

A Review of the New England Fishery Management Process

NEFMC Presentation

April 26, 2011

Background
Methodology
Findings
Recommendations
Conclusions

Identified stakeholders mainly through referrals

Asked high-level questions; drilled down where applicable

Focused on the “process” not the “outcomes” of the process

Interviews were confidential

Conducted two regional visits, and attended multiple Council meetings

Themed data

Developed recommendations

Reviewed prior efforts

Stakeholder Group	# of Interviewees
Industry	59
New England Fishery Management Council	40
Northeast Regional Office	30
Northeast Fisheries Science Center	20
Non-Governmental Organizations	11
National Marine Fisheries Service Headquarters	6
Research Partners	6
Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council	4
Municipal	3
Grand Total	179

This report is based on stakeholder input

We could not speak with everyone

We made some generalizations

We have been objective and neutral

Eliminating redundancies across the entire system

Building a shared sense of accountability for outcomes among NERO, NEFSC,
and NEFMC

Defining clear, objective criteria for determining the success of management
decisions

Developing a shared vision and strategy to guide the process

Creating a more welcoming environment at the Council meetings.

Reducing the negative impacts of lawsuits and politics on the process

Working to minimize redundancy created by NEPA and the MSRA

Fostering an environment of service to the industry

Reestablishing “development of the commercial fishing industry” as part of the
NMFS mission

Streamlining the layers of NOAA review necessary to respond to stakeholder
requests

Improving the quality and timeliness of industry generated data

Building industry confidence in survey generated data

Reducing the time required for science to inform the management process

Simplifying NMFS outreach and communications

Geography and history compound challenges

Scale up the collection and use of socioeconomic data in the FMPs in order to make socioeconomic analysis a more visible and meaningful part of the management process.

Conduct a comprehensive analysis of all NMFS data systems to identify areas that will improve data gathering, data management, data analysis and data use.

Conduct a comprehensive analysis of the FMP reporting requirements to find opportunities to eliminate unnecessary reporting/analysis/writing (e.g. Does an EIS need to be created for each FMP?) and decrease the reporting workload on Council and NERO staff.

Begin the creation of a regional vision and strategic plan to define a new model for collaborating with all stakeholders and to set a future direction for the fishery.

Recommendations: Starting in 120 Days (Cont'd)

Consider resources to scale up observer program and aging analysis to eliminate that as a bottleneck in the science process.

Streamline NMFS communications review protocols to improve the response time to stakeholder request and inquiries.

Design a cost-effective performance management system to track the progress of decisions and capture lessons learned and best practices.

Discussion