alliance – California (RFAC)	Tom Marking	Tmmarking@sbcglobal.net
Sablefish and Halibut Pot Association (SHPA)	Paul Clampitt	pfishcl@gmail.com

Seafood Producers Coop (SPC)	James Carter Hughes	carterhughes@hotmail.com
SE Alaska Fishermen's Alliance (SEAFSA)	Kathy Hansen	kathy@seafa.org
Sitka Halibut & Sablefish Marketing Association (SHSMA)	Phillip Wyman	philwyman@hotmail.com
Southeast Alaska Guides Organisation (SEAGO)	Forrest Braden	forrest@seagoalaska.org
St. Paul Fishing Company (SPFC)	Jeff Kauffman	Jeff@spfisco.com
Tribal Government of St. Paul (TGSP)	Simeon Swetzof Jr.	swetzof@hotmail.com
United Fishermen's Marketing Association (UFMA)	Jeff Stephan	jeff.stephan@me.com
Westport Charter Boat Association (WCBA)	Michael Sawin	sawinmikey@gmail.com
Yukon Delta Fisheries Association (YDFA)	Landry Price	Landry.ydfda@gmail.com

IPHC Secretariat

Participant	Title	Email
Ms Lara Erikson	Branch Manager, Fisheries Statistics and Services	lara.erikson@iphc.int
Ms Monica Thom	Setline Survey Specialist	monica.thom@iphc.int

APPENDIX II**AGENDA FOR THE 91ST SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB091)****Date:** 26-28 January 2021**Location:** Electronic**Venue:** Adobe Connect**Time:** 26th: 13:30-17:00; 27th: 09:00-17:00; 28th: 09:00-12:00**Co-Chairperson:** Mr Jim Lane (Canada); Ms Linda Behnken (United States of America)

- 1. OPENING OF THE SESSION (Co-Chairpersons)**
 - 1.1 Election of Co-Chairpersons
 - 1.2 Accreditation of CB Membership (2021-25)
- 2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION (Co-Chairpersons)**
- 3. IPHC SECRETARIAT INFORMATIONAL SESSION**
 - 3.1 Mortality Limits and TCEY (I. Stewart)
 - 3.2 MSE Update (A. Hicks)
 - 3.3 Pacific Halibut Multiregional Economic Impact Assessment (PHMEIA): summary of progress (B. Hutniczak)
- 4. FISHING PERIODS: SEASON OPENING AND CLOSING DATES**
- 5. MORTALITY LIMITS (Co-Chairpersons)**
 - 5.1 Coastwide perspectives
 - 5.2 Regulatory Area perspectives
 - 5.3 TCEY Recommendations
- 6. IPHC FISHERY REGULATIONS: PROPOSALS FOR THE 2020/21 PROCESS**
 - 6.1 IPHC Secretariat fishery regulation proposals (L. Erikson)
 - 6.2 Contracting Party fishery regulation proposals (Contracting Parties)
 - 6.3 Other Stakeholder fishery regulation proposals (Stakeholders)
- 7. INCIDENTAL CATCH (BYCATCH) (Co-Chairpersons)**
- 8. OTHER BUSINESS (Co-Chairpersons)**
- 9. REVIEW OF THE DRAFT AND ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE 91ST SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB091) (Co-Chairpersons; IPHC Secretariat)**

APPENDIX III**PACIFIC HALIBUT MORTALITY PROJECTED FOR 2021 BASED ON THE CB RECOMMENDED TCEY MORTALITY LIMITS**

Note: All values reported in millions of net pounds.

CANADA RECOMMENDATION: Nil

	2A	2B	2C	3A	3B	4A	4B	4CDE	Total
Commercial discard mortality									
O26 Non-directed discard mortality									
Recreational									
Subsistence									
Total Non-FCEY									
Commercial discard mortality									
Recreational									
Subsistence									
Commercial Landings									
Total FCEY									
TCEY									
U26 Non-directed discard mortality									
Total Mortality									

USA RECOMMENDATION

	2A	2B	2C	3A	3B	4A	4B	4CDE	Total
Commercial discard mortality	0.03	0.17	NA	NA	0.11	0.14	0.05	0.08	0.58
O26 Non-directed discard mortality	0.10	0.23	0.09	1.14	0.42	0.24	0.12	2.20	4.54
Recreational	NA	0.04	0.94	1.53	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	2.54
Subsistence	NA	0.41	0.37	0.19	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.03	1.02
Total Non-FCEY	0.14	0.84	1.39	2.86	0.56	0.41	0.17	2.31	8.69
Commercial discard mortality	NA	NA	0.07	0.24	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.31
Recreational	0.61	0.92	0.78	1.91	NA	NA	NA	NA	4.23
Subsistence	0.03	NA	0.03						
Commercial Landings	0.87	5.23	3.41	8.78	2.56	1.97	1.27	1.67	25.75
Total FCEY	1.51	6.15	4.26	10.93	2.56	1.97	1.27	1.67	30.31
TCEY	1.65	7.00	5.66	13.79	3.12	2.38	1.44	3.98	39.00
U26 Non-directed discard mortality	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.29	0.06	0.08	0.01	0.78	1.25
Total Mortality	1.65	7.03	5.66	14.07	3.18	2.46	1.45	4.75	40.25

APPENDIX IV

**CONSOLIDATED SET OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND REQUESTS OF THE 92ST SESSION OF THE
IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB091) (26-28 JANUARY 2021)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Election of Co-Chairpersons

CB091–Rec.01 ([para. 4](#)) **NOTING** the issue identified whereby the Co-Chairpersons may change at the start of the CB meeting, which limits the degree of preparedness for a meeting by incoming chairs, the CB **RECOMMENDED** that the IPHC Rules of Procedure be modified so that the tenure of the CB Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson ends at the close of the applicable CB meeting. The intention is to ensure continuity between meetings and allow the IPHC Secretariat to work with, and prepare the Co-Chairpersons leading into a meeting of the CB. [**Canada:** In favour=13; against=0; abstain=1][**U.S.A.:** In favour=27; against=1; abstain=0].

Definition of Mortality Limits and TCEY

CB091–Rec.02 ([para. 9](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission request the IPHC Secretariat and the IPHC Management Strategy Advisory Board examine the potential impacts of eliminating, reducing or maintaining the 32 inch minimum size limit in the directed commercial fishery. Analysis should include potential effects such as fishing intensity, yield at the coast wide and individual IPHC Regulatory Area scale, fishery limit distribution, economic yield, effects on other sectors and possible shifts in fishing behaviour. [**Canada:** In favour=15; against=1; abstain=0;][**U.S.A.:** In favour=28; against=1; abstain=2]

Fishing periods: season opening and closing dates

CB091–Rec.03 ([para. 18](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** the following fishing period dates for 2021:

- a) Opening: 4 March [in favour=37; against=2; abstain=13]
- b) Closing: 31 December [in favour=37; against=2; abstain=13]

Mortality limits

CB091–Rec.04 ([para. 21](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** the Commission adopt an F43 for the 2021 harvest rate along with the corresponding coastwide TCEY of 39 million pounds. [**Canada:** In favour=22; against=0; abstain=0;][**U.S.A.:** In favour=25; against=5; abstain=5].

IPHC Fishery Regulations: Mortality and Fishery Limits (Sect. 5)

CB091–Rec.05 ([para. 39](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal [IPHC-2021-AM097-PropA1](#), with the addition of the mortality limits for each Contracting Party, by sector, as detailed in [Section 5.3](#)). [**Canada:** In favour=17; against=0; abstain=1][**U.S.A.:** In favour=23; against=0; abstain=1].

IPHC Fishery Regulations: minor amendments

CB091–Rec.06 ([para. 45](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal IPHC-2021-AM097-PropA3 as written in Appendix I. [**Canada:** unanimous; **U.S.A.:** unanimous].

Charter management measures in IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C and 3A (Sect. 29)

CB091–Rec.07 ([para. 47](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal [IPHC-2021-AM097-PropB1](#). [**Canada:** In favour=0; against=0; abstain=18][**U.S.A.:** In favour=19; against=0; abstain=8].

Commercial Fishing Period (Sect. 9)

CB091–Rec.08 ([para. 49](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** the Commission move to a year-round directed commercial fishery. [**Canada:** In favour=9; against=2; abstain=6][**U.S.A.:** In favour=22; against=1; abstain=5].

Incidental catch (Bycatch)

CB091–Rec.09 ([para. 55](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission request the IPHC Secretariat and MSAB further examine the potential impacts of bycatch of Pacific halibut on the resource and directed commercial and recreational fisheries coastwide. Analysis should include potential effects to yield at the coastwide, regional and individual IPHC Regulatory Area scale, fishery limit distribution and economic yield. [**Canada:** In favour=17; against=0; abstain=0] [**U.S.A.:** In favour=25; against=4; abstain=3]

Other business

CB091–Rec.10 ([para. 74](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the IPHC Secretariat report all weights primarily in terms of pounds. [**Canada:** In favour=14; against=3; abstain=1][**U.S.A.:** In favour=22; against=3; abstain=3].

CB091–Rec.11 ([para. 75](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** the Commission host the 98th Session of the Annual Meeting (AM098) in Victoria, BC, Canada. [**Canada:** In favour=19; against=0; abstain=0][**U.S.A.:** In favour=14; against=7; abstain=6].

CB091–Rec.11 ([para. 76](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission continue to rotate the Chair between the Contracting Parties on an annual basis. [**Canada:** In favour=5; against=0; abstain=12][**U.S.A.:** In favour=24; against=1; abstain=5].

REQUESTS**TCEY Recommendations**

CB091–Req.01 ([para. 31](#)) The CB members from the USA **REQUESTED** the following 2021 TCEYs for Alaska IPHC Regulatory Areas based on SPR 43 resulting in a Coastwide TCEY of 39 million pounds ([Table 1](#)). FCEYs for IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C and 3A include an adjustment for unguided angler estimates using a midpoint between ADFG high and low values, where the reference mortality table uses high values. An increase to IPHC Regulatory Area 2C from the reference TCEY is offset by reducing increases to IPHC Regulatory Areas 3A, 4A, and 4B in relative proportion to their increases from 2020 adopted values. TCEY for IPHC Regulatory Areas 3B and 4CDE stay at reference values ([Appendix III](#)).

Table 1. Conference Board (CB) recommended TCEY mortality limits for 2021. See previous paragraphs for voting.

IPHC Regulatory Area	Mortality limit (TCEY) (mlb)
2C	5.66
3A	13.79
3B	3.12
4A	2.38
4B	1.44
4CDE	3.98
Total (IPHC Convention Area)	39.00

Canada: In favour=0; against=0; abstain=19

U.S.A.: In favour=21; against=7; abstain=6

CB091–Req.02 ([para. 61](#)) The CB members from the U.S.A. **REQUESTED** the Commission initiates a process to modify the Interim Agreement to more closely track Regional/ IPHC Regulatory Area abundance trends and the available yield of the Pacific halibut resource surveyed by the FISS within each contracting parties' waters. Modification to the Interim Agreement should be completed prior to setting 2022 Catch limits. [**Canada:** In favour=0; against=21; abstain=2][**U.S.A.:** In favour=19; against=3; abstain=8]