

Proposed Revisions to the National Standards

Tom Nies

New England Fishery Management Council

June 8, 2014



New England
Fishery Management Council

Major Elements

- Increase flexibility in rebuilding programs
- Improve management of data limited stocks.
- Clarify guidance on which stocks require conservation and management.
- Enhance ecosystem approaches to management.
- Provide more stability in annual catch limits.
- Define depleted stocks.
- Improve the routine review of management plans.

Overall Concept

- Council support for increased rebuilding flexibility
- Questions on many elements:. Some examples:
 - Stocks that require conservation and management
 - Practical/possible vs. practicable
 - MSST
- Does it go far enough on ecosystem approaches?
- Does it adequately recognize limits of science?

Review Plan

- Review letter in sections
- Work by consensus as much as possible
- Try to avoid wordsmithing – focus on substantive comments
- Once finished, vote to forward letter, as edited ,to Council

General

- Need for better system design
- Mixed stock fisheries
- MSST (page 9)
- Practical vs. practical vs. possible

Rebuilding Flexibility

- General support for less emphasis on strict timelines
- Revisions to Frebuild not needed ,but... (page 21)
- Evaluating adequate progress (page 21)
- Interim measures (page 21)
- Calculation of T_{max} (page 20)

Data Limited Stocks

- Information limited, not data limited (pages 18-19)

Stocks

- Clarification on ecosystem component species (page 5-7)
- Definition of *fishery* (page 12)
- Impacts of climate change on jurisdiction

Ecosystem Approaches

- Aggregate MSY: how does it interface with other values (OFL, ABC, etc.) (page 6)

Catch Limit Stability

- Multi-year overfishing definitions (pages 9, 18)
- Phase-in of control rules (page 15)
- How much uncertainty is enough?
- Carry-over provisions (page 15)

Depleted Stocks

- Support for term, but...
 - When it should apply
 - Management measures needed (page 9, 22)

Review of FMPs

- Councils should determine periodicity

Questions?

CCC Policy Documents

NEPA White Paper

- Streamline development and review of FMP actions
- Does not remove analytic requirements
- Opportunities for comment extensive in Council process
- Similar to language in HR 1335

Allocation Review

- Prompted by debates in other regions over past allocation decisions
- Two papers:
 - CCC: when should allocations be reviewed?
 - NMFS: what factors should be considered when developing allocations?

When Should Allocations Be Reviewed?

- Public interest
 - Ongoing public input
 - Solicitation of comment
 - Forma; petitions or referenda
- Specific time intervals
- Indicators
 - Are goals and objective still valid?
 - Are goals and objectives being met?