

Literature Review Summary of Allocation Papers

Council staff has reviewed several papers regarding allocation between commercial and recreational sectors and included them in the table below. Staff specifically focused on papers and presentations that provided methods for allocating between commercial and recreational sectors.

Paper Title	Background	Date Published	Items of Interest
<p>Processes for the allocation, reallocation and governance of resource access in connection with a framework for the future management of fisheries in Western Australia</p> <p>Compiled by W. Fletcher and I. Curnow</p>	<p>The paper was developed as a scoping document for a fishery management committee to make long term management decisions (5-10 yrs). The paper assesses various allocation options and outlines cost, data requirements, compensation issues, and robustness of each option.</p>	<p>May 2002</p>	<p>In the past, resource access has evolved implicitly through historical level of exploitation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - relative market value - relative effectiveness of gear - extent and ease of access to resource - different levels of controls placed on each group - numbers of individuals participating <p>Options for allocation among sectors for initial allocation included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ascendency model involves prioritizing the order in which competing sectors are considered in the allocation process. For example, in NZ, the environment is first priority and sustainable yield is identified. Then indigenous/customary take is subtracted, then recreational. Commercial receives the remainder. - Historical model involves using a point in time when the relative shares between sectors is known and fixing future access levels based on these shares. - Futures model (Historic plus explicit initial reallocation) involves determining implicit historic allocations and using that as a starting point for negotiations about what future allocations should be. - Socioeconomic Assessment involves developing a model based on assessing the optimal community benefits of various combinations for allocating access among sectors. - Submissions from Sector Groups included variations of the historical model (supported by industry), futures model (supported by recreational interests) and socio-economic model with ecological priority and a special committee to make these decisions (supported by conservation groups). <p>Other information is also included in the document concerning how to go about making allocation decisions (example: how much of a benefit would be necessary to warrant a change from traditional historical allocations?), cost of reallocation, legal concerns, etc.</p>

<p>Overview of Sharing the Fish Conference in Perth, Australia</p> <p>Ray Hilborn</p>	<p>This presentation provides an overview of conference discussions including the various methods of allocation used and issues surrounding allocation.</p>	<p>Feb. 2006</p>	<p>This presentation summarizes the allocation methods used or proposed during the conference including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ITQ - Cooperatives - Community allocation - State auctions - TURFs - Recreational and commercial reserves - MPAs -
<p>Comparative Analysis of Allocation Approaches in Shared Fisheries</p> <p>Mark Edwards and Lindie Nelson</p>	<p>This presentation provides an overview of allocation approaches, evaluation, and application of approaches used in NZ.</p>	<p>Feb. 2006</p>	<p>Approaches to allocation from lowest to highest ability to achieve evaluation criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Catch based - Valuation based - Negotiation based - Market based <p>Evaluation criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ability to increase net value of fishery - Incentives for stakeholders - Acceptability of process and outcomes for governance and stakeholders - Operational cost - Establishment costs/issues
<p>Models for Allocation of Fisheries Resources Between Sectors</p> <p>Steve Halley, Andy Hill, Spencer Clubb</p>	<p>Provides information on allocation approaches considered in New Zealand, benefits and drawbacks of each, and next steps for New Zealand on this issue.</p>	<p>Feb. 2006</p>	<p>Approaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Claims based</u>: Based on historical and present use and future expectations Requirement – need good catch info Benefits – less disruption to existing fishers, provides some certainty Drawbacks – choosing base years contentious, doesn't focus on maximizing benefits - <u>Utility based</u>: Based on the utility that would flow from a particular allocation Requirement – Need good data Benefits – can maximize benefits; can incorporate various factors Drawbacks – potential for considerable disruption to fishers and transition costs; relative values between options is uncertain <p>Stakeholders rejected utility based approach due to uncertainty.</p>
<p>Allocation Within Commercial Fisheries in Canada: Pacific Herring, Salmon, and</p>	<p>This paper compares allocations for three fisheries in Canada.</p>	<p>Feb. 2006</p>	<p>Herring allocation process: From the total TAC are subtracted amounts for aboriginal use, sport bait herring sales, aquarium, charity, food and bait, special commercial projects, conservation research, co-management, and test fishing allocation. The remainder is allocated to the commercial sector.</p>

<p>Groundfish</p> <p>Gordon Gislason</p>			<p>Salmon allocation process: Initial shares to the commercial sector were based on the landings during 1991-94 and catch capacity per vessel. Prior to initial allocation two buyouts and various other regulations were implemented to decrease capacity.</p> <p>Groundfish intrasector allocation process: Via arbitration</p>
<p>Benefits of Developing a Fisheries Resource Allocation Policy in Queensland</p> <p>Claire Anderson and Allan Dekker</p>	<p>Describes the Queensland, Australia Fisheries Resource Allocation Policy.</p>	<p>Feb. 2006</p>	<p>The Queensland Fisheries Resource Allocation Policy has a set of agreed principles on which allocation decisions are based (see paper). The Policy also includes a summary of needs and aspirations of all fishery resource users. Users and their needs and aspirations include:</p> <p>Commercial fishing: Security of access and business certainty; recognition of community value; flexibility; compensation.</p> <p>Recreational fishing: Opportunity for access; diversity of experience; some reasonable expectation of catching a fish; equity; recognition of benefits.</p> <p>Charter fishing tourism: Recognition distinct from the recreational sector; sustainability of the industry; regional equity.</p> <p>Seafood consumers: Recognition as a user group; expectation of availability, affordability and quality.</p> <p>Other users include aboriginal, aquaculture, conservation, tourism/ecotourism, and community. The benefit of the plan has been that while it does not provide a single formula that can determine allocation, it provides a process and structure for negotiating positive and balanced outcomes.</p>
<p>The Journey Towards an Explicit Resource Sharing Arrangement for the Tasmanian Rock Lobster Fishery</p> <p>Hilary Revill, Howell Williams</p>	<p>Describes the process and allocation methodology developed for allocation of rock lobster between commercial and recreational sectors.</p>	<p>Feb. 2006</p>	<p>The final allocation decision was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If the TAC is set at 1700 thousand tons or more, the commercial sector will be allocated 90% and the recreational sector 10%. - If the TAC is set below 1700 thousand tons, the recreational sector will be allocated 170 tons, the commercial sector will be allocated the remainder of the TAC. - This arrangement is reviewed periodically to ensure against risk of exceeding the TAC.