

RF36: Potential modifications to the red snapper IFQ program

Program Eligibility	Items in Scoping Document	Consequences for conservation/management Questions for Committee	Develop in Options paper?
	<p>Restrict future transfer of shares to only shareholder accounts that hold a valid commercial reef fish permit.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would limit participation, including by entities who intend to only buy and sell allocation. • Limiting participation would support goal to reduce overcapacity. • May not be perceived as a problem needing attention anymore. 	
	<p>Allow accounts with shares but without a commercial reef fish permit to harvest the allocation associated with those shares.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vessels would have to follow IFQ program landings requirements, including hail-ins and offloading at approved sites. • Is a form of inter-sector trading. 	
	<p>Limit the amount of shares/allocation non-permitted IFQ accounts may possess.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would limit participation, including by entities who intend to only buy and sell allocation. 	

	Items in Scoping Document	Consequences for conservation/management Questions for Committee	Options paper?
Full retention	Eliminate the commercial red snapper minimum size limit.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could reduce/eliminate regulatory discards. • May not be possible given limited quantity of IFQ allocation. 	
	Consider the full retention of commercially caught red snapper.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could reduce/eliminate regulatory discards. • May not be possible given limited quantity of IFQ allocation. 	

IFQ Allocation Caps	Items in Scoping Document	Consequences for conservation/management Questions for Committee	Options paper?
	<p>Establish a cap on the amount of RS-IFQ allocation that may be held by an entity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the Committee trying to achieve with a cap? What practice or behavior is to be addressed? 	
<p>Establish a cap on the amount of RS-IFQ allocation that can be landed by a single vessel.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landings of red snapper by vessel are similar to vessel landings before IFQ program implementation. • Would disproportionately affect entities with a single vessel more than accounts associated with multiple vessels. • What is the Committee trying to achieve with a cap? What practice or behavior is to be addressed? 		

Accounts that have never been activated	Items in Scoping Document	Consequences for conservation/management Questions for Committee	Options paper?
	<p>For accounts that have never been activated in the current system, close accounts and redistribute shares:</p> <p>i) if the accounts are not active by a specified date.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would improve sector's ability to achieve OY. 	
	<p>ii) to those with no or small shares or to new entrants to reduce regulatory discards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is not much quota remaining in these accounts (<1%); is this a problem needing attention? 	
	<p>iii) to address reduction of regulatory discards through quota banks or NMFS administration (particularly for eastern Gulf shareholders and vessels).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is not much quota remaining in these accounts (<1%); is this a problem needing attention? • Quota banks are already being developed among shareholders. 	
<p>In the event of future increases to the commercial red snapper quota, consider alternatives to redistribute the quota increases to new entrants and small shareholders.</p>			

	Item in Scoping Document	Consequences for conservation/management Questions for Committee	Options paper?
Enforcement	Require all vessels with a commercial reef fish permit to hail-in prior to landing, even if they are not in possession of IFQ species.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would improve enforcement of all commercial reef fish landings, including IFQ species. 	

Requirements for use of shares/allocation	Items in Scoping Document	Consequences for conservation/management Questions for Committee	Options paper?
	Establish use-it or lose-it provisions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the Committee trying to achieve? What practice or behavior is to be addressed? 	
	Restrict ability for shareholders not actively engaged in fishing to transfer their shares and allocation to other shareholders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IFQ system does not track the transfers of individual pounds of allocation, which may be transferred multiple times, and entities often separate assets into multiple accounts. • How would “actively engaged in fishing” be defined, e.g., for shares held by corporations? 	
	Place restrictions on the transfer of IFQ allocations and shares.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the Committee trying to achieve with restrictions? What practice or behavior is to be restricted? • What type of restrictions should be made? 	
	Adopt a roll-over provision for unused IFQ allocation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be problematic for monitoring annual sector ACL; quota will be decreasing over next 3 years. 	
	Consider adopting a lease-to-own provision, such that an entity buying (“leasing”) allocation earns some credit toward possession of IFQ shares.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would shift possession of shares toward those who land red snapper allocation. • May result in unintended consequences as shareholders are less likely to sell allocation (“lease”) if they would be required to surrender the shares. • Difficult to track transfers of allocation to determine original shareholder when allocation is landed. 	

	Item in Scoping Document	Consequences for conservation/management Questions for Committee	Options paper?
Quota change	Withhold distribution of some portion of a shareholder's allocation at the beginning of the year if a mid-year quota reduction is expected.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since inclusion in the scoping document, this action is under development in a Framework Action which would apply to the 2016 season, only. The action could be made permanent in this amendment. • As an action, could evaluate applicability to all IFQ species. 	