

RSA Review Panel Findings and Recommendations		Agree/Disagree? Level of importance (0=none, 1=less important, 2=important, 3=very important)	Timing (Short-term, Medium-term, Long-term)	Which Plan(s)? (Scallop, Herring, Monkfish)	How to address? Council Action, Grants Admin., staff adjustment (POTENTIAL LEAD)
1	Finding 1 RSA programs performing well, generally highly successful, especially the scallop program.				
2	Rec. 1	Caution should be exercised not to screw up a good thing.			
3	Finding 2 Some concerns do exist about some aspects of the program.				
4	Rec. 2	Potential ideas to improve several aspects of RSA programs			
5		2.1 Inadequacies in priority setting process			
6		2.1.a Invest more time and effort in development of priorities and specific deliverables, one meeting may not be enough.			
7		2.1.b PDTs with NEFSC identify status of each priority, continued need, specific deliverable needed, and when it may be time to remove items from the list.			
8		2.1.c Identify a group with wider experience and less potential for conflict of interest to review RSA priorities (e.g. SSC).			
9		2.1.d Budget RSA by topic rather than ranking priorities to establish Council agreement on program balance. Could be indicative rather than binding to maintain flexibility.			
10		2.1.e Align RSA topics with RSA mission statement (see Recommendation 3).			
11		2.1.f Maintain and review all input on RSA priorities from all levels to maintain transparency and reduce concerns about conflict of interest.			
12		2.2 Perceived weakness and lack of transparency in review processes			
13		2.2.a NMFS should improve communications about process.			
14		2.2.b Consider ways to attract more members of the industry to participate in management review process.			
15		2.3 Limited pool of RSA applicants and recipients			
16		2.3.a NEFMC and NMFS could expand efforts to highlight opportunities - Sea Grant networks.			

17			Unique challenges created by awarding RSA fishing opportunities instead of monetary awards				
18		2.4	2.4 To address uncertainty and unpredictability in value NMFS should in consultation with the Council...				
19		1	1 Establish standard procedures on how to specify value estimated for each program.				
20		2	2 Identify mechanisms to respond to inaccurate price estimates, develop guidelines for when and how these would be used, and guidelines for multi-year grants.				
21		3	3 Consider transfer of RSA between years.				
22		4	4 Consider reserving portion of RSA to offset low price estimates.				
23		5	5 Consider additional compensation fishery incentives.				
24		6	6 Consider more formal process between NMFS and NEFMC when awarded projects need to be modified.				
25		2.4.b	2.4.b To increase value of RSA, NMFS in consultation with the Council should consider...				
26		1	1 Scallops - Transfer between years or extend the 3 months RSA carryover provision				
27		2	2 Feasibility and benefit of periodically increasing RSA amount (esp. when harvest is high) to create an RSA reserve that could be awarded to grant recipients and harvested later				
28		3	3 Allow harvest of scallops in certain areas or under certain situations for RSA only when it's not feasible to harvest them for the general fishery				
29		4	4 Monkfish - Exempt vessels on monkfish RSA trips from skate possession limits or other species like groundfish				
30		5	5 Change monkfish RSA from DAS to fixed pounds				
31		6	6 Allow transfer of RSA DAS/pounds between fishing years				
32		7	7 Ways to expand the pool of vessels eligible to conduct monkfish RSA compensation fishing when demand by currently eligible vessels isn't adequate to use RAS DAS and support research budgets				
33		8	8 Additional effort control exemptions that could incentivize monkfish RSA compensation fishing				

34		9	Atlantic herring - Allow transfer of pounds between fishing years or rollover if transfer isn't possible				
35		10	Set RSA that isn't attributed to specific management areas or allow pound transfer between areas				
36		11	Reserve haddock and river herring under catch caps to enable RSA compensation to continue when caps are met by commercial fleet				
37		12	Consider additional effort control exemptions such as days-out, 1A seasonal gear prohibitions				
38		13	All RSA species - Use some of choke stocks as RSA since they may be more valuable than target species (has the potential to produce a lot of research support but need to consider several factors)				
39		14	Review the RSA set-aside amount and compensation fishing performance periodically (e.g. every 5 years)				
40		15	Encourage compensation from all species landed during RSA compensation fishing trips, not just RSA species (i.e. mackerel on herring trips)				
41		16	Create an on-line tool to facilitate auctioning for RSA fishing opportunities by RSA awardee				
42		17	Review and compare compensation fishing allowances between FMPs to ensure general consistency of incentives and flexibilities				
43		2.5	Fairness concerns in the ways RSA fishing opportunities are used				
44		2.5.a	Equitable access to RSA fishing opportunities could be included in grant solicitations as an objective/evaluation criteria and grant awards could include requirements for the distribution of RSA fishing opportunities				
45		2.5.b	Meetings between RSA grant recipients and vessels interested in compensation fishing could be hosted by NMFS and NEFMC				
46		2.5.c	Perhaps develop an online system to assist connections between RSA grant recipients and vessels interested in compensation fishing				

47		2.5.d	The online system in 2.5.c could be expanded to facilitate an online auction between grant recipients and the fishing industry				
48		2.6	Timelines of RSA awards				
49		2.6.a	NMFS and NEFMC should prepare a detailed time table for steps from priority setting to awarding RSA grants				
50		2.6.b	NEFMC should consider initiating the priority setting process earlier in the year esp. if the priority setting process becomes more intensive				
51		2.6.c	Perhaps stagger the annual cycle of RSA awards for the 3 species				
52		2.7	Lack of clarity about financial oversight of grants				
53		2.7.a	Important to achieve high confidence level in the financial integrity of RSA programs				
54		2.7.b	RSA review panel recommends NMFS conduct an internal audit of its financial oversight procedures and strengthen them as appropriate				
55		2.8	Results are not feeding back into the management process as well as they could be				
56		2.8.a	Post award meeting could be scheduled to share/review survey plans for sea scallop RSA survey projects (in April after award announcements and before survey begins); evaluate/adjust survey plans for more efficient overall survey strategy				
57		2.8.b	Advisory Committee could be established for each award with NMFS/Council staff, etc. to provide input throughout the project on ways to increase utility of the project and to identify ways the results can be integrated more effectively; at a minimum 1 NEFSC staff could be assigned to each project to ID if there are ways to enhance results utility				
58		2.8.c	A separate more general Committee could be established to enhance monitoring and tracking of RSA results more intensely than the current system used (Or additional NMFS/Council resources could be dedicated for project oversight)				

59		2.8.d	More formal communication of progress reports could be shared with PDT, Advisory Panels, and Committees to improve monitoring/accountability or RSA awards				
60		2.8.e	Applicants could be required to specify the anticipated impacts of project results if awarded RSA				
61		2.8.f	Council has been hosting annual "Scallop RSA Share Days" to provide a forum for RSA to be shared with the Scallop PDT and advisory panel. These periodic meetings could be considered for Atlantic herring and monkfish plans too. Goals and objectives for RSA share days should be considered by the Council and NMFS.				
62		2.8.g	Periodic subject based updates on the status of RSA research (but would add to the Council/NMFS staff workloads unless part of cooperative agreement with its own support staff)				
63		2.9	Data generated by RSA funded projects has not always been made available to the public in a timely fashion				
64		2.9.a	The data sharing policy and rights of data ownership should be clarified in the FFO and on the RSA website				
65		2.9.b	Data from RSA-funded projects is public property and should be made available in a consistent format in a publicly accessible database (data warehousing will require additional resources --> solution to build in these costs into accepted proposals)				
66		2.9.c	NMFS and the Council should develop an annual report to summarize the status of RSA projects (annually/biannually via newsletter)				
67		2.10	Lack of collaboration among scientists participating in RSA grants and NMFS scientists				
68		2.10.a	NMFS should encourage its scientists to be collaborators on projects supported by RSA programs and make feasible by establishing more cooperative agreements to implement RSA projects				
69		2.10.b	Holding Advisory Committee meetings for RSA projects with NMFS staff could improve collaboration				
70	Finding 3	The role of RSA is unspecified such that there does not seem to be a basis to decide what is, or is not, appropriate for support by RSA					

71		To clarify the role of RSA, the NEFMC should adopt a mission statement for				
	Rec. 3	RSA				
72	Finding 4	Sea scallop surveys, which are the largest and most enduring RSA activity, lack an overall design, which likely does not optimize resources and scientific potential				
73	Rec. 4	A series of options for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of resource surveys for scallops should be considered				
74		4.1	Improvements that can be made that are within the general scope of the current RSA approach include:			
75		4.1.a	Annual meetings to coordinate survey activity after selection or awards are made beyond what currently occurs between NMFS and grantees			
76		4.1.b	NMFS could explore expanding the role of the scallop survey technical review panel to more broadly consider scallop survey design and survey implementation			
77		4.1.c	Extend duration of multi-year grants (up to 5-years) to facilitate stability in sea scallop survey design; could revisit the locations of the surveys each year by engaging an established survey panel (stating the survey location and intensity)			
78		4.1.d	Recommendation 2.8 has additional ideas aimed at increasing the use of RSA results, some apply to sea scallop surveys			
79		4.2	Re-establishing the Scallop Survey Advisory Panel with the primary charge of designing an overall strategic approach for sea scallop surveys			
80		4.3	Using an RSA supported cooperative agreement to prepare a statistically rigorous (i.e. model based) design for Scallop Surveys			
81		4.4	Use a relatively long term cooperative agreement to design and implement Sea Scallop Surveys			
82		4.5	Establish a long term Cooperative Agreement for Research Set Aside Programs (CARSAP)			
83	Finding 5	Implementing RSA programs generates a substantial administrative workload				
84	Rec. 5	NMFS, in consultation with the Council, should evaluate and document RSA program administrative capacity to determine where support is sufficient and where it could or should be increased; the RSA review panel supports a dedicated evaluation of resources available and/or needed to ensure RSA programs are functioning well				

85	Finding 6	One or more of the current RSA programs may no longer be viable, but other species may be candidates for RSA in the future				
86	Rec. 6	The NEFMC should consider preparing an Omnibus FMP for Research Set Aside Programs that would be available for all fisheries under the jurisdiction of the Council				