(ii) The SAFE report provides information to the Councils for determining annual harvest levels from each stock, documenting significant trends or changes in the resource, marine ecosystems, and fishery over time, and assessing the relative success of existing state and Federal fishery management programs. Information on bycatch and safety for each fishery should also be summarized. In addition, the SAFE report may be used to update or expand previous environmental and regulatory impact documents, and ecosystem and habitat descriptions.

(iii) Each SAFE report must be scientifically based, and cite data sources and interpretations.

(2) Each SAFE report should contain information on which to base harvest specifications.

(3) Each SAFE report should contain a description of the maximum fishing mortality threshold and the minimum stock size threshold for each stock or stock complex, along with information by which the Council may determine:

(i) Whether overfishing is occurring with respect to any stock or stock complex, whether any stock or stock complex is overfished, whether the rate or level of fishing mortality applied to any stock or stock complex is approaching the maximum fishing mortality threshold, and whether the size of any stock or stock complex is approaching the minimum stock size threshold.

(ii) Any management measures necessary to provide for rebuilding an overfished stock or stock complex (if any) to a level consistent with producing the MSY in such fishery.

(4) Each SAFE report may contain additional economic, social, community, essential fish habitat, and ecological information pertinent to the success of management or the achievement of objectives of each FMP.

(5) Each SAFE report may contain additional economic, social, and ecological information pertinent to the success of management or the achievement of objectives of each FMP.

§600.320 National Standard 3—Management Units.

(a) Standard 3. To the extent practicable, an individual stock of fish shall be managed as a unit throughout its range, and interrelated stocks of fish shall be managed as a unit or in close coordination.

(b) General. The purpose of this standard is to induce a comprehensive approach to fishery management. The geographic scope of the fishery, for planning purposes, should cover the entire range of the stocks(s) of fish, and not be overly constrained by political boundaries. Wherever practicable, an FMP should seek to manage interrelated stocks of fish.

(c) Unity of management. Cooperation and understanding among entities concerned with the fishery (e.g., Councils, states, Federal Government, international commissions, foreign nations) are vital to effective management. Where management of a fishery involves multiple jurisdictions, coordination among the several entities should be sought in the development of an FMP. Where a range overlaps Council areas, one FMP to cover the entire range is preferred. The Secretary designates which Council(s) will prepare the FMP, under section 304(f) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

(d) Management unit. The term "management unit" means a fishery or that portion of a fishery identified in an FMP as relevant to the FMP’s management objectives.

(1) Basis. The choice of a management unit depends on the focus of the FMP’s objectives, and may be organized around biological, geographic, economic, technical, social, or ecological perspectives. For example:

(i) Biological—could be based on a stock(s) throughout its range.

(ii) Geographic—could be an area.

(iii) Economic—could be based on a fishery supplying specific product forms.

(iv) Technical—could be based on a fishery utilizing a specific gear type or similar fishing practices.

(v) Social—could be based on fishermen as the unifying element, such as when the fishermen pursue different species in a regular pattern throughout the year.
(vi) Ecological—could be based on species that are associated in the ecosystem or are dependent on a particular habitat.

(2) Conservation and management measures. FMPs should include conservation and management measures for that part of the management unit within U.S. waters, although the Secretary can ordinarily implement them only within the EEE. The measures need not be identical for each geographic area within the management unit, if the FMP justifies the differences. A management unit may contain, in addition to regulated species, stocks of fish for which there is not enough information available to specify MSY and OY or to establish management measures, so that data on these species may be collected under the FMP.

(e) Analysis. To document that an FMP is as comprehensive as practicable, it should include discussions of the following:

(1) The range and distribution of the stocks, as well as the patterns of fishing effort and harvest.

(2) Alternative management units and reasons for selecting a particular one. A less-than-comprehensive management unit may be justified if, for example, complementary management exits or is planned for a separate geographic area or for a distinct use of the stocks, or if the unmanaged portion of the resource is immaterial to proper management.

(3) Management activities and habitat programs of adjacent states and their effects on the FMP’s objectives and management measures. Where state action is necessary to implement measures within state waters to achieve FMP objectives, the FMP should identify what state action is necessary, discuss the consequences of state inaction or contrary action, and make appropriate recommendations. The FMP should also discuss the impact that Federal regulations will have on state management activities.

(4) Management activities of other countries having an impact on the fishery, and how the FMP’s management measures are designed to take into account these impacts. International boundaries may be dealt with in several ways. For example:

(i) By limiting the management unit’s scope to that portion of the stock found in U.S. waters;

(ii) By estimating MSY for the entire stock and then basing the determination of OY for the U.S. fishery on the portion of the stock within U.S. waters;

(iii) By referring to treaties or cooperative agreements.

[61 FR 32540, June 24, 1996, as amended at 63 FR 24234, May 1, 1998]

§ 600.325 National Standard 4—Allocations.

(a) Standard 4. Conservation and management measures shall not discriminate between residents of different states. If it becomes necessary to allocate or assign fishing privileges among various U.S. fishermen, such allocation shall be:

(1) Fair and equitable to all such fishermen.

(2) Reasonably calculated to promote conservation.

(3) Carried out in such manner that no particular individual, corporation, or other entity acquires an excessive share of such privileges.

(b) Discrimination among residents of different states. An FMP may not differentiate among U.S. citizens, nationals, resident aliens, or corporations on the basis of their state of residence. An FMP may not incorporate or rely on a state statute or regulation that discriminates against residents of another state. Conservation and management measures that have different effects on persons in various geographic locations are permissible if they satisfy the other guidelines under Standard 4. Examples of these precepts are:

(1) An FMP that restricted fishing in the EEZ to those holding a permit from state X would violate Standard 4 if state X issued permits only to its own citizens.

(2) An FMP that closed a spawning ground might disadvantage fishermen living in the state closest to it, because they would have to travel farther to an open area, but the closure could be justified under Standard 4 as a conservation measure with no discriminatory intent.