

and management and that are identified on the basis of geographic, scientific, technical, recreational, or economic characteristics,” as distinguished from the Magnuson-Stevens Act’s second definition of fishery as “any fishing for such stocks.”

[61 FR 32540, June 24, 1996, as amended at 63 FR 7075, Feb. 12, 1998; 63 FR 24229, May 1, 1998]

**§ 600.310 National Standard 1—Optimum Yield.**

(a) *Standard 1.* Conservation and management measures shall prevent overfishing while achieving, on a continuing basis, the OY from each fishery for the U.S. fishing industry.

(b) *General.* The determination of OY is a decisional mechanism for resolving the Magnuson-Stevens Act’s multiple purposes and policies, implementing an FMP’s objectives, and balancing the various interests that comprise the national welfare. OY is based on MSY, or on MSY as it may be reduced under paragraph (f)(3) of this section. The most important limitation on the specification of OY is that the choice of OY and the conservation and management measures proposed to achieve it must prevent overfishing.

(c) *MSY.* Each FMP should include an estimate of MSY as explained in this section.

(1) *Definitions.* (i) “MSY” is the largest long-term average catch or yield that can be taken from a stock or stock complex under prevailing ecological and environmental conditions.

(ii) “MSY control rule” means a harvest strategy which, if implemented, would be expected to result in a long-term average catch approximating MSY.

(iii) “MSY stock size” means the long-term average size of the stock or stock complex, measured in terms of spawning biomass or other appropriate units, that would be achieved under an MSY control rule in which the fishing mortality rate is constant.

(2) *Options in specifying MSY.* (i) Because MSY is a theoretical concept, its estimation in practice is conditional on the choice of an MSY control rule. In choosing an MSY control rule, Councils should be guided by the characteristics of the fishery, the FMP’s objec-

tives, and the best scientific information available. The simplest MSY control rule is to remove a constant catch in each year that the estimated stock size exceeds an appropriate lower bound, where this catch is chosen so as to maximize the resulting long-term average yield. Other examples include the following: Remove a constant fraction of the biomass in each year, where this fraction is chosen so as to maximize the resulting long-term average yield; allow a constant level of escapement in each year, where this level is chosen so as to maximize the resulting long-term average yield; vary the fishing mortality rate as a continuous function of stock size, where the parameters of this function are constant and chosen so as to maximize the resulting long-term average yield. In any MSY control rule, a given stock size is associated with a given level of fishing mortality and a given level of potential harvest, where the long-term average of these potential harvests provides an estimate of MSY.

(ii) Any MSY values used in determining OY will necessarily be estimates, and these will typically be associated with some level of uncertainty. Such estimates must be based on the best scientific information available (see § 600.315) and must incorporate appropriate consideration of risk (see § 600.335). Beyond these requirements, however, Councils have a reasonable degree of latitude in determining which estimates to use and how these estimates are to be expressed. For example, a point estimate of MSY may be expressed by itself or together with a confidence interval around that estimate.

(iii) In the case of a mixed-stock fishery, MSY should be specified on a stock-by-stock basis. However, where MSY cannot be specified for each stock, then MSY may be specified on the basis of one or more species as an indicator for the mixed stock as a whole or for the fishery as a whole.

(iv) Because MSY is a long-term average, it need not be estimated annually, but it must be based on the best scientific information available, and should be re-estimated as required by changes in environmental or ecological

conditions or new scientific information.

(3) *Alternatives to specifying MSY.* When data are insufficient to estimate MSY directly, Councils should adopt other measures of productive capacity that can serve as reasonable proxies for MSY, to the extent possible. Examples include various reference points defined in terms of relative spawning per recruit. For instance, the fishing mortality rate that reduces the long-term average level of spawning per recruit to 30–40 percent of the long-term average that would be expected in the absence of fishing may be a reasonable proxy for the MSY fishing mortality rate. The long-term average stock size obtained by fishing year after year at this rate under average recruitment may be a reasonable proxy for the MSY stock size, and the long-term average catch so obtained may be a reasonable proxy for MSY. The natural mortality rate may also be a reasonable proxy for the MSY fishing mortality rate. If a reliable estimate of pristine stock size (i.e., the long-term average stock size that would be expected in the absence of fishing) is available, a stock size approximately 40 percent of this value may be a reasonable proxy for the MSY stock size, and the product of this stock size and the natural mortality rate may be a reasonable proxy for MSY.

(d) *Overfishing*—(1) *Definitions.* (i) “To overfish” means to fish at a rate or level that jeopardizes the capacity of a stock or stock complex to produce MSY on a continuing basis.

(ii) “Overfishing” occurs whenever a stock or stock complex is subjected to a rate or level of fishing mortality that jeopardizes the capacity of a stock or stock complex to produce MSY on a continuing basis.

(iii) In the Magnuson-Stevens Act, the term “overfished” is used in two senses: First, to describe any stock or stock complex that is subjected to a rate or level of fishing mortality meeting the criterion in paragraph (d)(1)(i) of this section, and second, to describe any stock or stock complex whose size is sufficiently small that a change in management practices is required in order to achieve an appropriate level and rate of rebuilding. To avoid confu-

sion, this section uses “overfished” in the second sense only.

(2) *Specification of status determination criteria.* Each FMP must specify, to the extent possible, objective and measurable status determination criteria for each stock or stock complex covered by that FMP and provide an analysis of how the status determination criteria were chosen and how they relate to reproductive potential. Status determination criteria must be expressed in a way that enables the Council and the Secretary to monitor the stock or stock complex and determine annually whether overfishing is occurring and whether the stock or stock complex is overfished. In all cases, status determination criteria must specify both of the following:

(i) *A maximum fishing mortality threshold or reasonable proxy thereof.* The fishing mortality threshold may be expressed either as a single number or as a function of spawning biomass or other measure of productive capacity. The fishing mortality threshold must not exceed the fishing mortality rate or level associated with the relevant MSY control rule. Exceeding the fishing mortality threshold for a period of 1 year or more constitutes overfishing.

(ii) *A minimum stock size threshold or reasonable proxy thereof.* The stock size threshold should be expressed in terms of spawning biomass or other measure of productive capacity. To the extent possible, the stock size threshold should equal whichever of the following is greater: One-half the MSY stock size, or the minimum stock size at which rebuilding to the MSY level would be expected to occur within 10 years if the stock or stock complex were exploited at the maximum fishing mortality threshold specified under paragraph (d)(2)(i) of this section. Should the actual size of the stock or stock complex in a given year fall below this threshold, the stock or stock complex is considered overfished.

(3) *Relationship of status determination criteria to other national standards*—(i) *National standard 2.* Status determination criteria must be based on the best scientific information available (see §600.315). When data are insufficient to estimate MSY, Councils should base

status determination criteria on reasonable proxies thereof to the extent possible (also see paragraph (c)(3) of this section). In cases where scientific data are severely limited, effort should also be directed to identifying and gathering the needed data.

(ii) *National standard 3.* The requirement to manage interrelated stocks of fish as a unit or in close coordination notwithstanding (see § 600.320), status determination criteria should generally be specified in terms of the level of stock aggregation for which the best scientific information is available (also see paragraph (c)(2)(iii) of this section).

(iii) *National standard 6.* Councils must build into the status determination criteria appropriate consideration of risk, taking into account uncertainties in estimating harvest, stock conditions, life history parameters, or the effects of environmental factors (see § 600.335).

(4) *Relationship of status determination criteria to environmental change.* Some short-term environmental changes can alter the current size of a stock or stock complex without affecting the long-term productive capacity of the stock or stock complex. Other environmental changes affect both the current size of the stock or stock complex and the long-term productive capacity of the stock or stock complex.

(i) If environmental changes cause a stock or stock complex to fall below the minimum stock size threshold without affecting the long-term productive capacity of the stock or stock complex, fishing mortality must be constrained sufficiently to allow rebuilding within an acceptable time frame (also see paragraph (e)(4)(ii) of this section). Status determination criteria need not be respecified.

(ii) If environmental changes affect the long-term productive capacity of the stock or stock complex, one or more components of the status determination criteria must be respecified. Once status determination criteria have been respecified, fishing mortality may or may not have to be reduced, depending on the status of the stock or stock complex with respect to the new criteria.

(iii) If manmade environmental changes are partially responsible for a

stock or stock complex being in an overfished condition, in addition to controlling effort, Councils should recommend restoration of habitat and other ameliorative programs, to the extent possible (see also the guidelines issued pursuant to section 305(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act for Council actions concerning essential fish habitat).

(5) *Secretarial approval of status determination criteria.* Secretarial approval or disapproval of proposed status determination criteria will be based on consideration of whether the proposal:

(i) Has sufficient scientific merit.

(ii) Contains the elements described in paragraph (d)(2) of this section.

(iii) Provides a basis for objective measurement of the status of the stock or stock complex against the criteria.

(iv) Is operationally feasible.

(6) *Exceptions.* There are certain limited exceptions to the requirement to prevent overfishing. Harvesting one species of a mixed-stock complex at its optimum level may result in the overfishing of another stock component in the complex. A Council may decide to permit this type of overfishing only if all of the following conditions are satisfied:

(i) It is demonstrated by analysis (paragraph (f)(6) of this section) that such action will result in long-term net benefits to the Nation.

(ii) It is demonstrated by analysis that mitigating measures have been considered and that a similar level of long-term net benefits cannot be achieved by modifying fleet behavior, gear selection/configuration, or other technical characteristic in a manner such that no overfishing would occur.

(iii) The resulting rate or level of fishing mortality will not cause any species or evolutionarily significant unit thereof to require protection under the ESA.

(e) *Ending overfishing and rebuilding overfished stocks—* (1) *Definition.* A threshold, either maximum fishing mortality or minimum stock size, is being “approached” whenever it is projected that the threshold will be breached within 2 years, based on trends in fishing effort, fishery resource size, and other appropriate factors.

## Fishery Conservation and Management

## § 600.310

(2) *Notification.* The Secretary will immediately notify a Council and request that remedial action be taken whenever the Secretary determines that:

- (i) Overfishing is occurring;
- (ii) A stock or stock complex is overfished;
- (iii) The rate or level of fishing mortality for a stock or stock complex is approaching the maximum fishing mortality threshold;
- (iv) A stock or stock complex is approaching its minimum stock size threshold; or
- (v) Existing remedial action taken for the purpose of ending previously identified overfishing or rebuilding a previously identified overfished stock or stock complex has not resulted in adequate progress.

(3) *Council action.* Within 1 year of such time as the Secretary may identify that overfishing is occurring, that a stock or stock complex is overfished, or that a threshold is being approached, or such time as a Council may be notified of the same under paragraph (e)(2) of this section, the Council must take remedial action by preparing an FMP, FMP amendment, or proposed regulations. This remedial action must be designed to accomplish all of the following purposes that apply:

- (i) If overfishing is occurring, the purpose of the action is to end overfishing.
- (ii) If the stock or stock complex is overfished, the purpose of the action is to rebuild the stock or stock complex to the MSY level within an appropriate time frame.
- (iii) If the rate or level of fishing mortality is approaching the maximum fishing mortality threshold (from below), the purpose of the action is to prevent this threshold from being reached.
- (iv) If the stock or stock complex is approaching the minimum stock size threshold (from above), the purpose of the action is to prevent this threshold from being reached.

(4) *Constraints on Council action.* (i) In cases where overfishing is occurring, Council action must be sufficient to end overfishing.

(ii) In cases where a stock or stock complex is overfished, Council action must specify a time period for rebuilding the stock or stock complex that satisfies the requirements of section 304(e)(4)(A) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

(A) A number of factors enter into the specification of the time period for rebuilding:

- (1) The status and biology of the stock or stock complex;
- (2) Interactions between the stock or stock complex and other components of the marine ecosystem (also referred to as “other environmental conditions”);
- (3) The needs of fishing communities;
- (4) Recommendations by international organizations in which the United States participates; and
- (5) Management measures under an international agreement in which the United States participates.

(B) These factors enter into the specification of the time period for rebuilding as follows:

(1) The lower limit of the specified time period for rebuilding is determined by the status and biology of the stock or stock complex and its interactions with other components of the marine ecosystem, and is defined as the amount of time that would be required for rebuilding if fishing mortality were eliminated entirely.

(2) If the lower limit is less than 10 years, then the specified time period for rebuilding may be adjusted upward to the extent warranted by the needs of fishing communities and recommendations by international organizations in which the United States participates, except that no such upward adjustment can result in the specified time period exceeding 10 years, unless management measures under an international agreement in which the United States participates dictate otherwise.

(3) If the lower limit is 10 years or greater, then the specified time period for rebuilding may be adjusted upward to the extent warranted by the needs of fishing communities and recommendations by international organizations in which the United States participates, except that no such upward adjustment can exceed the rebuilding period calculated in the absence of fishing mortality, plus one mean generation time

or equivalent period based on the species' life-history characteristics. For example, suppose a stock could be rebuilt within 12 years in the absence of any fishing mortality, and has a mean generation time of 8 years. The rebuilding period, in this case, could be as long as 20 years.

(C) A rebuilding program undertaken after May 1, 1998 commences as soon as the first measures to rebuild the stock or stock complex are implemented.

(D) In the case of rebuilding plans that were already in place as of May 1, 1998, such rebuilding plans must be reviewed to determine whether they are in compliance with all requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, as amended by the Sustainable Fisheries Act.

(iii) For fisheries managed under an international agreement, Council action must reflect traditional participation in the fishery, relative to other nations, by fishermen of the United States.

(5) *Interim measures.* The Secretary, on his/her own initiative or in response to a Council request, may implement interim measures to reduce overfishing under section 305(c) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, until such measures can be replaced by an FMP, FMP amendment, or regulations taking remedial action.

(i) These measures may remain in effect for no more than 180 days, but may be extended for an additional 180 days if the public has had an opportunity to comment on the measures and, in the case of Council-recommended measures, the Council is actively preparing an FMP, FMP amendment, or proposed regulations to address overfishing on a permanent basis. Such measures, if otherwise in compliance with the provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, may be implemented even though they are not sufficient by themselves to stop overfishing of a fishery.

(ii) If interim measures are made effective without prior notice and opportunity for comment, they should be reserved for exceptional situations, because they affect fishermen without providing the usual procedural safeguards. A Council recommendation for interim measures without notice-and-comment rulemaking will be considered favorably if the short-term bene-

fits of the measures in reducing overfishing outweigh the value of advance notice, public comment, and deliberative consideration of the impacts on participants in the fishery.

(f) *OY—(1) Definitions.* (i) The term “optimum,” with respect to the yield from a fishery, means the amount of fish that will provide the greatest overall benefit to the Nation, particularly with respect to food production and recreational opportunities and taking into account the protection of marine ecosystems; that is prescribed on the basis of the MSY from the fishery, as reduced by any relevant economic, social, or ecological factor; and, in the case of an overfished fishery, that provides for rebuilding to a level consistent with producing the MSY in such fishery.

(ii) In national standard 1, use of the phrase “achieving, on a continuing basis, the OY from each fishery” means producing, from each fishery, a long-term series of catches such that the average catch is equal to the average OY and such that status determination criteria are met.

(2) *Values in determination.* In determining the greatest benefit to the Nation, these values that should be weighed are food production, recreational opportunities, and protection afforded to marine ecosystems. They should receive serious attention when considering the economic, social, or ecological factors used in reducing MSY to obtain OY.

(i) The benefits of food production are derived from providing seafood to consumers, maintaining an economically viable fishery together with its attendant contributions to the national, regional, and local economies, and utilizing the capacity of the Nation's fishery resources to meet nutritional needs.

(ii) The benefits of recreational opportunities reflect the quality of both the recreational fishing experience and non-consumptive fishery uses such as ecotourism, fish watching, and recreational diving, and the contribution of recreational fishing to the national, regional, and local economies and food supplies.

(iii) The benefits of protection afforded to marine ecosystems are those

resulting from maintaining viable populations (including those of unexploited species), maintaining evolutionary and ecological processes (e.g., disturbance regimes, hydrological processes, nutrient cycles), maintaining the evolutionary potential of species and ecosystems, and accommodating human use.

(3) *Factors relevant to OY.* Because fisheries have finite capacities, any attempt to maximize the measures of benefit described in paragraph (f)(2) of this section will inevitably encounter practical constraints. One of these is MSY. Moreover, various factors can constrain the optimum level of catch to a value less than MSY. The Magnuson-Stevens Act's definition of OY identifies three categories of such factors: Social, economic, and ecological. Not every factor will be relevant in every fishery. For some fisheries, insufficient information may be available with respect to some factors to provide a basis for corresponding reductions in MSY.

(i) *Social factors.* Examples are enjoyment gained from recreational fishing, avoidance of gear conflicts and resulting disputes, preservation of a way of life for fishermen and their families, and dependence of local communities on a fishery. Other factors that may be considered include the cultural place of subsistence fishing, obligations under Indian treaties, and worldwide nutritional needs.

(ii) *Economic factors.* Examples are prudent consideration of the risk of overharvesting when a stock's size or productive capacity is uncertain, satisfaction of consumer and recreational needs, and encouragement of domestic and export markets for U.S.-harvested fish. Other factors that may be considered include the value of fisheries, the level of capitalization, the decrease in cost per unit of catch afforded by an increase in stock size, and the attendant increase in catch per unit of effort, alternate employment opportunities, and economies of coastal areas.

(iii) *Ecological factors.* Examples are stock size and age composition, the vulnerability of incidental or unregulated stocks in a mixed-stock fishery, predator-prey or competitive interactions, and dependence of marine

mammals and birds or endangered species on a stock of fish. Also important are ecological or environmental conditions that stress marine organisms, such as natural and manmade changes in wetlands or nursery grounds, and effects of pollutants on habitat and stocks.

(4) *Specification.* (i) The amount of fish that constitutes the OY should be expressed in terms of numbers or weight of fish. However, OY may be expressed as a formula that converts periodic stock assessments into target harvest levels; in terms of an annual harvest of fish or shellfish having a minimum weight, length, or other measurement; or as an amount of fish taken only in certain areas, in certain seasons, with particular gear, or by a specified amount of fishing effort.

(ii) Either a range or a single value may be specified for OY. Specification of a numerical, fixed-value OY does not preclude use of annual target harvest levels that vary with stock size. Such target harvest levels may be prescribed on the basis of an OY control rule similar to the MSY control rule described in paragraph (c)(1)(ii) of this section, but designed to achieve OY on average, rather than MSY. The annual harvest level obtained under an OY control rule must always be less than or equal to the harvest level that would be obtained under the MSY control rule.

(iii) All fishing mortality must be counted against OY, including that resulting from bycatch, scientific research, and any other fishing activities.

(iv) The OY specification should be translatable into an annual numerical estimate for the purposes of establishing any TALFF and analyzing impacts of the management regime. There should be a mechanism in the FMP for periodic reassessment of the OY specification, so that it is responsive to changing circumstances in the fishery.

(v) The determination of OY requires a specification of MSY, which may not always be possible or meaningful. However, even where sufficient scientific data as to the biological characteristics of the stock do not exist, or where

the period of exploitation or investigation has not been long enough for adequate understanding of stock dynamics, or where frequent large-scale fluctuations in stock size diminish the meaningfulness of the MSY concept, the OY must still be based on the best scientific information available. When data are insufficient to estimate MSY directly, Councils should adopt other measures of productive capacity that can serve as reasonable proxies for MSY to the extent possible (also see paragraph (c)(3) of this section).

(vi) In a mixed-stock fishery, specification of a fishery-wide OY may be accompanied by management measures establishing separate annual target harvest levels for the individual stocks. In such cases, the sum of the individual target levels should not exceed OY.

(5) *OY and the precautionary approach.* In general, Councils should adopt a precautionary approach to specification of OY. A precautionary approach is characterized by three features:

(i) Target reference points, such as OY, should be set safely below limit reference points, such as the catch level associated with the fishing mortality rate or level defined by the status determination criteria. Because it is a target reference point, OY does not constitute an absolute ceiling, but rather a desired result. An FMP must contain conservation and management measures to achieve OY, and provisions for information collection that are designed to determine the degree to which OY is achieved on a continuing basis—that is, to result in a long-term average catch equal to the long-term average OY, while meeting the status determination criteria. These measures should allow for practical and effective implementation and enforcement of the management regime, so that the harvest is allowed to reach OY, but not to exceed OY by a substantial amount. The Secretary has an obligation to implement and enforce the FMP so that OY is achieved. If management measures prove unenforceable—or too restrictive, or not rigorous enough to realize OY—they should be modified; an alternative is to reexamine the adequacy of the OY specification. Exceeding OY does not necessarily constitute overfishing. However, even if no over-

fishing resulted from exceeding OY, continual harvest at a level above OY would violate national standard 1, because OY was not achieved on a continuing basis.

(ii) A stock or stock complex that is below the size that would produce MSY should be harvested at a lower rate or level of fishing mortality than if the stock or stock complex were above the size that would produce MSY.

(iii) Criteria used to set target catch levels should be explicitly risk averse, so that greater uncertainty regarding the status or productive capacity of a stock or stock complex corresponds to greater caution in setting target catch levels. Part of the OY may be held as a reserve to allow for factors such as uncertainties in estimates of stock size and DAH. If an OY reserve is established, an adequate mechanism should be included in the FMP to permit timely release of the reserve to domestic or foreign fishermen, if necessary.

(6) *Analysis.* An FMP must contain an assessment of how its OY specification was determined (section 303(a)(3) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act). It should relate the explanation of overfishing in paragraph (d) of this section to conditions in the particular fishery and explain how its choice of OY and conservation and management measures will prevent overfishing in that fishery. A Council must identify those economic, social, and ecological factors relevant to management of a particular fishery, then evaluate them to determine the amount, if any, by which MSY exceeds OY. The choice of a particular OY must be carefully defined and documented to show that the OY selected will produce the greatest benefit to the Nation. If overfishing is permitted under paragraph (d)(6) of this section, the assessment must contain a justification in terms of overall benefits, including a comparison of benefits under alternative management measures, and an analysis of the risk of any species or ecologically significant unit thereof reaching a threatened or endangered status, as well as the risk of any stock or stock complex falling below its minimum stock size threshold.

(7) *OY and foreign fishing.* Section 201(d) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act

provides that fishing by foreign nations is limited to that portion of the OY that will not be harvested by vessels of the United States.

(i) *DAH*. Councils must consider the capacity of, and the extent to which, U.S. vessels will harvest the OY on an annual basis. Estimating the amount that U.S. fishing vessels will actually harvest is required to determine the surplus.

(ii) *DAP*. Each FMP must assess the capacity of U.S. processors. It must also assess the amount of DAP, which is the sum of two estimates: The estimated amount of U.S. harvest that domestic processors will process, which may be based on historical performance or on surveys of the expressed intention of manufacturers to process, supported by evidence of contracts, plant expansion, or other relevant information; and the estimated amount of fish that will be harvested by domestic vessels, but not processed (e.g., marketed as fresh whole fish, used for private consumption, or used for bait).

(iii) *JVP*. When DAH exceeds DAP, the surplus is available for JVP. JVP is derived from DAH.

[63 FR 24229, May 1, 1998]

**§ 600.315 National Standard 2—Scientific Information.**

(a) *Standard 2*. Conservation and management measures shall be based upon the best scientific information available.

(b) *FMP development*. The fact that scientific information concerning a fishery is incomplete does not prevent the preparation and implementation of an FMP (see related §§ 600.320(d)(2) and 600.340(b)).

(1) Scientific information includes, but is not limited to, information of a biological, ecological, economic, or social nature. Successful fishery management depends, in part, on the timely availability, quality, and quantity of scientific information, as well as on the thorough analysis of this information, and the extent to which the information is applied. If there are conflicting facts or opinions relevant to a particular point, a Council may choose among them, but should justify the choice.

(2) FMPs must take into account the best scientific information available at the time of preparation. Between the initial drafting of an FMP and its submission for final review, new information often becomes available. This new information should be incorporated into the final FMP where practicable; but it is unnecessary to start the FMP process over again, unless the information indicates that drastic changes have occurred in the fishery that might require revision of the management objectives or measures.

(c) *FMP implementation*. (1) An FMP must specify whatever information fishermen and processors will be required or requested to submit to the Secretary. Information about harvest within state boundaries, as well as in the EEZ, may be collected if it is needed for proper implementation of the FMP and cannot be obtained otherwise. The FMP should explain the practical utility of the information specified in monitoring the fishery, in facilitating inseason management decisions, and in judging the performance of the management regime; it should also consider the effort, cost, or social impact of obtaining it.

(2) An FMP should identify scientific information needed from other sources to improve understanding and management of the resource, marine ecosystem, and the fishery (including fishing communities).

(3) The information submitted by various data suppliers should be comparable and compatible, to the maximum extent possible.

(d) *FMP amendment*. FMPs should be amended on a timely basis, as new information indicates the necessity for change in objectives or management measures.

(e) *SAFE Report*. (1) The SAFE report is a document or set of documents that provides Councils with a summary of information concerning the most recent biological condition of stocks and the marine ecosystems in the FMU and the social and economic condition of the recreational and commercial fishing interests, fishing communities, and the fish processing industries. It summarizes, on a periodic basis, the best available scientific information concerning the past, present, and possible