bookboon.com

Fisheries Economics and Management

Ola Flaaten



Download free books at
bookboon.com

Ola Flaaten

Fisheries Economics and Management

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Fisheries Economics and Management
1st edition
© 2016 Ola Flaaten & bookboon.com
ISBN 978-87-403-1193-8

Peer reviewed by Senior lecturer Harald Bergland, PHD, University of Tromsø

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Contents

	List of Figures	**7**
	Preface	**9**
	Acknowledgements	**10**
1	**Introduction**	**11**
2	**Population dynamics and fishing**	**14**
2.1	Growth of fish stocks	14
2.2	Effort and production	17
2.3	Yield and stock effects of fishing	19
3	**A basic bioeconomic model**	**25**
3.1	Open access bioeconomic equilibrium	25
3.2	Maximising resource rent	30
3.3	Effort and harvest taxes	33
3.4	Fishing licences and quotas	40



Deloitte.

© Deloitte & Touche LLP and affiliated entities.

Discover the truth at www.deloitte.ca/careers

Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

4	**Investment analysis**	**47**
4.1	Discounting	47
4.2	Fish stocks as capital	51
4.3	Long-run optimal stock levels	54
4.4	Transition to long-run optimum	60
4.5	Adjusted transition paths	63
5	**The Gordon-Schaefer model**	**68**
5.1	The logistic growth model	68
5.2	The open-access fishery	70
5.3	Economic optimal harvesting	73
5.4	Discounting effects	76
6	**Fishing vessel economics**	**82**
6.1	Optimal vessel effort	82
6.2	Vessel behaviour in the long run	88
6.3	Quota price and optimal effort	90
6.4	A small-scale fisher's choice of leisure time and income	93



Click on the ad to read more
Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

7	**Extension of the basic bioeconomic model**	**99**
7.1	Intra-marginal rent for the most efficient vessels	99
7.2	Marine reserves	105
8	**Growth and yield of year classes**	**117**
8.1	Growth and ageing	117
8.2	Sustainable yield and economic surplus	127
9	**Multispecies and ecosystem harvesting**	**134**
9.1	Multispecies and ecosystem management	134
9.2	More on predator-prey modelling	146
10	**Recreational fishing**	**155**
10.1	Recreational angling	155
10.2	Short-run analysis	156
10.3	Long-run analysis	162
	References	**166**
	Endnotes	**176**



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

List of Figures

Figure 2.1 15
Figure 2.2 18
Figure 2.3 20
Figure 2.4 21
Figure 2.5 22
Figure 3.1 26
Figure 3.2 36
Figure 3.3 42
Figure 3.4 43
Figure 4.1 49
Figure 4.2 57
Figure 4.3 61
Figure 4.4 66
Figure 5.1 71
Figure 5.2 76
Figure 6.1 87
Figure 6.2 88
Figure 6.3 91
Figure 6.4 95
Figure 6.5 97
Figure 7.1 100
Figure 7.2 101
Figure 7.3 107
Figure 8.1 118
Figure 8.2 119
Figure 8.3 123
Figure 8.4 123
Figure 8.5 125
Figure 8.6 127
Figure 8.7 130
Figure 9.1 136
Figure 9.2 137
Figure 9.3 140

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Figure 9.4 141
Figure 9.5 142
Figure 9.6 149
Figure 9.7 152
Figure 10.1 159
Figure 10.2 161
Figure 10.3 163

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Preface

This book is the result of many years' experience of teaching fisheries economics and management, also called bioeconomics, for undergraduate and graduate students in interdisciplinary programs, both in Norway and abroad. These students often have a limited background in economics and mathematics and the challenge has been to be analytical without being unnecessary mathematical. I have found that with the exercises at the end of some of the chapters students are quite capable looking at fisheries economics and management from an analytic perspective. Exercises and careful reading of the logical steps of the text is the key to understanding fisheries economics.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Acknowledgements

Several students and colleagues contributed to the development of this book. In particular I would like to thank Claire Armstrong, Harald Bergland, Arne Eide, Knut Heen, Nguyen Ngoc Duy, Vina Ram-Bidesi, Siv Reithe, Anders Skonhoft and Thi Khanh Ngoc Quach for comments and suggestions, Liv Larssen for typing and technical assistance, Frøydis Strand for production of several of the figures and the OECD for permission to use some of their material.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

1 Introduction

As long as people have been living on the earth they have utilised fish and other renewable marine resources for food, clothes and other necessities. The species caught have varied across regions and time. For example, the Nordic countries have a several thousand-year history of utilisation of living marine resources. Fish species like cod, herring and salmon, as well as several species of seals and whales, have always been important elements in the diet of coastal people and as goods for trade. Historically, local people have had free access to these resources in the sense that no authority above the fishing village or tribal level decided how fishing could take place and the intensity of these activities. Natural short run and long run fluctuations in the size of fish stocks, fish migration, species composition and weather and climate, as well as seasonal variations in the availability of different species, represented the main challenge for the fishers. However, in particular during the twentieth century, several fisheries around the world have experienced more and more restrictions on the freedom of individual fishers to establish and conduct their business. In addition, technological change and the transformation of local supply fisheries to fisheries based on national and global markets have had an immense effect on the way fishers perform their profession.

The objective of these materials is to give a thorough introduction to and review of the theory of fisheries economics and management, illustrated by actual and stylised examples, such that the student may understand better why it could be beneficial for society at large to organise people's access to fishing, and how this may be done. Hopefully, this will contribute to the long-term improvement of fisheries management and fishing industry performance.

In economics, we study how human beings utilise scarce resources for the production and distribution of goods and services that have alternative uses. Scarce resources include labour, capital and natural resources. The relative emphasis on each of these resources varies across the sub-fields of economics. Historically the main emphases seem to have changed according to the perception of economists, and people in general, of which resource is the most scarce. In particular, over the last couple of decades environmental and resource economics have gained more and more ground within economic discourse and theory. This has probably been affected by the increase in industrial production, transport and population growth, and the implications of this for local communities and countries all over the world. Some global problems, such as climate change, may be the result of millions of decisions at the household, business and national level. For each of the economic agents pursuing their own private interests their emission of CO_2 as individuals might seem insignificant, but the total is huge and is expected to have serious long-term effects. Another example is biological and economic overfishing. Each fisher's catch might seem insignificant compared with the wide ocean and the size of the ecosystem. However, the total catches of many fish stocks around the world have contributed to biological and economic overfishing. This has at some points in time been the case, for example, for cod in Canadian, Icelandic and Norwegian waters, despite the relatively small catch of each fisher and vessel.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

In this text, fisheries economic theory is partly used as a synonym for bioeconomic theory and partly for something wider, including the application of microeconomic theory to fishing industry issues. A distinctive feature of bioeconomic theory is that it aims at analysing and modelling the main interactions between fishers (economic agents) and fishstocks (resources that might sustain harvest), as well as studying how such interactions are affected by the managers (principals of the society). However, we admit that the analysis is limited to major economic and biological issues, excluding most post-harvesting issues, as well as social and legal issues. Some basic elements from biological modelling will be used, but we do not intend to go into any detail of biological modelling and analyses. There are several similarities between the methods used by economists and biologists. Within both disciplines, core elements are theories, models and statistical methods to test hypotheses and give predictions. Predicting economic growth and the growth of fish stocks is not that different from a methodological point of view.

The economic world is extremely complex and difficult to grasp, not just for lay people, but also for trained economists. Even within smaller economies, such as Norway, Namibia and New Zealand, not to mention major economies like China, the European Union, Japan and the United States of America, millions of transactions between firms, and between firms and consumers, are taking place every day. To gain an overview of the functioning of these economies it would not be sufficient to start collecting data and other empirical information from these markets. We also need theories and models to explain connections between important economic variables. From consumer theory we recognise concepts like budget constraint, utility and individual demand, and from the theory of the firm, or production theory, the concepts of marginal cost, average cost and supply curve are well known. Market theory integrates elements from the theories of consumers and firms and concepts such as total demand, market price and equilibrium are well known. Based on theories, the functioning of complex markets may be described in a sufficiently simple way to give students and other interested parties an understanding of how markets work, and researchers may derive hypotheses to be tested against economic data. This does not necessarily mean that theory has to come before empirical investigation. Sometimes empirical data may give the researcher ideas for further investigation of interesting economic relationships and create the foundation for developing theories and models.

A theory or a model is not necessarily better the more detailed and complex it is. More important is that it includes, in a simple way, those economic variables of most importance for the issues at stake, and that it contributes to our knowledge of the functioning of the economy. Regarding the application of economic theory, a model that simplifies and summarises the theory in a coherent way is often useful. We may say, there is nothing as practical as an excellent theory, with the exception of an excellent model. Fisheries economic theory is in its most condensed form applied welfare theory, with elements from consumer, production and market theory. Fisheries economic models have something in common with macro economic models with the focus on aggregated economic variables. In fisheries economics the focus is often on the aggregated effects of all fishers' actions, to allow comparison of, for instance, the total catch of all fishers and the natural growth of the fish stock(s).

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Markets and ecosystems are often fluctuating and the development of key variables such as prices of fish, catches and fish stocks is uncertain. Risk and uncertainty are, however, not included in the analyses presented in this book. Focus is on deterministic theory to keep the discussion as simple as possible.[1]

Fisheries economic theory includes positive as well as normative elements: positive since it may explain why some fish stocks are over-fished, others under-utilised or not used commercially at all. On the other hand, like parts of welfare theory, fisheries economic theory is also normative since it may give guidance as to how intensively fish resources should be used and how the fishing industry could be managed. This text includes both positive and normative theories and models.[2]



Click on the ad to read more
Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

2 Population dynamics and fishing

This chapter shows the basic features of fish stock dynamics and how the stock is affected by fishing. The sustainable yield curve, yield as a function of fishing effort, is derived. This curve is an important bridge between the work of biologists and economists, and it will be used extensively throughout these materials.

2.1 Growth of fish stocks

A fish species that lives and is able to reproduce itself within a given geographical area is called a stock or a population. In fisheries science and management literature, the term "stock" is most common, whereas in the ecology literature "population" is generally preferred. Some authors use stock as a synonym for an exploited population, but in this text the term stock will be used for any population, whether exploited or not. Ecologically speaking a population is "a group with unimpeded gene flow". An example of the relationship between species and stocks is the North Atlantic species cod (*Gadus morhua*) which consists of several stocks, including the Canadian-Newfoundlandic, the Icelandic and the Arcto-Norwegian cod. In principle, stocks are self-contained entities, even though there might be some migrational exchange between them. Each stock has its own particular characteristics that may be genetic, a result of differing environments, or usually a mixture of both.[3]

Fish stock change depends on recruitment, natural mortality, individual growth and harvesting. This may be summarised as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Stock change} &= \text{Recruitment} + \text{Individual growth} - \text{Natural mortality} - \text{Harvest} \\ &= \text{Natural growth} - \text{Harvest}\end{aligned}$$

Note that the stock change can be positive or negative if recruitment and individual growth together is greater or smaller, respectively, than natural mortality and harvest. Empirical research and theoretical reasoning have concluded that natural growth of fish stocks may be illustrated as bell-shaped growth curves as shown in figure 2.1. Growth curves could also be called yield curves since the natural growth of fish stocks might be harvested. For most fish species, lower stock levels mean relative higher recruitment and individual growth, whereas higher stock levels imply relative lower recruitment, lower individual growth and/or higher natural mortality due to density-dependent biological processes. Thus, the sum of growth-augmenting and growth-impeding factors is a bell-shaped growth curve with the highest growth at an intermediate stock level. The maximum natural growth is at stock level X_{MSY} in figure 2.1. If the natural growth of the stock is harvested, the maximum harvest is achieved for stock level X_{MSY} and this harvest is called the maximum sustainable yield (MSY). MSY could be, for example, 200 000 tonnes per year for a cod stock. In each case shown in figure 2.1 a stable equilibrium of the unharvested stock exists at level K, and this level is usually called the environmental carrying capacity of the stock.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com




Figure 2.1. Growth curves with (a) compensation, (b) depensation, and (c) critical depensation.

For growth curve (a) in figure 2.1 the relative natural rate of growth $F(X)/X$ increases when the stock level decreases, and we call this effect pure compensation. At low stock levels, some stocks have relative growth rates that decrease with reduced stock level. The growth of such stocks is said to be depensatory, and two growth curves with depensation are shown in panels (b) and (c) in figure 2.1. Growth curve (c) has a critical stock level K_0 which implies extinction if the stock should be depleted below this level for any reason. Depensation may be observed for some prey stocks, for example, herring, but not exclusively prey stocks. This feature may be the effect of a predator, for instance, seals, that continue to consume its prey even when the prey stock declines. Thus, in such a case the prey stock will demonstrate depensatoric growth. In case the predator is in strong need and has the ability to locate and consume the last school of prey, the prey stock is vulnerable to critical depensation and extinction if fished too hard.

For a thorough discussion of bioeconomic fishery models we shall need some simple mathematical tools. The following symbols will be used, where t indicates point in time:

$X(t)$ = Stock level (weight of the stock, for example in thousand tonnes)
$\dot{X}(t)$ = $dX(t)/dt$ = Change in stock per unit of time
$F(X)$ = Natural growth function.

Unless necessary for the understanding, the symbol for time, t, will be omitted in the text and equations.

For the natural growth function $dX/dt = F(X)$ the following characteristics are valid:

(2.1) $$F'(X) = \frac{dF(X)}{dX} \gtreqless 0 \quad \text{for} \quad X \lesseqgtr X_{MSY}.$$

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

A closer look at figure 2.1 reveals that the growth curves in panels (a) and (b) fulfil the requirements of growth function (2.1). However, this is not the case for very low stock levels in panel (c). Natural growth, expressed as in figure 2.1 and equation (2.1), is the limit to fishers' harvest. To produce a harvest, fishers need man-made tools and fishing effort, in addition to nature's tool, the fish stock. Without both, there will be no harvest.

Note that the growth curve in Figure 2.1 panel (a) is based on the natural growth function $F(X) = rX(1 - X / K)$ which we shall return to several times. In this function K is the carrying capacity of the habitat of this fish stock. Thus K is the maximum stock level, to be observed only before harvesting takes place. Further, r is the maximum growth rate, $F(X)/X$, to be observed only when X is close to zero.

Box 2.1 The Zarephath widow's pot

The importance of the supply of natural resources for people's survival and welfare have been described and discussed in both the secular and religious literature down the ages. The Bible, for example, mentions in several places water resources and their significance for people living in the area that today is called the Middle East. Issues related to the production of food from land and sea are also common themes in the Bible. The story of the Zarephath widow's pot is a case of renewable resource use. In fact, it was not just one pot in this story, but two – a jar and a cruse.

In 1Kings 17, the Bible tells how the prophet Elijah had been living from water of the stream Cherith, east of Jordan, and of bread and meat that the ravens brought him in the mornings and evenings. However, after a while the stream dried up because of lack of rain. Then God told Elijah to go to the town of Zarephath to stay with a poor and hungry widow. He came upon her at the gate of the city and she willingly shared her very last resources with him, using her final meal and oil to make a cake to be shared between Elijah, her son and herself.

And Eli'jah said to her, "Fear not; go and do as you have said; but first make me a little cake of it and bring it to me, and afterward make for yourself and your son. For thus says the LORD the God of Israel, 'The jar of meal shall not be spent, and the cruse of oil shall not fail, until the day that the LORD sends rain upon the earth.'" And she went and did as Eli'jah said; and she, and he, and her household ate for many days. The jar of meal was not spent, neither did the cruse of oil fail, according to the word of the LORD which he spoke by Eli'jah.
1 Kings17, 13–16.

As the pots of the widow sustained her use of meal and oil, so the fish in the sea might sustain mankind's harvest. As long as harvesters use the resource within its production possibilities, the fish stock will give a lasting yield. However, it might go wrong if too many take too much from the same pot. A necessary, but not sufficient condition to avoid over-fishing is ecological and economic knowledge – that is to say, knowledge about interactions between man and nature.


Epilogue. Supply and sharing of resources are hardly as easy as in this story. Could it be that future "water wars" would be much harder, with more severe consequences for the people involved than some of the fish wars we have seen in recent decades? The Middle East area of Elijah and the widow in this story might be a candidate area for such wars. However, with co-operation and proper management conflicts may be avoided or reduced, for water as well as for fish resources.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

2.2 Effort and production

A fish harvesting firm or a fisher uses several inputs, or factors, to catch fish and to land it round, gutted or processed. Inputs used include fuel, bait, gear and labour. In this respect a harvesting firm is not much different from any other firm – a set of inputs is used to produce an output. However, the direct contribution from the natural resource, the fish stock, constitutes a significant difference compared with a manufacturing firm that can use as much as it wants of all the required inputs. A fisher can vary the amount of inputs, but not the size of the stock.

In actual fishing we usually find that for a given set of inputs the amount of output for the fishing firm varies with the stock level and the availability of the fish. Fish migration for spawning and feeding makes most stocks in certain areas more available for the fishers at some times of the year than in others. Such seasonal variations in the distribution of fish stocks and year classes are the basis for many seasonal fisheries around the world. However, to start with, we shall simplify the analysis by disregarding seasonal variations and assume that the fish stock is homogeneously distributed across area and time. The focus is on the size of the stock and the importance of this for the catch.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

For analytical and practical purposes it is useful to let fishers encounter the stock with what is called fishing effort, or just effort. Examples of effort are hours of trawling, number of gillnets and number of long-line hooks[4]. Effort is produced by optimal use of inputs and is expressed in the production function

$$E = \Psi(v_1,...,v_n)\,, \tag{2.2}$$

where E is effort and v_i is factor i. In one way, this is a regular production function recognisable from the theory of the firm. However, the great difference is that E is not a final product to be sold, like the products of most firms, but an intermediate good produced to encounter the fish stock.

Catch, the product of fish harvesting firms, is a function of effort and stock and this can be expressed in the harvest function

$$H = f(E,X)\,. \tag{2.3}$$

Harvest function (2.3) is a short-run production function in the sense that it is valid for a given stock level at any point in time, without any feedback from effort to stock. Figure 2.2 gives an example of how catch varies with effort for two stock levels; H: high and L: low. Note that the catch is non-increasing in effort – that is, more effort implies higher catch, but not necessarily proportional to the increase in effort.




Figure 2.2. Short-run variations in harvest as a function of effort.

If effort is measured, for example, in trawl hours, catch could be measured in kg or tonnes. Effort and catch should both be related to the same unit of time, which could be a day or a week.

Thus, there is a dichotomy in the analysis of fish production that is not found in the traditional theory of the firm. This way of analysing fisheries has the advantage that it treats the inputs controlled by the firm, such as fuel, bait and gear, differently from the major input, fish stocks. The latter is a necessary factor of production affected by the actions of numerous fishers (see the next section), but not controlled by any of them.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

2.3 Yield and stock effects of fishing

Fish stock levels are affected by fishing if the total effort is sufficiently high over some period of time. How much depends on the growth potential of the stock and the total harvest. Change in the stock is expressed by the growth equation

$$\dot{X} = F(X) - H. \tag{2.4}$$

From this equation follows

$$\dot{X} \gtreqless 0 \quad \text{if} \quad H \lesseqgtr (X). \tag{2.5}$$

To ensure positive growth of the stock, the harvest must be lower than the natural growth. Biological equilibrium is by definition achieved when $\dot{X} = 0$, and in this case equations (2.3) and (2.4) give

$$f(E, X) = F(X). \tag{2.6}$$

Since this is one equation with two variables, *X* and *E*, the stock is implicitly given as a function of effort *E*. This means that at equilibrium the stock level is a function of effort, and from equation (2.3) it now follows that the equilibrium harvest is also a function of effort. This equilibrium harvest is often called sustainable yield since it can be sustained by the stock for a given level of effort.

We have seen that, knowing the growth function *F(X)* and the short-run harvest function (2.3), the sustainable yield may be derived from equation (2.6). This can also be done graphically as shown in figure 2.3. To simplify the analysis we now assume that the short-run harvest function is linear in effort and stock level:

$$H = qEX. \tag{2.7}$$

Equation (2.7) is called the Schaefer harvest function (Schaefer, 1957). The parameter q is a constant called the availability parameter. This parameter expresses how effective the effort is in relation to the stock level. If effort is measured in, for example, gill net days, *q* expresses the ratio between catch per gill net day, *H/E*, and stock level, *X*. Thus, the value of *q* is directly linked to the scaling of *E*. In some fisheries the combined harvest technology and fish behaviour is such that catch per unit of effort, *H/E*, is nearly independent of the stock size (see Bjørndal, 1987). In other fisheries catch per unit effort increases with the stock level, but not proportionally as in the Schaefer function (see Eide et al., 2003).

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Panel (a) of figure 2.3 shows short-run harvest as straight lines for five different effort levels. For the smallest effort E_1 the harvest curve crosses the growth curve for stock level X_1 and harvest H_1. Thus, a small effort – over a sufficiently long time to let the stock reach equilibrium – gives a high stock level and a relatively small catch. A somewhat higher effort level E_2 gives a lower stock level X_2 but a higher sustainable catch, H_2. However, an even higher effort like E_4 gives stock level X_4 that is significantly lower than X_2, even though the sustainable catch H_4 is equal to H_2. Similarly, E_5 gives a catch H_5 equal to E_1, even though the stock level X_5 is much smaller than X_1. In Figure 2.3 the highest possible harvest is reached for effort level E_3 and this harvest is called the maximum sustainable yield (MSY).




Figure 2.3. The sustainable yield curve shows harvest as a function of effort and is derived from the natural growth curve and the harvest curve.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

The natural-growth stock-level curve in panel (a) has been transformed into a sustainable-harvest effort curve in panel (b). The *H(E)* curve is also called the sustainable yield curve and it connects the long-run harvest potential to fishing effort. This harvest-effort curve has the same form as the growth curve in this case since the Schaefer short-run harvest function is linear in both effort and stock. It is important to note the difference between the short-run harvest function $H = f(E,X)$ in (2.3), depicted as straight lines in panel (a) of figure 2.3, and the sustainable yield curve *H(E)*, in panel (b). The former is valid for any combination of effort, E, and stock, X, at any time, whereas the latter is the long-run equilibrium harvest for given levels of effort. The sustainable yield curve is conditional on equilibrium harvest.

The main purpose of figure 2.3 is to derive the equilibrium harvest-effort curve shown in panel (b). Let us now use this to discuss what happens over time if fishing takes place outside equilibrium. Suppose fishers use effort E_1 to harvest a virgin stock at the carrying capacity level K. To start with, the harvest will be significantly greater than H_1 since the stock level K is bigger than X_1, and this implies that the stock level will decrease. When the stock decreases, the harvest will also decrease until it reaches such a level that, according to the short-run harvest curve designated qE_1X in panel (a) of figure 2.3, harvest equals the natural growth of the stock. The decrease in harvest will continue until stock level X_1 has been reached. At this point in time, harvest equals natural growth, and another equilibrium has been established. On the other hand, if fishers use effort E_1 to fish at a stock level lower than X_1 the stock will grow since natural growth is greater than harvest. The length of the transition period between, for example, the virgin stock level K and level X_1 depends on the biological production potential of the stock. Growth curves and sustainable yield curves, as shown in figure 2.3, may be used to compare different equilibria but cannot be used to tell how long a time the transition from one equilibrium to another will take.

So far in this chapter we have analysed the effects of fishing on a stock with growth compensation (see figure 2.1). However, if the growth process exhibits depensation or critical depensation, the sustainable yield curve proves to become very different from the case of compensation. This is demonstrated in figures 2.4 and 2.5. The former is for the case of depensation and the latter is for the case of critical depensation of growth. In figure 2.4 panel (a), E_D is the effort that makes the Schaefer harvest curve tangent to the growth curve at the zero stock level. Mathematically, E_D can be found from equation




Figure 2.4. The natural growth curve and sustainable yield as a function of effort in the case of depensation.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com




Figure 2.5. The natural growth curve and sustainable yield as a function of effort in the case of critical depensation.

(2.8) $$qE_D = \lim_{X \to 0} F'(X) .$$

The left-hand side (lhs) of this equation is the slope of the Schaefer harvest curve, and the right hand side (rhs) is the slope of the growth curve.

To ensure a sustainable harvest there is an upper limit on effort which cannot be exceeded, and this effort level is designated E_{MAX} in figures 2.4 and 2.5. If effort levels above E_{MAX} are maintained for a sufficiently long time the stock will be biologically over-fished and finally will become extinct. In case of extinction, panel (b) of figures 2.4 and 2.5 shows that the yield is zero for effort higher than E_{MAX}.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Figure 2.4 panel (b) shows that the harvest curve is double, with an upper and a lower branch for each value of effort between E_D and E_{MAX}. This is due to the existence of two intersection points between each of the linear harvest curves and the growth curve, as shown in panel (a). There is, however, a significant difference between the two branches of the yield curve. The upper part constitutes stable points of harvesting whereas the lower part constitutes unstable harvesting. An example will explain the stability problem. The harvest curve for effort E_1 intersects with the growth curve for two stock levels, the low one X_{1L} and the high one X_{1H} in panel (a) of figure 2.4. For stock levels lower than X_{1L} the harvest curve is above the growth curve and the natural growth is too small to compensate for the harvest. This implies that the stock will decrease from X_{1L} to zero if effort E_1 is maintained over a sufficiently long period of time, indicated in panel (a) by an arrow pointing to the left. Thus, X_{1L} is an unstable equilibrium for the stock harvested by effort E_1. This would also be the case for all other left-hand side intersections between the harvest curve and the growth curve for effort levels between E_D and E_{MAX}. On the other hand, if the stock level is just above X_{1L} natural growth is larger than harvest for effort E_1 and the stock will increase. An arrow pointing to the right indicates this. Therefore, in this case the stock will in the long run increase towards X_{1H}, which is a stable equilibrium. The lower part of the yield curve in figure 2.4 panel (b) is dashed to mark that this part represents unstable harvest. Figure 2.5 shows that, in case of growth with critical depensation, the harvest curve is double for all levels of E between zero and E_{MAX}. The lower part of the yield curve also represents unstable harvest in this case.

Exercise 2.1

Assume that the harvest function is $H(E,X)=qEX$, where q is the catchability coefficient and E is fishing effort. The catchability coefficient for a particular fishery is q=0.00067, and the stock level is X=3.0 million tonnes.

a) What is the catch per unit of effort (CPUE) in this case?
b) What could the unit of measurement of effort be if the fish stock is for example cod or hake?

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Exercise 2.2

Assume that the function $F(X) = rX\left(1 - \frac{X}{K}\right)$ describes the annual natural growth of a fish stock. X represents the stock biomass at the start of the year. K is the environmental carrying capacity in stock biomass terms and r is the intrinsic growth rate.

a) Show that the maximum sustainable yield (MSY) can be expressed by the two parameters r and K, so that $MSY = \frac{rK}{4}$.
b) Draw a picture of F(X) for r=0.4 and K=8.0 million tonnes.
Assume that the harvest function is $H(E,X)=qEX$, where q is the catchability coefficient and E is fishing effort measured in number of vessel year.
c) Show how the sustainable yield curve (the long-run catch function) H(E) can be found. Tip: find it graphically like in figure 2.3, or by use of $H(E,X)=F(X)$ where you eliminate X by using the harvest function.
d) Add to your picture of $F(X)$ the harvest function $H(E,X)=qEX$ for q=0.00067 and E equal to 100, 200, 400 and 500 vessel year. What is the sustainable yield for these levels of effort?

LIGS University
based in Hawaii, USA
is currently enrolling in the Interactive Online BBA, MBA, MSc, DBA and PhD programs:
- enroll by October 31st, 2014 and
- save up to 11% on the tuition!
- pay in 10 installments / 2 years
- Interactive Online education
- visit www.ligsuniversity.com to find out more!

Note: LIGS University is not accredited by any nationally recognized accrediting agency listed by the US Secretary of Education.
More info here.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

3 A basic bioeconomic model

In this chapter we shall use the sustainable yield curve derived in figure 2.3 to analyse economic and biological effects of fishing under open access and managed fisheries. The concept of resource rent is defined and discussed, and we demonstrate how important this concept is for the analysis of managed fisheries.

3.1 Open access bioeconomic equilibrium

Let us start by asking the following question: if fishers have open and free access to a fishery, is there an effort level that may give rise to an economic equilibrium in the fish harvesting industry in the sense that effort is stable over time? If the answer to this question is affirmative, then one might ask how economic factors like effort costs and fish prices affect effort and stock at equilibrium.

The gross revenue of a fishery, for example, per season or year, equals quantity harvested multiplied by the price of fish. The price of fish from a particular stock is hardly affected by quantity fished if the fish is sold in a competitive market with many sellers and buyers and in competition with similar types of fish from other stocks. In the following analysis we shall assume that the price of fish, p, is constant across time and quantity.

Based on the sustainable yield curve (see *H(E)* in figure 2.3) the total revenue of fishing can be represented as

(3.1) $$TR(E) = p \cdot H(E).$$

The total revenue curve will simply have the same shape as the sustainable yield curve, scaled up or down depending on the actual price. It is important to notice that the total revenue function and curve are both in terms of effort. In micro-economics, however, revenue is usually related to output.

From the total revenue function in equation (3.1) we derive the average revenue and the marginal revenue functions. The average revenue per unit of effort is

(3.2) $$AR(E) = TR(E) / E,$$

and the marginal revenue of sustainable fishing is

(3.2') $$MR(E) = dTR(E) / dE.$$

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

The distinction between the concepts of average and marginal revenue is very important in fisheries economics. Average revenue is the total revenue divided by total effort, whereas marginal revenue shows the change in total revenue as a result of a small change in effort. When we know the sustainable yield harvest, *H(E)* and the price of fish, *p*, we can also find *TR(E)*, *AR(E)* and *MR(E)*. Figure 3.1 panel (a) shows the total revenue curve based on the sustainable yield curve in figure 2.3 and a constant price of fish. The corresponding average revenue of effort *AR(E)* and marginal revenue of effort *MR(E)* curves are shown in panel (b). In this case the form of the *TR* curve is such that the *AR* and *MR* curves are almost straight lines. Whether they really are straight lines or curved is not of importance for this analysis. Note that for sufficiently high effort costs, or low price, the open access effort level in Figure 3.1 may be lower than the maximum sustainable yield effort, implying that the stock will be higher than its MSY level (also see Figure 2.3).




Figure 3.1. The maximum economic yield level of fishing effort is significantly lower than the open access level.

The total cost of a fishery depends on the costs and efficiency of each fishing vessel and its crew. However, at this stage we shall not go into a detailed discussion of the cost structure of the vessels. In the long run, actual effort expands by the addition of new vessels and the subtraction of old ones, as well as by varying the effort and efficiency of each vessel. To simplify the analysis, we shall assume that the total cost of a fishery can be expressed in a simple function of effort. In general, the connection between average cost of effort, *AC(E)*, and marginal cost of effort, *MC(E)*, on the one hand, and total cost, *TC(E)*, on the other is

$$AC(E) = TC(E) / E, \tag{3.3}$$

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

and

$$MC(E) = dTC(E)/dE, \quad dMC(E)/dE \geq 0. \tag{3.4}$$

If $dMC/dE > 0$ each additional unit of effort would be more costly than the previous ones, whereas $dMC/dE = 0$ means that effort can be added to the fishery at constant marginal costs. Increasing marginal cost means that the vessels are different from a cost and efficiency perspective. In this case we organise vessels along the effort axis with the most cost effective one to the left and the least cost effective ones towards the right (more on this in chapters 6.1 and 7.1). Constant marginal cost of effort implies that there is an infinitely elastic supply of effort – in other words, the supply curve is horizontal. In this case one could think of homogenous vessels that are added to the fishery at the same cost as the previous one. Homogenous vessels are, from a cost point of view, equally equipped and crewed and the marginal and the average cost of effort are the same for all vessels. Costs, including capital, labour and operating costs, per unit of effort could be denominated, for example, as $ per vessel year, vessel day, trawl hour or gill net day. In figure 3.1 panel (a) the total cost curve, *TC(E)*, is shown as an upward-sloping straight line. In other words, the cost function is linear in effort at a constant cost, *a*, per unit of effort.

$$TC(E) = aE\,. \tag{3.5}$$

Since effort in this analysis is homogenous from a cost point of view we shall also assume that vessels are homogenous from an efficiency point of view. This implies that they all catch the same amount of fish per unit of effort and that the average revenue is the same for all vessels. Under open access, vessels will enter the fishery if revenue per unit of effort is greater than cost per unit, and exit the fishery if cost per unit is higher than revenue. When average revenue of effort equals marginal cost of effort there will be an economic equilibrium with neither an incentive to leave nor an incentive to enter the fishery. Thus, we have now arrived at the following criterion for open access economic equilibrium in the fish harvesting industry

$$MC(E) = AR(E). \tag{3.6}$$

Recall that the revenue curves in figure 3.1 are based on biological equilibria ($\dot{X} = 0$) and that this is also the case for criterion (3.6). In other words, there are simultaneous biological and economic equilibria when (3.6) is fulfilled. This is called the open access bioeconomic equilibrium, or just bionomic equilibrium.

For homogenous vessels, as in the analysis of this chapter, effort and harvest are the same for all vessels. Thus, the catch efficiency is the same for all vessels. What factors determine this efficiency at bioeconomic equilibrium? Are biological or economic factors most important? Let us try to answer these questions by using the bioeconomic model analysed above. By taking the derivative of (3.5) with respect to *E* we have

$$MC(E) = a, \tag{3.7}$$

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

and from (3.1) and (3.2) follows

Box 3.1 Denomination of fishing variables

H and *E* in the harvest function (2.3) have to be related to the same time period, for example one day, month or year. The unit of measurement of effort, *E*, can be, for example, one hour of trawling in demersal trawl fisheries, one gill net day in coastal gill net fishing, or 100 hooks in long line fisheries. Using Δt as symbol for the unit of time, one hour of trawling as the unit of effort and metric tonne as the unit of harvest and stock, the denominations of the variables would be

E: Trawl hours/Δt
H: Tonnes/Δt
X: Tonnes

The unit of time used for measuring *TR* and *TC* has to be the same as for measuring *H* and *E*. The denomination of the cost per unit of effort, *a*, would be $ per trawl hour, $ per gill net day or $ per 100 fishing hooks, respectively, using the above examples. The denominations in $ terms will be

a: $/trawl hour
TC = *aE*: $/$\Delta t$
TR = *pH*: $/$\Delta t$

If one vessel produces *s* units of effort during Δt, *Z* vessels will produce the total effort

$$E = s\,Z\,Dt$$

If we know the total effort and the number of vessels, the average effort per vessel is found by dividing trawl hours with the number of vessels times the unit of time

$$s = E/Z\Delta t.$$

(3.8) $$AR(E) = \frac{pH(E)}{E}.$$

Substituting for *MC(E)* from (3.7) and for *AR(E)* from (3.8) into (3.6) and re-arranging somewhat gives the following

(3.9) $$\frac{H(E)}{E} = \frac{a}{p}.$$

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

The left-hand side of (3.9) is called catch per unit of effort (CPUE), and this is equal to the ratio of cost per unit of effort to price of fish. It may seem strange that only economic factors, and not biological, affect CPUE at the open access bioeconomic equilibrium. How is this possible? Firstly, note that E and a are closely related. If E is measured, for example, in trawl hours, a will be in $ per trawl hour, and if E is measured in trawler year, a will be in $ per trawler year. CPUE will be tonnes per trawl hour or tonnes per trawler year, correspondingly. At bionomic equilibrium, CPUE will be greater the greater cost of effort and the lower price of fish is. Biological conditions do not affect the productivity of fishing, according to (3.9). The reason for this is that the open access stock level is an endogenous variable determined together with the sustainable catch, effort and CPUE by the exogenous variables; effort cost and fish price (see also Ch. 5.2). The ratio of cost of effort-price of fish affects fishing and thereby the size of the stock and the CPUE; low effort cost and high fish price imply a low equilibrium stock level under open access harvesting.

In actual fisheries, prices, costs, efficiency and fish stocks fluctuate over time and economic and biological equilibria are only rarely observed. Nevertheless, the open access model has proved a useful point of reference in fisheries economics, just as the model of perfect competition is a useful reference model for understanding economics in general.

TURN TO THE EXPERTS FOR
SUBSCRIPTION CONSULTANCY

Subscrybe is one of the leading companies in Europe when it comes to innovation and business development within subscription businesses.

We innovate new subscription business models or improve existing ones. We do business reviews of existing subscription businesses and we develope acquisition and retention strategies.

Learn more at linkedin.com/company/subscrybe or contact
Managing Director Morten Suhr Hansen at mha@subscrybe.dk

SUBSCRYBE - to the future

Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

3.2 Maximising resource rent

Economic rent is, generally speaking, a payment to a factor of production in excess of what is necessary for its present employment. For example, if a fisher makes $20 000 in his present occupation as a participant in an open-access fishery and his second best alternative, as a builder, pays $18 000, the economic rent is $2000. If his neighbour is a less efficient fisher who makes only $18 000, which is just above his opportunity cost in the labour market, this fisher does not earn any rent. The kind of rent earned by the former fisher is called intra-marginal rent (more on this in Ch. 7.1), which is closely related to rent from land discussed by classical economists like Ricardo. In Ricardo's context, rent is payment for the use of land: "the uses of the original and indestructible powers of the soil" (Ricardo, 1821, p. 33).

In present day economies, firms in some industries have monopoly power, which is the ability to influence the market price of the goods or services they sell. If such a firm generates revenue exceeding all its opportunity costs, including normal profit, super-normal profit is generated. Normal profit is the necessary payment to attract and keep capital in an industry. This may vary since risk and uncertainty vary between industries. Super-normal profit in this context is also called monopoly rent. Monopoly rent is related to the downward-sloping demand curve for the goods produced by a firm, whereas the intra-marginal rent noted above is related to the upward-sloping marginal cost curve of an industry. In the latter case the intra-marginal producers are more efficient than the marginal one that just breaks even.

In fisheries, there is a possibility of generating another type of rent related to the common pool characteristics of fish as a natural resource. This rent, called resource rent, is the industry earnings in excess of all costs and normal profit, and this may exist independently of any monopoly or intra-marginal rent. We shall see this more clearly when there is a horizontal marginal cost curve (no intra-marginal rent) and a horizontal demand curve (no monopoly rent) at the industry level. Using the previous symbols, resource rent is defined, within the sustainable harvest model, by

$$\pi(E) = TR(E) - TC(E). \tag{3.10}$$

The resource rent equals the revenue in excess of all costs, and this will vary with fishing effort. Assuming that the objective of fisheries management is to maximise the resource rent, let us now derive the effort level that can realise this objective. Note that alternatively we could have used harvest, H, as the management instrument instead of effort, E. Whether we use harvest or effort is mainly a matter of convenience and tradition. For a given effort the corresponding equilibrium harvest follows from the sustainable yield curve derived in chapter 2. To find the optimal level of effort, we may think of a sole owner that has total control of the fishery, including the control of effort and exclusive right to use the resource; Gordon (1954) and Scott (1955) are early proponents of this approach. A necessary condition for maximisation of $\pi(E)$ in (3.10) is

$$d\pi(E)/dE = MR(E) - MC(E) = 0, \tag{3.11}$$

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

where $MR(E) = dTR(E)/dE$ is the marginal revenue of effort for sustainable fishing and $MC(E)$, the marginal cost of effort, is defined in (3.4). The second order condition for maximisation of $\pi(E)$ is

$$d^2\pi(E)/dE^2 = dMR(E)/dE - dMC(E)/dE < 0. \tag{3.12}$$

From the necessary condition (3.11) we derive the following condition for maximum resource rent

$$MC(E) = MR(E). \tag{3.13}$$

The optimality rule in (3.13) is a very important economic reference point for fisheries management. Note the difference between this rule and the open access rule in (3.6). In both cases the left-hand side is the same, the marginal cost of effort $MC(E)$, whereas the right-hand side differs. Under open access the effort expands and the stock decreases until the average revenue, $AR(E)$, is reduced and equals marginal cost of effort at the bionomic equilibrium. In order to maximise resource rent, effort has to be reduced to such a level that the marginal revenue $MR(E)$ equals marginal cost, as shown in (3.13).




Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Maximum resource rent is also called maximum economic yield, with the acronym *MEY*. Effort and stock level corresponding to maximum economic yield are therefore given the subscript *MEY* as shown above in figure 3.1. This figure shows that E_{MEY} is significantly lower than E_{MSY}. The reduction of effort compared with the open access effort level saves costs and/or enlarges fishery revenues. Figure 3.1 has been designed such that revenue is about the same under open-access and *MEY* fishing and this is also the case for quantity harvested since price per kg of fish, p, is constant – independent of quantity harvested. But how is it possible to harvest the same quantity of fish with two such different effort levels as under open access and *MEY* fishing? Recall that to harvest fish we need two major inputs, effort and stock, as expressed in the harvest function (2.3). To harvest a certain quantity of fish one may choose a large fishing effort and a small fish stock, or a small effort and a large stock. From an analytical point of view we compare two different equilibria without taking into account the time needed to change from one stock level to another. The sustainable yield curve (shown in figure 2.3) and the above analysis allows for comparison of different biological and economic equilibria, without paying regard to the time dimension (time and investment will be studied in Ch. 4). It is pretty obvious that to maximise resource rent within the above analysis it pays to use the small effort-large stock combination, instead of large effort-small stock.

Under the open access regime each fisher does not have an incentive to save fish in the sea to let it grow and to let it spawn new recruits for later periods of fishing. If fisher Mary wanted to pursue such goals it is very likely that Peter, Paul or another fisher, or all of them, would take such an opportunity to catch what Mary left. This leaves Mary without any other choice than to behave selfishly and maximise her own goal at any time. Thus, under open access the fish in the sea has zero opportunity cost for each fisher, resulting in the large-effort small-stock equilibrium.

Under *MEY* management the resource has a positive opportunity cost due to the spawning and growth capacity of fish that can be used for harvesting and to maintain a larger stock than the open access provides. A larger stock gives lower unit cost of harvest ($ per tonne) than a small stock. This cost saving effect of increased stock level, called stock effect, is utilised to generate resource rent under the MEY regime.

The analysis in this text is based on the assumption that effort, which combines inputs like vessel, gear, fuel, and labour, has an alternative value in the society's production. This is a reasonable assumption for the long-term adaptation analysed within a bioeconomic framework. It takes time for stocks to adjust to changes in effort and other exogenous factors. Factors of production used to produce vessels and gear could alternatively have been used for the production of other goods and services for consumption and investment.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

When a society's resources and outputs are allocated in such a way that no feasible change can improve anyone's welfare without reducing the welfare of at least one other person, then a Pareto optimum exists (named after Vilfredo Pareto, Italian economist and mathematician, 1848–1923). A reallocation that makes one person better off without making anyone else worse off is called a Pareto improvement. From our analysis it should be clear that open access harvesting is not Pareto optimal. By reducing effort from E_{∞} to E_{MEY}, as shown in figure 3.1, society saves on some factors of production that can be used in other sectors of the economy. This saving of resources should make it possible for the society to realise a Pareto improvement. Note that this criterion is rather strict, requiring that the improvement should take place "without making anyone else worse off". However, economic development often takes place with net gains for someone, but losses for others. Even if total gains are larger than total losses in monetary terms, such a change is not a Pareto improvement because of the losses for someone. The Kaldor-Hicks criterion says that if a change in the economy is such that the gainers could compensate the loosers and still be better off, this change is beneficial for the society as a whole (J.R. Hicks and N. Kaldor published their work in 1939 in the *Economic Journal*). Compensation is hypothetical and this criterion suggests that the change is preferable even if compensation does not actually take place.

3.3 Effort and harvest taxes

In the previous section we have seen that a fishery can provide an economic surplus, resource rent, if effort is reduced below the open access level. We also derived the effort level E_{MEY} that maximises resource rent. Using the sustainable yield curve, *H(E)* in figure 2.3, what the rent maximising harvest, H_{MEY}, is follows immediately. The analysis so far does not tell how the reduction in E could take place. In many countries regulation traditionally plays a key role in managing fishing capacity and effort. We may think of capacity in numbers and size of vessels whereas effort is related to use of vessels in fishing. Examples of management instruments for capacity and effort reductions include vessel and fisher licences, effort quotas, length and weight limits for hull and fitted vessels, as well as engine power limitations. Such regulations are called input regulations. Output regulations related to the harvest of fish are called quotas – be it total harvest quotas or harvest quotas per enterprise, vessel or fisher. In addition, input and output regulations may be combined with technical regulations, which include minimum mesh size of gear, minimum size of fish, and closed areas and seasons. Some of the regulatory instruments may be transformed into market instruments, such as tradeable licences and quotas (more on this in the next section).

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Indirect management instruments include taxes, fees and subsidies. The latter, for example a fuel subsidy, would encourage an expansion of effort and can be disregarded as an instrument to reduce effort in the direction of E_{MEY}. In other parts of the economy corrective taxes are used to discourage the use of some goods and services, for example, motor vehicle fuel and tobacco, and to finance government budgets. Corrective taxes can in theory bring marginal private costs into alignment with marginal social costs. Such instruments are called Pigouvian taxes (after the British economist A. C. Pigou, 1877–1959). In principle, these could be used in fisheries, even though in practical fisheries policy they are hardly the regulatory means of primary choice among major fishing nations (see, for example, OECD, 1997). Nevertheless, studying the effects of Pigouvian taxes on fishing effort, as well as on resources, is an excellent point of departure for studies in fisheries management – and to gain a basic grasp on how economic instruments work. Therefore, let us have a closer look at the effects of taxes on effort and harvest.

We have seen in sections 3.1 and 3.2 that a renewable resource like fish is economically overexploited under an open access regime, provided the market price is high enough and the harvest cost low enough to make it a commercial resource. Another interpretation is that the bioeconomic model predicts that open access fisheries, in the long run, will not generate resource rent. Figure 3.1 shows that the average revenue per unit effort, *AR(E)*, is greater than the marginal cost of effort, *MC(E)* if total participation in the fishery, measured by E, is less than E_∞. The existence of a super-normal profit for the participants attracts new fishers with the result that total effort increases. This will take place as long as E is less than E_∞. On the other hand, if effort at the point of departure for our analysis is greater than E_∞ fishers will have higher costs than revenues and some of them will leave this fishery. Thus, E_∞ is the open access equilibrium level for effort as long as prices and costs are constant, and to this effort corresponds an open access equilibrium level of the fish stock.

In public discourse "the tragedy of the commons" seems to have several meanings, including that effort is higher than the maximum sustainable yield effort, effort is higher than the maximum economic yield effort, stock level is lower than the maximum sustainable yield stock and that sustainable yield is lower than maximum sustainable yield. It is, however, important to distinguish between "tragedies" related to biological concepts and to economic concepts. A fish stock that is economically over-fished, as is always the case at open access equilibrium, is not necessarily biologically over-fished. If fishing costs are high and/or fish price is low, open access does not necessarily attract enough effort to cause biological over-fishing. The equilibrium effort has to be higher than the maximum sustainable yield effort to cause biological over fishing, and this will not happen unless the effort cost is sufficiently low and/or the fish price is high enough.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com


Based on the analysis above it is now clear that the management board should aim at doing something with the prices, costs or institutions that fishermen face. For fishermen high fish prices may be good in the short run, but with bad institutions (open access) this may in the long run be a threat against fish stocks. Using Pigouvian taxes, the manager's task is to find the tax rate, on either effort or harvest, that adjusts effort to the maximum economic yield level E_{MEY}. This requires an extensive knowledge about the biological and economic characteristics of the fishery, expressed in the *H(E)*, *TR(E)* and *TC(E)* functions. However, any tax rate lower than the optimal one will move the fishery in the right direction, from E_{∞} towards E_{MEY}. Let us now assume that the manager has all the necessary information freely available so that we do not have to include information and management costs in the analysis. Panel (a) of figure 3.2 shows total revenues and costs, whereas panel (b) shows average and marginal figures.

The following symbols will be used:

t_E = tax per unit effort (for example, $ per trawl hour or trawler year)
t_H = tax per unit harvest (for example, $ per kg or tonne of fish landed).

With an effort tax the total cost for the fishers is

(3.14) $$TC_P(E) = (a + t_E)E,$$



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com




Figure 3.2. Use of corrective (Pigouvian) taxes on effort and harvest can equate social and private costs and social and private revenues.

where E and a are effort and cost per unit of effort, respectively. The use of subscript p for TC underlines that this is the total private cost of the fishers, including what they have to pay in effort taxes to the government. Note that for any value of E total private cost TC_p is greater than the total cost, TC, since fishers have to include the effort tax in their costs. The effect of an effort tax can be analysed equivalent to a shift in the cost per unit effort, thus increasing the slope of the total cost curve for the industry. This is shown in figure 3.2, where $TC(E)$ is the total cost curve exclusive of the effort tax and $TC_p(E)$ is the total cost curve including the tax. The effect of the effort tax is to augment total private costs to such a level that the TC_p curve intersects the total revenue curve for the maximum sustainable yield effort level E_{MEY}. This implies that the total revenue, $TR(E)$, is shared between the government, as the tax collector, and the fishing industry. The former receives the resource rent, π_{MEY}, and the fishers end up with the difference between the total revenue and the resource rent, $TR(E)$ minus π_{MEY}. Fishers in total receive $TR(E)$ for their catch, and out of this they pay a tax proportionate to their effort. What is left is just enough to cover the costs of the fishers. Recall that ordinary remuneration of capital and labour is included in the costs.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

The total amount of resource rent depends on biological and economic characteristics of the fishery, related to the forms of the curves in figure 3.2. In general, we could say that low cost fisheries with high priced and/or easy to catch fish have the greatest potential for generating resource rent. On the other hand, high cost fisheries with low priced and/or hard to catch fish may even make it uneconomical to sustain a fishery on a commercial basis. Realising resource rent has a meaning only when a fishery generates, or is expected to generate, higher revenues than costs.

With a harvest tax the total private revenue of fishers equals

$$TR_P(E) = (p - t_H)H(E) \tag{3.15}$$

where p and H are the price of fish and of harvest, respectively. Note that TR now has the subscript p to underline that the total revenue in (3.15) is what the private industry receives net of taxes. The other part, equal to $t_h H(E)$, is the government's tax revenue. It is easy to see by re-arranging (3.15) that the total revenue of the fishery, $p_H(E)$, equals the sum of private and government revenues. Recall that the tax rate t_h is measured in $ per kg or per tonne – in other words we do not use a percentage tax in this analysis.

Figure 3.2 panel (b) shows in detail the effects of the two taxes discussed above. The MC, AR and MR curves are the before-tax fishery marginal cost, average revenue and marginal revenue, respectively. The open access bioeconomic equilibrium is at the effort level E_∞ where the fishery marginal cost curve intersects the average revenue curve. In this case with a horizontal MC curve the effort tax shifts this curve upward to MC_p, a distance equal to the size of the tax. If, for example, the fishery marginal cost is $100 per trawl hour and the effort tax t_E also equals $100 per trawl hour, the fishery marginal cost including the tax will be twice the pre-tax level. In figure 3.2 panel (b) this is illustrated with a MC_p curve at a level twice as high as the MC curve. The MC_p curve intersects the AR curve for an effort level that gives maximum economic yield, E_{MEY}. The industry now faces the effort cost including the tax and this will equal average revenue AR at equilibrium. For effort levels lower than E_{MEY} the AR curve is above the MC_p curve. This implies that additional effort will enter the fishery due to super-normal profit in the industry, and the stock will decline to reduce the average revenue along the downward sloping AR curve towards the E_{MEY} level. On the other hand, if effort is above the E_{MEY} level the effort cost including the tax is above the average revenue curve, imposing a loss on the participating vessels. This implies that some effort will have to leave the industry, resulting in lower catch, increased stock level and increased average revenue when moving from the right along the AR curve towards E_{MEY}. In case of an effort tax as the only management instrument fishers will face a higher cost of effort, but in all other respects their adaptation will be as under open access.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

In case of a harvest tax, the average and the marginal revenue curves of the sustainable fishery are affected as shown in figure 3.2 panel (b). If the price of fish is \$2.00 per kg and the harvest tax is \$1.00 per kg, the net price of fish received by the fishers will be \$1.00. Whether fishers receive \$2.00 per kg and are charged a tax of \$1.00 per kg, or they receive the net price of \$1.00 does not make any difference to their net revenues. In the latter case the \$1.00 harvest tax is levied on the buyers who collect the tax on behalf of the government. With this example the $AR_p(E)$ curve has a slope about half as steep as the $AR(E)$ curve in figure 3.2. This is due to the definition of average revenue; namely total revenue divided by effort. With a constant price of fish the numerator of the average revenue will change in proportion with the harvest tax for a given level of effort. The right-hand side end point of the average revenue curve on the effort axis will not be affected by the harvest tax; thus the intersection is at E_k for both the AR and the AR_p curve.

In figure 3.2 the level of the effort tax is such that the linear TC_p curve intersects the total revenue curve for E_{MEY}. This implies that the total tax revenue equals the resource rent:

(3.16) $$\pi_{MEY} = t_E E_{MEY}.$$



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

In the case of a harvest tax in figure 3.2 the level of this tax has been set such that the TR_p curve intersects the total cost curve for E_{MEY}. The resource rent in this case is exactly of the same amount as the tax revenue:

(3.17) $$\pi_{MEY} = t_H H_{MEY}.$$

By use of taxes on effort or harvest, the profit maximising behaviour of fishers results in lower effort than under open access, and those who stay in the industry earn a normal remuneration. Open access fisheries give, as we have seen, too many fishers in the industry, but resource taxes on effort or harvest could positively alter this. Thus, a tax on harvest contributes to decreasing the total revenue of the industry whereas a tax on effort contributes to increasing the industry costs. Resource taxes levied on effort or harvest would change the private cost or private revenue, respectively, to discourage participation in the fishery. The tax authority, traditionally the central government, collects the resource rent generated. This tax revenue may be used to reduce other taxes or to augment the government's expenditures. From a policy point of view resource rent can be re-distributed, for example, to fishing communities or regions, without any efficiency loss. The question of how the resource rent is spent or re-distributed should be seen independently of the problem of generating the rent. That is one of the strengths of this analysis. However, in actual commercial fisheries resource taxes have not been a common management instrument, like in other environmental and natural resource saving relations (for an overview of environmentally related taxes in industrialised countries, see OECD, 2001; OECD 2003; and The Environmental Taxes Database of OECD at http://www.oecd.org/). Also see Flaaten, 2010 for a story on what may happen to fisheries dependent regions and countries if distributional issues are neglected.

Management does not come for free (Schrank et al., 2003). There are costs of research and assessment of fish stocks and markets, as well as costs of obtaining information on costs and earnings of fishing vessels. In addition management and enforcement systems are necessary institutions which need economic funding. In some cases locally limited ecosystems may be governed more efficient and less costly by fishermen and other stakeholders themselves (see Ostrom, 1990, which is one of the major works that gained professor Elinor Ostrom the 2009 Nobel price in economics).

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

3.4 Fishing licences and quotas

We have seen in the previous section how effort and harvest taxes could be used to reduce effort down to or towards the long run optimum, the rent maximising level. How much effort is reduced from the open-access level depends on the size of the tax, which in this case acts as a price instrument. In simple cases like this, with a single resource and no distinction between year classes, with one-dimensional effort (no substitution[5] between inputs), no management costs and no uncertainty, the manager may choose freely between indirect price instruments (taxes) and direct instruments, such as effort and harvest quotas. Price management (taxes) and quantity management (quotas) have equivalent effects on overall industry production and economic performance, therefore they are called dual instruments. However, to ensure that the expected results are lasting, the effort quotas and harvest quotas should be transferable. This means that there has to be a quota market to ensure that at any time the most cost-effective fishers do the fishing. In a successful MEY-managed fishery resource rent per unit effort would be Π_{MEY}/E_{MEY} and resource rent per unit harvest would be Π_{MEY}/H_{MEY} (recall figure 3.2). These two ratios indicate the equilibrium prices of effort and harvest quotas, respectively.

In actual fisheries the initial distribution of the fishing rights, such as vessel licences, effort quotas and harvest quotas are often heavily debated. There could be several reasons for this, but the main one has to do with the distribution of resource rent, which may be significant in well-managed fisheries. Even in a system with non-transferable harvest and effort quotas, significant resource rent may still be generated, in particular, if the initial quotas are given for free to those fishers that are most successful under the open access regime. The question is, however, whether these fishers also in the future will be the most efficient ones (Nøstbakken, 2012).

Let us now have a closer look at the effects of using licences and quotas as management instruments and compare the results to that of taxes. A vessel licence is a permission to register and use a vessel for commercial fishing. The licence may or may not specify limits to the vessel characteristics, for example, length (metres), weight (gross registered tonnes), hold volume (cubic metres) or engine power (horse power or kilowatt), and to the type of gear (for example, trawl, long-line or purse seine). A licence usually restricts the fishing capacity of the vessel; in general capacity is the amount of fish that can be produced per unit of time, for example, per year, with existing vessel, equipment and gear at a given stock level, provided the availability of variable factors of production is not restricted.[6] While capacity is related to the mere existence of the fishing vessel, effort is related to its use, measured for example, in hours, days or years. What to use as the unit of effort is mainly a question of convenience (see Box 3.1). In what follows we shall focus on effort and harvest quotas as management tools without discussing explicitly the use of licences. However, there is a close connection between the licence value and the quota value, depending on the amount of harvest quotas or effort quotas a licence holder is given or allowed to acquire.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Figure 3.3 is derived from figure 3.2 and shows effort along the horizontal axis and market price of effort along the vertical axis. Effort and its market price are both related to the same unit of measurement. For example, if effort is measured in trawl hours the effort quota price is in $ per hour trawling, and if effort is measured in whole-year operated trawlers, the price is in $ per trawler year. Resource rent per unit effort is the difference between the average revenue per unit effort, *AR(E)*, and the marginal cost of effort, *MC(E)* (see figure 3.2). In a perfect market, disregarding uncertainty, the effort quota price reflects the expected resource rent per unit effort and the harvest quota price reflects the expected resource rent per unit harvest. The licence price in figure 3.3 has its maximum for just one unit of effort, recalling that the highest average resource rent is gained if only one unit of effort participates in the fishery. At the other end of the effort price curve is the zero price for the open access case. The quota price is zero if the number of effort quotas equals the amount of effort that would establish itself under open access. In an open access fishery the market price of quotas is zero because no resource rent is generated. The total value of the quotas is, as usual, the product of price and quantity. In this case the maximum total value of the effort quotas, which is the product $m_{MEY}E_{MEY}$ shown in figure 3.3, is equal to the maximum resource rent, $\square_{MEY}$, shown in figure 3.2. Note that this analysis relates to long run equilibrium harvesting where the manager has adapted the number of effort quotas to maximise resource rent.

This e-book
is made with
SetaPDF

SETASIGN



PDF components for **PHP** developers

www.setasign.com

Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com




Figure 3.3. Effort quota price as a function of sustainable effort.

So far in this chapter we have studied some long-run aspects of fisheries, in particular the cases of open-access and MEY management, assuming that the supply of homogenous effort is plentiful at a constant marginal cost of effort, previously denoted *a*. However, from the theory of the firm we recall that increasing marginal cost is necessary to avoid corner solutions with "all" or "nothing" production. In fisheries economics the declining stock as a function of effort helps avoid corner solutions, as shown implicitly in figure 3.2.[7]

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Let us now assume that in the short run there is increasing marginal cost of effort at the firm level (more on this in chapter 6). This means that if there is a market for effort quotas the firm wants to buy more quotas the cheaper they are; the firm may be a multi-vessel company, a single vessel company or an owner-operated vessel. The downward sloping demand curve corresponds fully to the regular firm's demand for any variable input that can be bought in the market. Figure 3.4 shows the equilibrium in a quota market with two competitive firms. The quota price is shown on the vertical axis. On the horizontal axis the distance CD measures the managers' total supply of effort quotas or harvest quotas. If effort quotas are used, the total supply CD has to be less than the open access effort level to ensure demand and a positive price. If there is a positive price for effort quotas this also ensures a positive price for harvest quotas, and vice versa. In figure 3.4 quotas in firm A are measured off to the right from C and quotas in firm B are measured off to the left from D. The AA curve expresses the value of the marginal quota in firm A and the BB curve measures the value of the marginal quota in firm B. Thus the AA and the BB curves are the demand curves for quotas for firms A and B respectively. Each of these demand curves depends upon three things. First, the harvest technology for producing effort from capital, labour and other inputs. Second, the price of fish; an increase in the price shifts the demand for quota upwards. Third, the amount of vessel specific capital, which may be different for the two firms. In this case depicted in figure 3.4 there is more vessel capital in firm B than in firm A since the quota demand for any price *m* is higher in firm B than in firm A.




Figure 3.4. Two firms' demand for quotas as a function of quota price. "Effort/harvest" means effort quota or harvest quota.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Figure 3.4 shows that the quota price m^* is the equilibrium price. For this price the total quota, equal to the distance CD, is allocated between the two competitive firms according to the profit maximising criterion.[8] If the initial quota distribution is CG for firm A and DG for firm B, both firms will gain from a quota trade. Firm A will sell quota FG to firm B, and the market equilibrium is established at F with the quota price m^*. In general, if the manager distributes for free the initial total quota CD equally between several firms, which are allowed to trade quotas, a competitive quota market ensures that the most efficient firms conduct the actual harvest. This is also the case for any other initial free distribution of the total quota. When quotas are distributed for free to the fish harvesting firms these firms reap the benefits of a successful management regime. Alternatively the manager could auction the quotas, and with a competitive market the equilibrium price is m^*, as shown in figure 3.4. The main difference between an auction and initially free quotas is in the distribution of the resource rent. With an auction the auctioneer collects the resource rent, whereas the rent benefits the recipients when quotas are distributed for free. This may explain why fishers are usually in favour of free initial quotas and why they oppose auctions.



Deloitte.

Discover the truth at www.deloitte.ca/careers

© Deloitte & Touche LLP and affiliated entities.

Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Exercise 3.1

A fish stock with its distribution area limited to a bay is managed locally. Assume that the following function describes the annual growth of the stock:

$$F(X) = r \cdot X \cdot (1 - \frac{X}{K}),$$

where X is the stock level at the beginning of the year, r is the intrinsic growth rate and K is the carrying capacity.

When fishing takes place harvest per unit of effort is proportional to the stock level, implying the following catch function:

$$H = q \cdot E \cdot X,$$

where H is catch, q is the catchability coefficient and E is fishing effort measured as number of vessel years. The unit cost of effort is a and p is the price of fish.

The parameter values are:

r = 0.25 per year
K = 1000 tonnes
q = 0.05 tonnes per vessel year
p = 1.00 $ per kg
a = 10 000 $ per vessel year

Find (and explain how) equilibrium effort, catch, revenues and costs for each of the following management objectives:

a) Maximise employment in fish harvesting,
b) Maximise harvest to be processed onshore,
c) Maximise resource rent of the fishery.

How could you as the manager of this fishery realise objective *c* given that objective *a* has been followed until now?

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Exercise 3.2

Two firms, A and B, are profit maximisers and act as if they are price takers in a competitive quota market (it could be either harvest quota or effort quota).

M = quota price ($ per tonne or per trawl day)
X = quota (tonnes or trawl days)

The demand functions for quotas differ between the two firms, and are:

$m_A = 1000 - 0.015X_A$
$m_B = 1200 - 0.010X_B$

1. What is the marginal value of quota for each firm (m_A and m_B) if the total quota X = 50 000 is distributed between A and B, with X_A = 20000 and X_B = 30000?
2. What is the competitive equilibrium quota price ($m^* = m_A = m_B$) and the corresponding quota for each firm (X_A and X_B), assuming that quotas are fully utilised?
3. What is the traded quota (the difference between the initial distribution and the competitive equilibrium) for each firm?
4. Draw a picture of what you have derived in question 1–4 based on the information above (tip: see figure 3.4) and mark on the axis the numbers you have found.

What is the efficiency gain from trade, in $ and in % of the equilibrium value of the total quota?

Exercise 3.3

In a fishery the long-run harvest function (harvest volume) is

$$H(E) = aE - bE^2$$

a,b positive constants, E is fishing effort. Total cost is

$TC(E) = cE$, with c=unit cost of effort and
Total revenue is $TR(E) = pH(E)$, with p = constant price of fish.

a) Find the open-access equilibrium values of effort and harvest, E_∞ and H_∞, respectively.
b) Find the fishing effort that maximizes resource rent, E_{MEY}, and the corresponding harvest, H_{MEY}. What happens to E_{MEY} and H_{MEY} if p increases?
c) Find the fishing effort that maximizes sustainable yield (harvest), E_{MSY}.
d) With the parameters a = 30, b = 0.02, c = 100 and p = 10, calculate E_∞, E_{MSY} and E_{MEY}. Does this imply biological overfishing or not?
e) The fisheries management board levy a tax per unit fishing effort, t_E = 100. What will the fishing effort be in this case? Does this imply biological overfishing or not?


Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

4 Investment analysis

To fish down or to build up a fish stock takes time, and time is money for enterprises and consumers. In this chapter we introduce the concept of discounting and analyse how a positive discount rate affects the optimal long-run harvest and stock level, as well as the fishery in transition. Both discrete and continuous time frameworks are used.

4.1 Discounting

In the previous chapter we discussed resource rent in an open access and in a maximum economic yield fishery, and showed that open access implies dissipation of the potential resource rent due to excessive effort and too low stock level. To change from open access to maximum economic yield fishing necessitates reduced effort and increased stock level. However, rebuilding a fish stock takes time since the resource itself has a limited reproductive and growth capacity. Rebuilding can only take place if harvesting is reduced or stopped for some time since harvest has to be less than natural growth to generate growth in the stock. At any point in time the resource manager has the choice between depletion, rebuilding and equilibrium harvesting of the fish stock. Depletion means that harvest is greater than natural growth, and revenue is high in the short run. However, this harvest strategy is not viable in the long run and will have to be changed after some while to avoid economic losses.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Rebuilding a fish stock means investing the foregone harvest, thus, revenue is reduced in the short run with the aim of getting more in return at a later stage. In this case a part of the potential net revenue is invested in the fish stock, the natural resource capital, to save for future purposes. For the resource owner, usually the society, the question at any point in time is whether to consume or invest. For an investment in the stock to be profitable, the return on this investment should be just as good or better than for other investment projects. A sum of money to be received in the future is not of the same value as the same sum of money received today, since money could be deposited in the bank at a positive interest rate. Thus, the interest rate plays an important role in the evaluation of investment projects as well as in comparison of the value of money at different points in time.

Before we proceed to study capital management of the resource stock, let us recapitulate the main connections between present value and interest rate in a discrete and a continuous time context. (Now you should have a quick look at this sub-chapter. If you already knows this you may go directly to chapter 4.2).

When investing A_0 dollars, for example as a bank deposit, at an annual interest of i per cent, your capital will after one year have grown to $A_0(1 + i)$ and after two years the value will be $A_0(1 + i)^2$. In general, an investment of A_0 dollars on these conditions will after t years have the following value

$$A_t = A_0(1+i)^t. \tag{4.1}$$

Solving equation (4.1) for A_0 gives

$$A_0 = \frac{A_t}{(1+i)^t}. \tag{4.2}$$

This shows the connection between the future and the present value of money. A_t dollars in t years is worth A_0 at the present, therefore, A_0 is called the present value of A_t. It is easy to see from equation (4.2) that the present value of a given amount of future money is lower the farther in the future it will be received and the higher the interest is. For businesses and people investing their money, i is usually called the interest rate or market rate of interest, whereas in economic analysis it is often called the social rate of discount. The factor $1/(1 + i)^t = (1 + i)^{-t}$ of (4.2) is the discount factor, which has a value less than one for all positive values of i and t. For $t = 0$ the discount factor equals one and it decreases for increased values of t. This means that money at the investment or loan point in time is not discounted, whereas all future money is. Note that the discount factor approaches zero when t goes to infinity. This means that money values in the very, very far future hardly have any value today if they are discounted. The present value of a stream of future annual profit is the sum of the present value of each of them. For example, with an annual interest rate of 5 per cent the present value of a profit of \$1000 a year for the next five years, starting one year from now, is *0.952 · \$1000 + 0.907 · \$1000 + 0.864 · \$1000 + 0.823 · \$1000 + 0.784 · \$1000 = \$4330*. (The author has made a deliberate mistake for one of the discount factors – find this by use of your calculator).

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Traditionally, discrete time formulas as discussed above are commonly used in investment and economic analysis. This is due to the fact that usually interest is calculated and firms report economic results to owners and tax authorities on an annual basis. However, in principle the period length for interest and present value calculations may be arbitrarily chosen as long as the interest rate is adjusted accordingly. For use in population dynamics and natural resource economics it is often useful to calculate growth and decay on a continuous time basis using the instantaneous annual rate of discount, δ. The relationship between the discrete time annual interest rate and the instantaneous rate of interest is

$$(1+i)^{-t} = e^{-\delta t}, \tag{4.3}$$




Figure 4.1. Discount factors for discrete (bars) and continuous (curve) time, with $i = 0.10$ and $d = 0.093$.

where $e = 2.71828$ is the base of the natural system of logarithms. Figure 4.1 shows the connection between discount factors for $i = 0.1$ and $\delta = 0.0953$ using discrete and instantaneous time, respectively, on an annual basis. From (4.3) we derive, by taking the natural logarithm of both sides,

$$\ln(1+i) = \delta. \tag{4.4}$$

For $i = 0.1$ we derive $\delta = 0.0953$ by using (4.4). For bank deposits, using the annual rate of interest i, compound interest is usually calculated at the end of each year. However, using the instantaneous rate of interest δ implies that interest on interest is calculated on a continuous basis throughout the year. That is why δ is less than i – the continuous calculated interest on interest compensates for the lower value of the proper interest rate (δ compared to i). Note that this discussion is based on a time step of one year in the case of discrete time. If, however, we use a shorter time step, the difference between i and δ, according to equation (4.4), will be smaller. In the extreme case when the time step approaches zero, the discrete time rate of interest, i, will approach the continuous time rate of interest, δ.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

As noted above, formula (4.2) is for the discrete time case. Using continuous time in the corresponding formula for computation of the present value A_0 of the future value at time t, $A(t)$, we get

(4.5) $$A_0 = A(t)\, e^{-\delta t}.$$

Whether one should use discrete or continuous time approach in economic analysis of investment is primarily a question of convenience. The formulas (4.2) and (4.5) give the same result as long as i and δ are in accordance with (4.4). In theoretical analysis it seems that the continuous time approach is the preferred one, whereas in empirical work discrete time calculations are the most common. The fact that most fish stocks are assessed at regular time intervals is a practical argument for using discrete time models in studies of applied fisheries biology and fisheries economics.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

4.2 Fish stocks as capital

At any point in time the resource manager has a choice between depleting, rebuilding and equilibrium harvesting of the fish stock. These options imply that the harvest has to be either above, below or equal to the natural growth of the stock. Globally many fish stocks are overexploited and the policy objective is to rebuild them (FAO, 2010). Such rebuilding means an investment in the natural capital. To assure profitability of an investment in a fish stock the present value of postponing the harvest has to be greater than the value of immediate harvest. In case of actual management the options are usually "greater" or "smaller" harvest now compared with "smaller" or "greater" future harvest, or change in harvest. However, to simplify the analysis let us start by comparing two distinct options, A and B. For option A there is an equilibrium harvest in all periods, with a constant harvest equal to the natural growth of the stock in the initial period. For option B there is no harvest in the initial period, period 0, and the natural growth of this period is invested in the stock with the aim of increasing the potential harvest in all succeeding periods. Therefore, for option B equilibrium fishing takes place such that natural growth is harvested from including period 1. With H denoting harvest and X fish stock, the two options are

Option A: $H_0^{\,A} = H_1^{A} = H_2^{\,A} = \cdots = F(X_0^{\,A})$, and

Option B: $H_0^{\,B} = 0,\ H_1^{\,B} = H_2^{\,B} = \cdots = F(X_1^{\,B})$,

where superscript denotes harvest option and subscript denotes harvest period. To compare the economic results of the two alternatives, the net economic result of each harvest period is discounted to the starting point, period 0. The fish price, p, is given at the world market whereas the unit cost of harvesting, c, depends on the stock size in the following way

$$c = c(X), \quad c'(X) < 0, \quad c''(X) > 0. \tag{4.6}$$

In other words, the unit cost of harvest, for example $ per kg, diminishes with increased stock level. The resource rent for each period of time is

$$\pi_t = (p - c(X_t))H_t, \quad t \in [0, \infty). \tag{4.7}$$

The two sets of resource rent we are going to compare are

$$\text{Option A}: \quad \pi_0^{\,A} = \pi_1^{\,A} = \ldots = \pi_\infty^{\,A} = \pi^{\,A}, \text{ and}$$
$$\text{Option B}: \quad \pi_0^{\,B} = 0,\ \pi_1^{\,B} = \ldots = \pi_\infty^{\,B} = \pi^{\,B}.$$

Note for option B the zero harvest and zero resource rent of the commencement period. Compared with option A, this will increase the stock level and the harvest potential for all subsequent periods. Now the question is: when is option B to be preferred to option A? To answer this let us try to derive a criterion, or rule, for when to invest in the stock. The analysis will conclude with the investment rule in (4.12).

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

The difference in resource rent between options B and A from and including period 1 is

(4.8) $$\Delta\pi = \pi_t^B - \pi_t^A = \pi^B - \pi^A, \quad t \in [1, \infty).$$

Recall that $\pi_0^A = \pi^A$, whereas $\pi_0^B = 0$. Assuming that the period length is one year, i designates the annual rate of discount. It is of course possible to use any period length as long as the interest rate i is adjusted accordingly. Nevertheless, we shall in this section think of one year as the period length. The present value of the future n-period resource rent differences is

(4.9) $$\Delta PV = \frac{\Delta\pi}{1+i} + \frac{\Delta\pi}{(1+i)^2} + \ldots + \frac{\Delta\pi}{(1+i)^n}.$$

Since a fish stock has the potential of living eternally we need the infinite horizon equivalent of (4.9). This is easily derived by letting n approach ∞ in formula (4.9), thus the right-hand side changes to an infinite horizon geometric series. According to the formula for an infinite geometric series, we have $a + ak + ak^2 + \ldots\ldots + ak^{n-1} = a/(1 - k)$, when $k < 1$ and $n \to \infty$ (see, for example, Berck and Sydsæter, 1991). Defining

$$a = \Delta\pi/(1+i)$$

and

$$k = 1/(1 + i)$$

we derive

(4.10) $$\Delta PV = \frac{\Delta\pi}{i}.$$

(the student should check that this is correct). We have now found, in (4.10), that by not harvesting during the starting period, thus investing the value π_0^A in the stock, the additional present value of future harvests equals the additional annual value divided by the annual rate of discount. The important question now is: is this a profitable investment for the resource owner? According to the standard investment criterion, the investment is profitable if there is a positive difference between present value of future profit due to the investment and the initial investment. Therefore, in our case the investment is profitable if

(4.11) $$\frac{\Delta\pi}{i} - \pi^A > 0.$$

Rearranging (4.11), we derive the following investment rule:

Invest in the fish stock if

(4.12) $$\frac{\Delta\pi}{\pi^A} > i.$$

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

This investment rule says that the resource owner should invest in the stock as long as the relative profitability of the fish stock capital is greater than that of alternative investments expressed by the annual rate of discount, *i*. This result also implies that the optimal stock level is established when the left-hand side expression of (4.12) equals the annual rate of discount. Thus, the long-run optimal stock level may be found from the formula

$$\frac{\Delta\pi}{\pi^{A}} = i. \tag{4.13}$$

At the optimum the relative profitability of the fishery, based on the notion of resource rent, should equal the annual rate of discount. Further investment in the resource will reduce the unit cost of harvesting, according to (4.6). However, sustainable yield and revenue will become relatively smaller and smaller due to the shape of the growth function, $F(X)$ (see figure 2.1). The resource rent on the left-hand side of (4.13) consists of both revenue and cost elements, which may vary differently with a change in the fish stock according to whether the stock level is lower or higher than the *MSY* level. The different elements of the resource rent and the effects of changes in the discount rate warrant further investigations.



Click on the ad to read more
Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

4.3 Long-run optimal stock levels

For the discrete time analysis in section 4.2 the interest rate i was used, measuring the rate of interest per year. In section 4.1 the instantaneous rate of interest, δ, was explained and compared with the discrete time rate of interest i. The former measures compound interest, that is, interest on the accrued interest as well as on the principal, on a continuous time basis. To see the implications for the long-run optimal stock level of the interest rate, fish price, density dependent harvest cost and natural growth, we shall now use continuous time to analyse the investment issue. Instead of asking how much harvest to postpone from one period of time to the next, for example, from one year to the next, we ask how much should possibly be postponed from one moment in time to the next moment, marginally later than the first.

We shall now assume that the management objective of the resource owner is to maximise his wealth. This is somewhat different from maximising resource rent (which was discussed in section 3.2). Resource rent is a flow concept, denoted for example by \$/year, whereas wealth is a stock concept, denoted for example by \$. Economic flows are related to time periods, for example periods of one year, whereas wealth is related to a specific point in time, for instance 1 January in a particular year. (Note that stock in this connection means a capital stock in general and not a fish stock.) There is, however, a clear link between flows and stocks, since wealth is the present value of the net revenue for all successive periods. To see this more clearly, let $A(t)$ denote the net revenue per period of time at time t, δ the rate of discount, and V the wealth of the resource owner. Recalling formula (4.2), the wealth is

$$V = \int_0^\infty A(t)\, e^{-\delta t}\, dt \,. \tag{4.2'}$$

As noted above, the resource manager has a choice among various income streams. In making this choice the manager is basically determining an investment strategy. In a perfectly certain world, which is the kind of world we are considering, the investment decision will be affected by the opportunity cost of capital, expressed by the discount rate δ, and the ecological and economic characteristics of the fishery. A necessary condition for maximising the resource owner's wealth, expressed in (*), is that he includes the opportunity cost of capital when considering what long-run level of the fish stock he shall aim at. (This opportunity cost of capital was deliberately excluded when we discussed the MEY management objective in section 3.2.)

We shall see that the long-run optimal stock level is implicitly given by equation (4.18) and that this may be presented graphically as in figure 4.2. We shall see that equation (4.19), called the Clark-Munro rule, is the continuous time equivalent to the discrete time investment rule of equation (4.13).

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Recall equation (4.13), which implicitly yields the discrete time long-run optimal stock level, and think of how it may look when we use continuous time and very small changes in the variables. As noted above, at any point in time the resource manager has the choice between depleting, rebuilding and equilibrium harvesting of the fish stock. In all three cases harvesting may be possible, but of a different magnitude. Harvesting a quantity H at any point in time creates revenues for and imposes costs on the industry. Current resource rent per unit harvest depends on the price of fish and the cost of harvesting. As in the previous analysis we shall assume a constant price of fish, p, independent of the level of harvest, and a unit cost of harvest, $c(X)$, that depends on the stock level only (see equation 4.6). Investing the proceeds at the instantaneous rate of discount, δ, implies that the sustainable interest from this harvest equals

$$R(H;X) = \delta(p - c(X))H \ . \tag{4.14}$$

Thus, the proceeds from the fishery, $(p\text{-}c(X))H$, becomes the principal of the resource owner's financial investment. Equation (4.14) expresses the sustainable net income per period of time from an instantaneous harvest H that has been converted into a perpetual investment. Note that on the left-hand side of (4.14), X is placed after the semicolon. This means that X is kept constant – thus H is the independent variable in this case.

The sustainable interest is altered by a marginal change in the instantaneous harvest and is found from equation (4.14) by taking the derivative of R with respect to H.

$$\frac{dR}{dH} = \delta(p - c(X)) \ . \tag{4.15}$$


This marginal sustainable interest is the marginal opportunity cost of resource capital, emanating from an incremental investment in the stock since the alternative to harvesting H is to leave it in the sea as an investment in the stock. Figure 4.2 panel (b) shows dR/dH as the upward sloping curve, equal to zero at the open access stock level. The open access stock level generates zero resource rent and we see from (4.14) that this is the case when $p = c(X_\infty)$; recalling that X_∞ is the open-access equilibrium stock level. If the current harvest generates zero rent there is no surplus to invest and sustainable interest on this zero value "investment" will of course also be zero. The unit cost of harvesting is lower the higher the stock level – thus the unit resource rent, $(p\text{-}c(X))$, is higher the higher the stock level. Harvesting H now with the objective of investing the proceeds in the bank means that the initial bank deposit, the principal, is higher the higher the stock level at the moment of harvesting. With a constant rate of interest, δ, this means that the marginal sustainable interest, expressed by dR/dH in equation (4.15), portrays an upward sloping curve in figure 4.2 panel (b).

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

The alternative to current harvest (option A) is to leave the fish in the sea (option B), which is to invest in the stock with the purpose of harvesting at a later point in time. Such an investment may augment the natural growth of the stock and decrease the unit cost of harvesting to yield a future net gain from these two effects combined. Sustainable harvesting is when the natural growth is being harvested, that is $H \equiv F(X)$. In this case the sustainable resource rent at stock level X is

$$\pi(X) = (p - c(X))F(X), \quad \text{when } H \equiv F(X), \tag{4.16}$$

where we have substituted natural growth, $F(X)$, for harvest, H. Recall that $H \equiv F(X)$ is by definition the equilibrium harvest, also called sustainable harvest, for a given level of the fish stock, X. The sustainable resource rent, $\pi(X)$, is portrayed in figure 4.2 panel (a). This rent has its maximum for stock level X_{MEY}, or to put it the other way around, the stock level that gives maximum economic yield is called the maximum economic yield level, X_{MEY}.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com




Figure 4.2. Graphical determination of the long-run optimal stock level X^* (panel (b) adapted from Clark, 1990).

Future gain comes via two components, lowering the unit cost of harvesting and possibly increasing the sustainable yield. Let us have a closer look at these two components by taking the derivative of equation (4.16) with respect to X, arriving at

$$\frac{d\pi}{dX} = (p - c(X))F'(X) - c'(X)F(X). \tag{4.17}$$

This is the marginal sustainable resource rent, portrayed in figure 4.2 panel (b) as the downward sloping curve. This may be interpreted as the "revenue" side of the investment budget – the net revenue resulting from a marginal investment in the fish stock. It is not obvious from equation (4.17) why $d\pi / dX$ is downward sloping. However, note that $d\pi / dX$ is the slope of the sustainable resource rent $\pi(X)$, defined in equation (4.16) and depicted in figure 4.2 panel (a). This panel shows that the slope of the $\pi(X)$-curve, the marginal sustainable resource rent, is positive but decreasing with increasing stock level between the open-access level, X_∞ and the maximum economic yield level, X_{MEY}. Therefore, investing one tonne of fish in the stock, that is, to increase the stock level by one tonne, gives a higher economic return for stock levels closer to X_∞ than close to X_{MEY}.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

The marginal sustainable resource rent consists of two terms (on the right-hand side of equation 4.17). The first term is the instantaneous marginal product of the stock, $F'(X)$, evaluated at the net price, or resource rent per unit of harvest, $[p - c(X)]$. This term expresses the partial net gain for the fishery due to a change in the sustainable yield from a marginal increase in the stock level. Recall that $F'(X)$ may be positive or negative, for stock levels below or above, respectively, the *MSY* level (see equation 2.1). The second term of the right hand side of (4.17) is related to the cost saving effect of increasing the stock level. Note that this is always positive due to the minus sign and the negative value of $c'(X)$ (see equation 4.6).

From an investment point of view there has to be a balance between the profitability of investing (proceeds from the harvest) in the bank and abstaining from harvesting to invest in "fish in the sea" (to increase the fish stock level). Thus, the marginal profitability of these two types of investment has to be equal to ensure a balanced portfolio. Equating equation (4.15) and (4.17) gives

$$(p - c(X^*))F'(X^*) - c'(X^*)F(X^*) = \delta(p - c(X^*)) . \tag{4.18}$$

where X^* denotes the long-run optimal stock level, implicitly given by this equation. In our case equation (4.18) has a unique solution for $X = X^*$, the optimal equilibrium stock level, shown in figure 4.2. We have discussed above the economic significance of each of the two sides of equation (4.18). It is easy to see from figure 4.2 that an increase in the discount rate, δ, will reduce the optimal stock level. Such an increase will turn the upward sloping curve anti-clockwise around X_∞, thus moving the intersection point towards the left. Increased δ means that the opportunity cost of investments rises, making it more costly to keep a large capital stock, the fish stock, in the sea. If δ goes towards infinity, which implicitly is to say that the manager sets a zero value on future revenues, the optimal stock level goes towards the open-access level X_∞. This is precisely what fishers in an open-access fishery are confronted with. For each fisher the opportunity cost of investing in the stock by abstaining from harvest is infinitely high. What Peter possibly saves in the sea for his future use will be harvested by his competitors, including Paul and Mary, to yield zero return on his savings. This is why Peter, and each of the other fishers, is forced by the open-access regime to behave in a myopic way to catch as much as possible at any point in time.

Having discussed the effect of an infinitely high discount rate we now turn to the other extreme, a discount rate equal to zero. Figure 4.2 panel (b) shows that the upward sloping curve, showing the marginal sustainable opportunity cost of investment, will turn clockwise around X_∞ when δ decreases. This moves the optimal stock level X^* towards the maximum economic yield level, X_{MEY}. Thus if future revenues are not discounted relative to current revenue, which is the meaning of $\delta \rightarrow 0$, the capital theoretic approach to management reduces to that of maximising the resource rent. In this case a sacrifice of current harvest for future gains causes less "pain" since future gains last forever without being discounted. One $ next year, or in 20 years, is just as good as one $ today.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Our analysis of the effect of discounting on the long-run optimal stock level is a simplified approach to capital-theoretic analysis of fisheries management. The development around 1970 of the mathematical tool of optimal control theory, an extension of the standard calculus of variations, made it possible to analyse dynamic economic issues in a more thorough way than had previously been done. Control theory was applied to analysis of economic growth, capital investment, natural resource management and other issues that included evaluation of income across time. Several studies of capital theoretic analysis of fisheries appeared in the early 1970s (for a review, see for example, Munro and Scott, 1985). In 1975 two Canadian researchers, a mathematician, Colin W. Clark, and an economist, Gordon R. Munro, published one of the most quoted fisheries economics papers ever (Clark and Munro, 1975) which led to the investment rule in equation (4.19). Note that if we divide with the resource rent per unit of harvest, $[p - c(X)]$, on both sides of equation (4.18) we arrive at

$$F'(X^*) - \frac{c'(X^*)F(X^*)}{p - c(X^*)} = \delta. \tag{4.19}$$



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Equation (4.19) is the continuous time equivalent to the discrete time equation (4.13) for computation of the long-run optimal fish stock level in steady state. The left-hand side of (4.19) is the fish stock's own rate of interest, and this equals the social rate of discount (which may or may not be equal to the market rate of interest) on the right-hand side. The stock's own rate of interest consists of two parts, first, the instantaneous marginal product of the resource, $F'(X)$, which can be positive, negative or zero. Second, it includes what has been termed the marginal stock effect, $-c'(X)F(X)/(p - c(X))$, which is always positive since $c'(X)$ is negative. The marginal stock effect has a positive effect on the optimal long-run stock size. If the unit cost of harvesting, $c(X)$, is high this implies a higher optimal stock level. The same result applies if the absolute value of the marginal unit cost of harvesting, $|c'(X)|$, is large. In some cases it may be that the marginal stock effect is great enough to imply an optimal stock level high enough to have $F'(X) < 0$ (see equation 4.19). This means that the optimal stock level may be above the maximum sustainable yield level, despite the use of discounting. It is also seen from equation (4.19) that if the unit cost of harvest is completely insensitive to stock changes, that is $c'(X) = 0$, the Clark-Munro rule reduces to the simple marginal-productivity rule $F'(X) = \delta$. In this special case the fish stock's instantaneous marginal productivity equals the marginal opportunity cost of capital, the social rate of discount, δ. Theoretical reasoning and empirical work have shown that the marginal stock effect is weak for schooling pelagic species, often fished with purse seine, and stronger for demersal species, often fished with bottom trawl or gill-net. Herring (*Clupea sp.*) and Anchoveta are examples of the former, and cod (*Gadus morhua*) and orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) are examples of the latter.

4.4 Transition to long-run optimum

We have seen that the long-run optimal stock level can be derived from equation (4.18), which is equivalent to the Clark-Munro rule in (4.19), and that this can be depicted graphically as in figure 4.2. The analysis started by comparing two investment alternatives, option A, with immediate equilibrium harvest and investment of the net proceeds in the "bank", versus option B, with no harvest during the initial period, but with equilibrium harvest from including the next period. Thus in option B the natural growth of the initial period is invested in the stock to harvest more later, whereas in option A the net proceeds of the initial period harvest are invested in the "bank" to yield future interest. To simplify the analysis we have in this approach discussed two outliers, the all (option B) or nothing (option A) fish stock investment of the initial period. However, in actual management situations there are at any point in time a wide range of possible exploitation intensities, from zero harvest, which implies investing the total natural growth in the stock, via some harvest or equilibrium harvest to different degrees of over-exploitation. The latter implies running down the fish stock. In a complete theoretical analysis there is usually a connection between the long-run optimum and the optimal path towards equilibrium. Nevertheless, for practical and pedagogical reasons we have discussed these two issues separately, as if the optimal long-run stock level implicitly is given by equation (4.18).

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Figure 4.3 shows two possible recovery strategies in case of an overfished stock, that is, when the initial stock level is below the optimal level. Path (i) is the non-fishing adjustment path, also called the bang-bang approach to fisheries adjustment. In this case the fishery is totally closed down (panel b) and the stock recovers at its maximum speed (panel a), limited by its natural rate of growth, until time t_1 when the optimal stock level is reached. From time t_1, long run optimal harvesting, H^*, takes place at stock level X^*. The gradual adjustment path, path (ii) in Figure 4.3, which allows some harvesting during the stock recovery period, goes on until time t_2, with the implication that it takes somewhat longer for the stock to reach its optimal equilibrium level.




Figure 4.3. Strategy (ii) implies some fishing during the transition period and a slower rebuilding of the stock than strategy (i), which is the bang-bang strategy with complete closure of the fishery for some time.

In figure 4.3 the difference between strategy (i) and (ii), with respect to harvest and stock recovery, is found during the adjustment period up to t_2. However, from t_2 to infinity the long-run optimal harvesting takes place regardless of the transition period strategy. Therefore, for an evaluation of the costs and gains of the alternative rebuilding strategies, it suffices to compare performances of the transition period, that is, until t_2. Strategy (ii) gives the highest catch in the first part of the period up to t_1, during which strategy (i) demands total close down of the fishery. In the second part of the transition period, between t_1 and t_2, strategy (i) gives the highest catch, equal to the long run optimum, H^*. If the price of fish is constant, regardless of quantity harvested, and the unit cost of harvesting depends on stock level only, as given in (4.6), the bang-bang strategy is superior to any other strategy (see Clark and Munro, 1975). This implies that any strategy postponing the moment for equilibrium harvesting beyond t_1, for example, to t_2, is an inferior solution. The present value of resource rent from harvesting will be highest with the bang-bang strategy, given the two crucial assumptions regarding price of fish and unit cost of harvesting. The reason for this is that there are no price and unit cost penalties from reduction of harvest and effort, neither from the market in the form of forgone opportunities for gaining a higher price with smaller harvest, nor from any effort-dependent unit cost of harvesting. (The case of price and cost characteristics that may lead to more gradual transition paths than the bang-bang path is discussed below.)

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

So far we have discussed transition as if path (ii) in figure 4.3 is the only alternative to the bang-bang path (i). However, this is just for illustrative purposes. In empirical work and actual management it could be that several alternative paths are closer to optimum than the bang-bang path. In figure 4.3 panel (b), path (ii) depicts a gradual increase in harvest during the transition period, from H_0 at the commencement of the transition to the equilibrium harvest, H^*, at the end. Alternatively we may for instance start with a catch somewhat larger than H_0 and keep this constant until the optimal equilibrium stock level is reached. Another alternative is to start with a harvest somewhat lower than H_0 and stay below harvest path (ii) throughout the transition period. This implies that the stock will grow faster than shown for stock path (ii) of figure 4.3 panel (a), and t_2 will be moved to the left to shorten the time necessary to rebuild the stock to the optimal level X^*.

If the price of fish varies with harvest, as is the case with a downward sloping demand curve, this may have an effect on the optimal transitional fishery. In this case the optimal path is usually a more gradual transition to the long-run equilibrium in order to benefit from the high price-low quantity combination. Thus, the bang-bang solution with complete closure of the fishery during the transition period is no longer optimal. The reason for this is that the positive economic effects of a small harvest at a higher average price throughout the transitional period will be beneficial compared with the negative effect from delaying the moment of time we reach a fully restored fishery. Related to figure 4.3, this means that the point in time when the optimal equilibrium stock level and harvest are reached, $t_{1,}$ is postponed somewhat, for example to t_2.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

If harvest costs are different from what we assumed above (see equation 4.6), this also may imply an optimal transition path different from the bang-bang approach (i), towards a more gradual transition path illustrated by (ii) in figure 4.3. For instance, if the unit cost of harvesting depends not only on the stock level, but also on effort or on harvest level, this may switch the optimal transition path from bang-bang to more gradual stock recovery. The existence of some high-liners, that is, fishers who are significantly more cost-effective than the average, could be an argument for letting this type of effort continue harvesting during the rebuilding of the fish stock. In other words, if effort is heterogeneous it may be an advantage for the realisation of resource rent, in present value terms, to operate a minor fishery with the most cost-effective effort rather than closing down the fishery during the transition period. (We shall return to the issue of high-liners and intra-marginal rent in chapter 7).

4.5 Adjusted transition paths

We have seen above that economically over-fished stocks need reduction or complete cession of harvesting to recover and grow to the optimal level. Temporary reduction in harvest also requires a reduction in fishing effort. Since effort is composed of, or produced from, labour, variable inputs like fuel, bait and gear, as well as vessel capital, the reduction of effort will have repercussions on the labour market and the markets for other inputs. The consequences of these changes are most severe in areas dependent on fishing with few alternative employment opportunities. The same applies to the negative effects of reduced quantities of fish as raw materials for the fish processing and marketing industries, often called the post-harvesting sector. For owners and employees of this sector there may be both economic and social costs incurred because of fluctuations in landings of fish, in particular when landings are reduced. Therefore, rebuilding of fish stocks is not possible without temporary negative effects on employment, the vessel service industry and the post-harvest industry. However, the short- and medium-term costs of industries and society should be outweighed by future gains from higher stock levels, otherwise fish stock investment is futile.

The objectives of actual fisheries management often include elements other than resource rent or net revenue of the industry. For example, such objectives are included in the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, adopted in 1995 by the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO), shown in Box 4.1.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Box 4.1 FAO Management Objectives

Recognising that long-term sustainable use of fisheries resources is the overriding objective of conservation and management, States and subregional or regional fisheries management organisations and arrangements should, inter alia, adopt appropriate measures, based on the best scientific evidence available, which are designed to maintain or restore stocks at levels capable of producing maximum sustainable yield, as qualified by relevant environmental and economic factors, including the special requirements of developing countries.

Such measures should provide inter alia that:

a. *excess fishing capacity is avoided and exploitation of the stocks remains economically viable;*
b. *the economic conditions under which fishing industries operate promote responsible fisheries;*
c. *the interests of fishers, including those engaged in subsistence, small-scale and artisanal fisheries, are taken into account;*
d. *biodiversity of aquatic habitats and ecosystems is conserved and endangered species are protected;*
e. *depleted stocks are allowed to recover or, where appropriate, are actively restored;*
f. *adverse environmental impacts on the resources from human activities are assessed and, where appropriate, corrected; and*
g. *pollution, waste, discards, catch by lost or abandoned gear, catch of non-target species, both fish and non-fish species, and impacts on associated or dependent species are minimised, through measures including, to the extent practicable, the development and use of selective, environmentally safe and cost-effective fishing gear and techniques.*

States should assess the impacts of environmental factors on target stocks and species belonging to the same ecosystem or associated with or dependent upon the target stocks, and assess the relationship among the populations in the ecosystem.

FAO (1995), pp. 9–10.

The Code, which is voluntary, was developed by FAO and its member countries as a response to the economic and ecological failure of several fisheries worldwide. Certain parts of it are based on relevant rules of international law, including those reflected in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982. From an economic point of view the main objective of "…*maximum sustainable yield, as qualified by relevant environmental and economic factors*…" is a little bit strange. However, instead of further interpretation of this agreed FAO text, let us anticipate that the manager, on his own or together with the industry and other stakeholders, does the thinking, specifies the management objective(s) and in the end arrives at a long-run target level for the fish stock. Let us call this level the target stock level, with the corresponding target harvest and effort level as well.[9] The target stock level may be above, equal to or below the optimal stock level discussed above.

The transition costs and benefits depend on the objectives of policy makers (for example, economic, biological, social, and administrative) and on the characteristics of the instruments (technical measures, input and output controls) that are used to achieve their objectives. The objectives pursued by fishery managers, and the management measures that are used to achieve these objectives will thus play an important role in determining the costs and benefits incurred in a transition to targeted fisheries.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Taking the development of the stock towards a long-run target as a guiding principle, it is possible to evaluate the benefits and costs associated with this transition. If a stock is not realising its production potential because it is too small, then harvest opportunities are being forgone. Potential harvest that could be generated by the stock is not being realised, due to its depleted state. Figure 4.4 provides a stylised illustration of the adjusted transition path. Panel (a) shows the harvests from the fish stock, panel (b) shows the effort levels associated with harvesting the stock over time and panel (c) shows the change in the stock level over time. In comparison with a fishery being managed at its target levels, time t_0 is characterised by lower harvest, higher effort and smaller stock size. If the stock were given a chance to rebuild, a larger harvest with lower level of effort could be realised. The line CB in panel (a) shows harvest forgone due to the depleted state of the stock.

LIGS University
based in Hawaii, USA
is currently enrolling in the Interactive Online BBA, MBA, MSc, DBA and PhD programs:
- enroll by October 31st, 2014 and
- save up to 11% on the tuition!
- pay in 10 installments / 2 years
- Interactive Online education
- visit www.ligsuniversity.com to find out more!

Note: LIGS University is not accredited by any nationally recognized accrediting agency listed by the US Secretary of Education.
More info here.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com




Figure 4.4. Stylised adjusted targets and transition paths for stock level, effort and harvest of a fishery.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Figure 4.4 also illustrates the principle of the transition period's pains discussed above. If managers enact remedial measures to allow fish stocks to rebuild, then harvest and effort need to be reduced during the transition period. Instead of continuing to harvest AB in panel (a), harvest needs to be reduced to DE. Figure 4.4 panel (b) illustrates the reduction in effort that is required. Effort needs to fall below that associated with the long-run target if the stock is to rebuild.

The movement over time from t_1 to t_2 illustrates the final stage of the transition process. As the size of the fish stock increases towards the target level, harvest can increase. Due to the increased abundance of fish, the effort required to harvest this level of yield would be relatively lower than that before the transition period started. A recovered fishery is characterised by relatively higher catch, larger stock and lower effort.

The benefits and costs of a transition to targeted fisheries also depend on the resource's biological characteristics. In the case of short-lived species, stocks that have been overfished may rebound to target levels in a relatively short period of time. In the case of species with low fertility or that grow slowly, recovery may take a significant amount of time, in which case the benefits associated with the transition will only be incurred in the more distant future. Indeed it is possible that the discounted costs could outweigh the benefits.

Exercise 4.1

Two fisheries, A and B, generate annual sustainable resource rent Π^1 (million €) as shown in the table. By closing the fishery completely for one year the stock is allowed to recover somewhat and the annual sustainable resource rent increases to Π^2.

	A	B
Π^1	11.00	0.90
Π^2	11.50	1.05

Table 4.1

1. Would you as the manager recommend this one-year closure of the fishery when the social rate of discount, at an annual basis, is 7%?
2. What size of the discount rate could make it worthwhile to close both fisheries for one year?

Exercise 4.2

1. Show that the present value, *PV*, of an eternal constant annual flow of income, *A*, equals $PV = \int_0^{\infty} A\, e^{-\delta t}\, dt = \frac{A}{\delta}$.
2. A resource economic investment project gives eternal net revenue of 10 million USD per year. What is the net present value of this project when the annual discount rate is 5% or 10%?

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

5 The Gordon-Schaefer model

This chapter discusses the Gordon-Schaefer model for analysis of open-access and optimally managed fisheries. The main differences between this and the previous chapters are derived from the use here of a specific form of the natural growth function. This allows us to find exact expressions for equilibrium levels of the fish stock, effort, revenues, costs and resource rent.

5.1 The logistic growth model

Most fish stocks are such that natural growth is small for both high and low stock levels and largest for some intermediate level. The reasons for this are mainly density-dependent biological factors, such as individual growth and natural mortality. In the previous chapters we have used a bell-shaped graph for natural growth as a function of stock size. Now we are going to use the logistic growth function, which is a mathematical representation of biomass growth of an animal stock, and this depicts a symmetric bell-shaped natural growth curve.

Stock change per unit of time is

$$\frac{dX}{dt} = F(X) - H, \tag{5.1}$$

TURN TO THE EXPERTS FOR
SUBSCRIPTION CONSULTANCY

Subscrybe is one of the leading companies in Europe when it comes to innovation and business development within subscription businesses.

We innovate new subscription business models or improve existing ones. We do business reviews of existing subscription businesses and we develope acquisition and retention strategies.

Learn more at linkedin.com/company/subscrybe or contact
Managing Director Morten Suhr Hansen at mha@subscrybe.dk

SUBSCRYBE - to the future

Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

where *F(X)* is natural growth and *H* is catch. The Gordon-Schaefer model, named after the works of two Canadian researchers (economist H. Scott Gordon (1954) and biologist M. B. Schaefer (1957)), is based on the logistic type natural growth equation

$$F(X) = rX(1 - X/K) \tag{5.2}$$

Equation (5.2) was designed and discussed first by P.F. Verhulst (1838), and later re-discovered by R. Pearl (1925). Parameter *r* is the maximum relative growth rate, also called the intrinsic growth rate, and *K* is the carrying capacity, both parameters assumed to be fixed. The reader should verify that the relative natural growth is a linear function of the stock level and approaches its maximum, equal to *r*, when the stock level goes to zero, that is $F(X)/X$ approaches *r* when *X* approaches zero. Parameter *r* is mainly related to the actual species we are studying while *K* depends on mainly the natural environment of the stock, such as size and biological productivity of the habitat. Equation (5.2) is quadratic in *X* and for low stock levels the first part with the positive sign is dominating, whereas for higher levels the second part, with the negative sign, is dominating. Natural growth is usually positive, but may even be negative if the stock level for any reason is higher than *K*. However, negative natural growth can for obvious reasons not represent biological equilibrium, with $dX/dt = 0$ in (5.1), neither with nor without harvesting.

Natural growth has its maximum for a specific stock level that may be found by maximising $F(X)$ with respect to *X*. This stock level produces the maximum sustainable yield (MSY), and the student should verify that this equals

$$X_{MSY} = K/2. \tag{5.3}$$

Substituting X_{MSY} for *X* in equation (5.2) gives

$$MSY = F(X_{MSY}) = rK/4. \tag{5.4}$$

Thus the maximum sustainable yield equals a quarter of the product of the two parameters.

The Gordon-Schaefer model includes natural growth, according to the law of equation (5.2), and harvest according to

$$H = qEX \tag{5.5}$$

that we recall from chapter 2. This harvest function has the property of having catch per unit of effort proportional to the stock level, with the catchability parameter q as the proportional ratio. In Schaefer (1957) catch and effort data were used to estimate changes in fish stocks.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

We are now going to find the connection between harvest and effort at equilibrium for this model. Equilibrium harvesting means $dX/dt \equiv 0$ and $H \equiv F(X)$ in equation (5.1), and from (5.5) follows $X = H/qE$. Substituting this expression for X in (5.1) gives

$$H = \frac{rH}{qE}\left(1 - \frac{H}{qKE}\right). \tag{5.6}$$

Rearranging equation (5.6) somewhat gives

$$H = H(E) = qKE\left(1 - \frac{qE}{r}\right), \quad \text{when} \quad H \equiv F(X). \tag{5.7}$$

Comparing (5.7) and (5.2), we notice also that the former, the equilibrium harvest function, is a quadratic function. It is quadratic in the product qE, whereas the natural growth function (5.2) is quadratic in X. You may notice that the product qE has to be less than r to have a positive harvest, according to equation (5.7). If qE is kept at or above r the stock becomes extinct and this of course gives a zero equilibrium harvest. We are now going to use the equilibrium harvest function for an economic analysis of open access and optimally managed fisheries.

5.2 The open-access fishery

Let us now see if we can find the open-access effort and stock equilibrium levels expressed as functions of biological and economic parameters. This way we may analyse the equilibrium levels are affected by changes in parameter values.

When harvest is sold in a competitive market with several close substitutes, the quay price of fish, p, is hardly dependent on the quantity landed. Let us assume that p is constant. Price multiplied by quantity in (5.7) gives the total revenue

$$TR(E) = pH = pqKE\left(1 - \frac{qE}{r}\right). \tag{5.8}$$

The $TR(E)$ curve and the $H(E)$ curve are shown in Figure 5.1 panel (a) for $p > 1$. In this case the TR curve is above the H curve, but generally the graphical picture depends on the units of measurement for total revenue and harvest.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com




Figure 5.1. The sustainable harvest and revenue curves, as well as total cost, are shown in Panel (a), and the marginal and average revenue and cost curves of the Gordon-Schaefer model are shown in Panel (b).



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Total harvest costs increase with effort, and the simplest form is when the increase is proportional. With a constant unit cost of effort, a, total cost equals

$$TC(E) = aE. \tag{5.9}$$

The total cost is shown as a straight line in Figure 5.1 panel (a). In this case $MC(E) = AC(E) = a$, and this is shown in panel (b). We may use equation (5.8) to find the average and marginal revenue of effort. The average revenue equals

$$AR(E) = TR(E)/E = pqK\left(1 - \frac{qE}{r}\right). \tag{5.10}$$

The average revenue curve is a straight, downward sloping line as shown in Figure 5.1 panel (b). Its maximum is for E close to zero. In this case the equilibrium stock level will be close to its carrying capacity, implying the highest $AR(E)$. The average revenue approaches zero when effort E approaches r/q. If the fishing effort is kept sufficiently large, $E > r/q$, for a long time the stock becomes extinct. This is why $AR(E) = 0$ for such high effort levels.

Let us now find the open-access effort level for the Gordon-Schaefer model. We have seen in Ch. 3, equation (3.6) that at bioeconomic equilibrium under open-access $MC(E) = AR(E)$. With total cost given in (5.9) the open-access equilibrium level of effort can be found from $AR(E) = a$ combined with (5.10). This gives

$$E_\infty = \frac{r}{q}\left(1 - \frac{a}{pqK}\right). \tag{5.11}$$

Thus the open-access equilibrium level of fishing effort depends on both biological and economic parameters. It is proportional with the intrinsic growth rate r, increases with fish price and carrying capacity, and decreases with effort cost. In other words, fisheries based on biologically highly productive resources with large r and K, may sustain a large fishing effort under open-access. In addition, this may be spurred on by high fish price and low effort cost. Having found the open-access effort level in (5.11) the corresponding equilibrium harvest may be found by substituting E_∞ for E in equation (5.7).

After discussing the open-access fishing effort, let us now find the open-access equilibrium level of the fish stock. For this we will use the unit cost of harvesting and the resource rent per unit harvest. The unit cost of harvest follows by use of equations (5.5) and (5.9):

$$c(X) = \frac{TC(E)}{H} = \frac{aE}{qEX} = \frac{a}{qX}, \tag{5.12}$$

This demonstrates that the unit cost of harvest decreases with an increase in the stock size. We could say that a large stock has a cost-saving effect for the fishery.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

With constant price of fish the resource rent per unit harvest is

$$b(X) = p - \frac{a}{qX}. \tag{5.13}$$

At the open-access equilibrium the stock level X_∞ follows from $b(X_\infty) = 0$, and we have

$$X_\infty = \frac{a}{pq}. \tag{5.14}$$

We notice that in this model the open-access equilibrium stock level is a function of economic and harvest technical parameters only. No biological parameters appear in (5.14), but they do in (5.11) for the open-access effort level. It is the economic parameters, in addition to the catchability parameter, that put a downward limit on the stock level in open-access fisheries. The stock level will be small if fish is expensive and easy to catch at a low cost.

5.3 Economic optimal harvesting

We have seen in Chapter 3 that to maximise the resource rent, $\pi(E) = TR(E) - TC(E)$, of a fishery, it is necessary for marginal cost of effort to equal marginal revenue of effort, that is, $MC(E) = MR(E)$. This is also the case for the Gordon-Schaefer model and we shall use this condition to find, first, the effort level that maximises the resource rent, and, second, the corresponding stock level. From (5.8) we derive

$$MR(E) = \frac{dTR(E)}{dE} = pqK\left(1 - \frac{2qE}{r}\right). \tag{5.15}$$

The graphical picture of (5.15) is a straight, downward sloping line, as shown in figure 5.1 panel (b). Comparing this with the average revenue, $AR(E)$ in (5.10), we see that the $MR(E)$ curve is exactly twice as steep as the $AR(E)$ curve. Putting $MR(E)$ in (5.15) equal to $MC(E)$, which is a in this case, gives the following effort level

$$E_{MEY} = \frac{r}{2q}\left(1 - \frac{a}{pqK}\right). \tag{5.16}$$

The optimal effort level, which maximises the resource rent, depends on the economic, biological and harvest efficiency parameters. E_{MEY}, where the subscript acronym means maximum economic yield, is large in the case of low effort cost and high fish price fisheries, for a given resource and harvest efficiency. The rent maximising effort level in (5.16) compared with the open-access effort in (5.11) is

$$E_{MEY} = \tfrac{1}{2} E_\infty. \tag{5.17}$$

Thus in the Gordon-Schaefer model the resource rent maximising effort level is just half of the open-access level. This implies that the total effort cost at the rent maximising equilibrium is just half of the open-access cost, since cost per unit of effort is constant, equal to a.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

To find the resource rent maximising stock level, we commence by substituting for H from (5.5) into (5.7), which gives

$$qEX = qKE\left(1 - \frac{qE}{r}\right). \tag{5.18}$$


By substituting for E from (5.16) into (5.18) and rearranging somewhat gives

$$X_{MEY} = \frac{K}{2} + \frac{a}{2pq}. \tag{5.19}$$

Using the expressions found for X_{MSY} in (5.3) and X_{∞} in (5.14) we can rewrite (5.19) to get

$$X_{MEY} = X_{MSY} + \tfrac{1}{2} X_{\infty}. \tag{5.20}$$

The rent maximising stock level is always greater than the maximum sustainable yield stock level. In fact, we have to add half of the open-access stock level to the MSY- stock level to get the MEY level. This is due to the cost-saving effect of a large fish stock. We have seen above, in (5.14), that the open-access stock level is affected positively by the cost of effort-price of fish ratio. When this ratio is large, the MEY-stock level should also be large, to allow the cost-saving effect of the stock to compensate for the relatively large effort cost.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

We have seen that the total cost is lower at the MEY equilibrium than at open access. However, in general we cannot say if the total revenue is highest for the MEY or the open-access equilibrium, as seen in figure 5.1. In fact, this depends partly on the unit cost of effort, *a*. Figure 5.1 demonstrates that the total cost curve will have a moderate slope if *a* is small, implying higher total revenue for the MEY fishery than under open access. In this case, with inexpensive harvest cost, MEY management may bring a triple dividend-reduced total cost, increased total revenue and increased stock level.

So far we have conducted the economic analysis using fishing effort as the independent variable in figure 5.1 and in several equations in this chapter. An alternative approach is to use the stock level instead of fishing effort. This has some advantages when it comes to the capital theoretic discussion on the optimal stock size. In addition, it allows a direct comparison between the open-access effort and stock levels on the one hand, and the MEY levels for effort and stock on the other hand. Even if we use the stock level as the independent variable, it has to be controlled, directly or indirectly, through harvest. At equilibrium we have $H \equiv F(X)$, which means that harvest is kept equal to the natural growth to keep the stock level constant. Thus sustainable yield equals natural growth. Combining this with a constant price of fish, *p*, and the natural growth function in equation (5.2), the total revenue as a function of stock size is

$$TR(X) = prX\left(1-\frac{X}{K}\right), \quad \text{when} \quad H \equiv F(X). \tag{5.21}$$

Equation (5.21) shows that the difference between the natural growth curve and the total revenue curve is to be found in the price of fish. For $p > 1$ ($p < 1$) the total revenue curve will be above (below) the natural growth curve, which equals sustainable yield.

Total cost as a function of stock size is found by multiplying the unit cost of harvesting in equation (5.12) by the sustainable yield that we used for equation (5.21). This gives

$$TC(X) = \frac{a}{qX} rX\left(1-\frac{X}{K}\right) = \frac{ar}{q}\left(1-\frac{X}{K}\right), \quad \text{when} \quad H \equiv F(X). \tag{5.22}$$

Equation (5.22) depicts a straight, downward sloping total cost curve as a function of the stock, as shown in Figure 5.2. For each stock level, $TC(X)$ tells how much it costs to harvest the sustainable yield produced at this stock level. The downward sloping $TC(X)$ curve clearly demonstrates the cost-saving effect of increasing stock size.

We can now find the resource rent as a function of stock size, $R(X)$, based on the expression found above for total revenue and total cost. The resource rent is

$$\pi(X) = prX\left(1-\frac{X}{K}\right) - \frac{ar}{q}\left(1-\frac{X}{K}\right), \tag{5.23}$$

which may be rearranged, and by substituting for X_∞ from (5.14) we have (the student should check this):

$$\pi(X) = pr(X - X_\infty)\left(1-\frac{X}{K}\right), \quad \text{when} \quad H \equiv F(X). \tag{5.24}$$

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com




Figure 5.2. Total revenue, total cost and resource rent as functions of the stock.

We notice from equation (5.24) that the resource rent equals zero for $X = X_\infty$ and for $X = K$. Thus the open-access stock level is the lower bound and the carrying capacity is the upper bound on the stock size for a positive resource rent. The graph of the resource rent is presented in figure 5.2 together with the total revenue and total cost curves as functions of stock size. The open-access stock level, X_∞, may be below, equal to or above the maximum sustainable yield stock level, X_{MSY}, whereas the rent maximising stock level, X_{MEY}, is always above the MSY level. Figure 5.2 may be used to explain what happens to the stock level when economic parameters change. For example, if the unit cost of effort, a, decreases, the total cost curve's intersection point at the vertical axis moves downward, as seen from equation (5.22). This reduces the open access as well as the MEY stock level.

5.4 Discounting effects

In Chapter 4 we discussed the concepts of discounting and present value in relation to the capital approach to resource management. We derived, in equation (4.19), the Clark-Munroe rule that implicitly gives the optimal long-term stock level as a function of biological and economic parameters, including the discount rate. For the Gordon-Schaefer model presented in this chapter we have natural growth and cost functions that can be used to find the optimal long-run stock level. This stock level is needed to ensure the maximum present value of future resource rent, our wealth, as defined in (4.2'). To find the explicit expression for the optimal long-term stock level we commence by substituting for $F(X)$ from equation (5.2) and $c(X)$ from (5.12), in addition to $F'(X)$ and $c'(X)$, into equation (4.19). Then solve equation (4.19) with respect to X, to arrive at a quadratic equation in X (the student should check these steps). The positive solution of this quadratic equation is

$$X^* = \frac{K}{4}\left[\left(\frac{a}{pqK} + 1 - \frac{\delta}{r}\right) + \sqrt{\left(\frac{a}{pqK} + 1 - \frac{\delta}{r}\right)^2 + \frac{8a\delta}{pqKr}}\ \right]. \tag{5.25}$$

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

To simplify somewhat we substitute the following into (5.25): $z = X/K$, $z_\infty = X_\infty/K = a/pqK$ and $\gamma = \delta/r$, and find

$$z^* = \frac{1}{4}\left[1 + z_\infty - \gamma + \sqrt{(1 + z_\infty - \gamma)^2 + 8z_\infty\gamma}\right]. \tag{5.26}$$

z is the normalised stock size, implying stock levels between zero and one. z_∞ is the normalised open-access stock level, and γ is the ratio of capital growth to maximum stock growth. γ could be called the bioeconomic growth rate. If $\gamma > 1$ it means that "bank" capital yields a higher interest rate than "nature" capital, and the opposite for $\gamma < 1$. We notice in equation (5.26) that the optimal long-term stock level, on its normalised form, depends on just two variables, the normalised open-access stock level, z_∞, and the bioeconomic growth rate, γ. Table 5.1 shows how z^* varies with z_∞ and γ.

For zero discount rate the optimal stock level, according to equation (5.27), is $z^* = ½ + z_\infty/2$. Comparing this with the expression for X_{MEY} in equation (5.20) we infer that $X^* = X_{MEY}$ when $\gamma = \delta = 0$, since $z_{MSY} = ½$. Thus, when the discount rate goes to zero, the optimal long-term stock level goes to the resource rent maximising level. In fact, we have previously seen this through the graphical analysis in Figure 4.2. We also notice from equation (5.26) that the optimal stock level equals the MSY level only for zero effort cost and zero discounting. In this case $z^* = z_{MSY} = 1/2$, since $z_\infty = 0$ and $\gamma = 0$.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

z_∞	0	0.10	0.30	0.50	0.70	0.90
γ						
0	0.50	0.55	0.65	0.75	0.85	0.95
0.10	0.45	0.51	0.62	0.73	0.84	0.95
0.25	0.38	0.45	0.59	0.71	0.83	0.94
0.50	0.25	0.37	0.54	0.68	0.81	0.94
1.00	0	0.25	0.47	0.64	0.79	0.93
2.00	0	0.16	0.40	0.59	0.77	0.92
5.00	0	0.12	0.34	0.54	0.73	0.91
∞	0	0.10	0.30	0.50	0.70	0.90

Table 5.1. Optimal normalised stock level as a function of the open-access stock level, z_∞, and the bioeconomic growth rate, γ.

From Table 5.1 we see that if the bioeconomic growth rate goes to infinity, $\gamma = \delta / r \rightarrow \infty$, the optimal stock level equals the open-access level, since the values in the last row equal the z_∞-values in the head row. Generally, the optimal stock level decreases with the bioeconomic growth rate – that is, when we move down a given column in Table 5.1. Also notice that the effect of the discount rate on the optimal stock size is greater for low-cost fisheries than for high-cost fisheries. In Table 5.1 low-cost fisheries are found in the columns to the left, recalling that $z_\infty = a/pqK$. "Low-cost" in this connection could also mean high-valued and easy-to-catch since p and q appear in the denominator and a in the numerator of z_∞.

Table 5.1 demonstrates, in the column of $z_\infty = 0$, that, with costless harvesting, the stock owner may want to extinguish the stock when the bioeconomic growth rate is equal to or greater than one. When $\delta = r$ ($\gamma > 1$) the fish has higher value in the "bank", at a discount rate of δ, than in the sea, at a maximum growth rate of r. In this case, with zero harvest cost, the resource owner would want to transform his capital from "fish in the sea" to "money in the bank" to maximise his wealth. In actual fisheries, however, effort costs are not zero and harvest efficiency, expressed by q, is not infinitely high. Thus the analysis of the effects of an infinitely high discount rate may be seen mainly as a modelling exercise, and not as a prediction of what would happen if a natural resource is managed by a sole owner. On the other hand, if biological, economic and harvest technical conditions are such that open-access harvesting would imply extinction of the resource, transferring the resource to a sole owner would not necessarily be sufficient to save the resource from extinction.

Exercise 5.1.

A fish stock X has the following natural growth function

$$F(X) = rX\left(1 - \frac{X}{K}\right) \tag{1.1}$$

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Assume that *F(X)* is the annual natural growth when the size of the stock at the beginning of the year is X.

1. Draw the graph based on (1.1) when $r = 0.30$ and $K = 8000$. K is measured in thousand tonnes.
2. What unit of measure does r have? Discuss the biological parameters r and K using the graph in question 1.
3. Assume that no fishing takes place. What is the equilibrium size of the fish stock, according to equation (1.1)?
   We introduce the following harvest function

   (1.2) $$H(E,X) = qEX,$$

   where q is the catchability/availability parameter/coefficient and E is fishing effort.
4. Discuss the catchability parameter q.
   With harvest, H, change in the stock level per unit of time is

   (1.3) $$\dot{X} = F(X) - H(E,X)$$

5. Define equilibrium fishing, using function (1.3), and show that the equilibrium harvest, H, can be presented as a function of X. Compare this function with function (1.1). What characterises equilibrium fishing?
6. Find an expression for the stock level (X_{MSY}) that gives maximum sustainable yield H_{MSY} (Hint: $\frac{dH}{dX} = 0$ is a necessary condition).
7. What is the size of X_{MSY} and H_{MSY}, in thousand tonnes and thousand tonnes per year, respectively?
8. Assume that no fishing has taken place and the fish stock is at its pristine/virgin equilibrium. What is the size of the harvest in year 1 when fishing effort is $E = 100$, and $q = 0.001 \frac{1}{vessels \cdot year}$?
9. Explain why the harvest in year 1 (see question 8) is higher than the maximum sustainable harvest/yield you found in question 7.
10. Use equations (1.1), (1.2) and (1.3) to find the equilibrium harvest H as a function of effort E (Hint: from (1.2) follows $X=H/qE$).
11. What is the equilibrium harvest when fishing effort is kept constant at 100 vessels per year?
12. What is the equation for annual total revenue as a function of effort, *TR(E)*, (for equilibrium harvesting) when the price of fish is constant?

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

13. What is the expression for sustainable resource rent when total cost of the fishery is

$$(1.4) \quad TC(E) = aE$$

14. The economic parameters are p = 1.0 \$/kg and a = 1.0 million \$/(vessel×year). What is the size of the equilibrium fish stock in an Open Access fishery? What is the total harvest in this case, and how many vessels participate?
15. What are the optimal/*MEY* fishing effort and the corresponding stock level and harvest? What is the maximum annual resource rent (total and per vessel)?

Exercise 5.2

1. Show that for the Schaefer model the long-run optimal stock level X^* is as given in equation (5.26).
2. Use the parameters from a previous exercise and δ = 10% to find the value of X^*.
3. Compare X* to what you previously found for X_{oo} and X_{MEY} and discuss the differences.

This e-book
is made with
SetaPDF

SETASIGN

PDF components for PHP developers

www.setasign.com

Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Exercise 5.3

Assume that the function

$$F(X) = rX\left(1 - \frac{X}{K}\right)$$

describes the growth of the fish stock. X represents the stock biomass, K is the environmental carrying capacity and r is the intrinsic growth rate.

Further we assume that the harvest function is linear in effort (E) and stock level.

$$H = qEX$$

where q s a constant catchability coefficient, and E is the total effort (measured in number of vessel year).

a) Show that the equilibrium harvest function will be:

$$H(E) = qKE\left(1 - \frac{qE}{r}\right)$$

b) Draw a picture of $H(E)$ for the values $r = 0.4$, $K = 8000$ (million tonnes) and $q = 0.001$.

c) Find the level of effort that gives maximum sustainable yield (E_{MSY}), and the sustainable yield for this level of effort (H_{MSY}).
Assume a constant price of fish (per unit of weight), p, and a constant cost per unit of effort, a.

d) Calculate the equilibrium effort and harvest in the case of open access (E_{∞} and H_{∞}), when the price and cost values are $p = 10$ and $a = 20$ (and the parameter values from b)).

e) Calculate the equilibrium effort and harvest in the case of optimal economically solution (E_{MEY}) and H_{MEY}) (with the same price, cost and parameter values).

f) Assume that the government introduces a fixed tax per unit of effort. Which value of this tax should be chosen to reach the optimal solution?

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

6 Fishing vessel economics

In this chapter we apply microeconomic theory to the operation of fish harvesting firms, including analysis of small-scale fishers' decision-making and the effects of share arrangements. Stock size and its availability for fishing are exogenous variables for each firm.

6.1 Optimal vessel effort

In the previous chapters we assumed that vessels are homogenous with respect to cost and catchability, implying that cost per unit of effort, *a*, is constant and equal for all vessels. The reason for this is the long-run perspective where it is reasonable to assume that adding homogenous vessels to the fleet can expand effort at a constant cost per unit effort. In actual fisheries vessels usually differ with respect to efficiency and costs. The latter is also the case for the opportunity cost of labour which may vary across geographical areas. For example, fishers living in a small coastal community far away from larger towns and cities usually have few alternative employment possibilities; thus the opportunity cost of labour will be lower in such a community than in larger labour markets. On the other hand, other inputs required for fishing may be more costly in small fishing communities than in towns, due to transportation cost and less competition between distributors. The price of fuel, for instance, seems to be higher in small, remote fishing communities than in larger towns. Thus, differences in efficiency of effort, market prices of inputs and opportunity cost of labour may all contribute to the existence of heterogeneous effort in the fish harvesting industry.

Before analysing the bioeconomic effects of heterogeneous effort (see chapter 7) we shall in this chapter study the **economic adaptation** of fishing vessels. This includes the **economic objectives** of fishing activities, the costs structure and the size and availability of the natural resource, the fish stock. The activity level of a vessel is measured by its fishing effort, and we reckon that any vessel's effort can be expressed by use of a standardised efficiency measure of fishing effort. The unit of measurement of effort at the vessel level, *e*, could be, for example, one hour of trawling in demersal trawl fisheries, one gill net day in coastal gill net fishing or 100 hooks in long line fisheries. Vessel effort, *e,* is in technical terms and it takes labour, fuel, gear etc. to produce effort. This may be expressed in the production function $e=f(v_1,v_2,....v_n)$ at the vessel level, where the *v*'s are the inputs. Recall the fishery wide effort function with total effort, *E*, in equation (2.2). Total effort is the aggregate of the effort of all vessels in a fishery. This production function has the same characteristics as we are used to in the theory of the firm in a microeconomic text. It may have one, two or *n* number of inputs and it may have constant returns to scale or variable returns to scale (see Varian, 2003).

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

We use the following symbols to analyse a vessel's economic adaptation of fishing effort

e = effort of one fishing vessel
$c(e)$ = total variable cost of effort
$avc(e)$ = average variable cost of effort
$mc(e)$ = marginal cost of vessel effort

Sometimes, subscripts i and j will be used to distinguish between or to compare two vessels. At this stage we disregard fixed cost, but shall return to this when discussing long-run issues in section 6.2.

Average variable cost of vessel effort equals total variable cost divided by effort:

$$avc = avc(e) = c(e)/e.$$

Marginal cost of vessel effort is the addition to total cost due to the addition of one unit to effort:

$$mc = mc(e) = d\ c(e)/d\ e.$$



Deloitte.

Discover the truth at www.deloitte.ca/careers

© Deloitte & Touche LLP and affiliated entities.

Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

If effort is measured in trawl hours, the average variable cost tells how many $ one hour of trawling on average costs, whereas marginal cost tells by how many $ total cost increases with the addition of one hour of trawling.

Each vessel can vary effort by varying the inputs needed for the generation of effort. For example, in the case of trawling, a vessel can vary its speed between harbour and fishing ground, allowing more or less time for proper harvest activities on the fishing ground. High speed to and from the fishing ground means more time for actual fishing. Since engine fuel consumption increases progressively with speed, this implies that also marginal cost of vessel effort increases with expansion of effort.

Recalling the theory of the firm, marginal cost may decline with output at low level, reaches a minimum, and rises thereafter, due to the form of the production function. In the case of fisheries we may think of effort as the (intermediate) product of the production process and that this (intermediate) product is produced by regular inputs according to a regular production function.

When the catch of a vessel is small in relation to the stock size, the vessel operator considers stock as constant in the short-run, not affected by the activity of the vessel. This also applies to the market price of fish – seen from a vessel operator's point of view, the market price is considered unaffected by the landings of each vessel. Even if there are effects on stock and market price from the total harvest of all vessels, the magnitude of this is an empirical question. However, for the analysis of a single vessel's adaptation we shall assume that there are no significant effects on stock level and market price. Thus, the vessel operator acts as if his fishing has no effect on the stock level or on the market price.

In a given period of time the vessel's catch is a function of its effort, which it can adapt, and the stock level, which is taken as given. For the case of simplicity, let us assume that the vessel harvest function equals the Schaefer harvest function:

(6.1) $$h(e;X) = qeX \ ,$$

where q is the catchability coefficient.

The operating profit of the vessel is

(6.2) $$\pi(e;X) = p \cdot h(e;X) - c(e)$$

Using (6.1) and (6.2) the operating profit is

(6.3) $$\pi(e;X) = p \cdot qeX - c(e)$$

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

We have included the stock level as an argument in functions (6.1) and (6.2), but after the semicolon of the functional symbols to stress that the stock level has an effect on harvest and that this is outside the control of the vessel operator. However, to simplify the notation, this has not been done for the fish price.

Assuming that the vessel operator maximises operating profit given in equation (6.3), the first order condition for this is

(6.4) $$\pi'(e;X) = pqX - mc(e) = 0$$

Equation (6.4) implies the following criterion for the vessel's adaptation of its effort

(6.5) $$mc(e) = pqX\,.$$

Equation (6.5) tells that the marginal cost of vessel effort shall equal the marginal revenue of effort. The latter equals the product of fish price, catchability coefficient and stock level, and this product is the revenue earned by the addition of one unit of effort. Note that in the traditional theory of production, or theory of the firm, the right-hand side of the equation, corresponding to (6.5), would include only p, whereas in this case both q and X are included in addition to the price. For a given set of p, q and X, the vessel's **optimal effort** is implicitly given by equation (6.5).

In studying the theory of production, we usually measure product along the horizontal axis whereas in this case we have used fishing effort as the fisher's decision variable. The reason for this is discussed above. An ordinary firm is considered to have control of its total production process, including all inputs needed and the costs of these. A fish-harvesting firm, however, does not have control of its most important input, the fish stock. This is definitely not an input like fuel and bait that can be bought in the input market. The fisher knows the cost per unit of effort, for instance, per trawl hour, and we anticipate that he also knows how the catch varies with stock level. Thus cost per unit of harvest will depend on both input costs and on the stock level and its catchability.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

The average variable cost and the marginal cost curves are shown in figure 6.1. Panel (a) of this figure shows that *avc* first declines, reaches its minimum for effort level e_∞, and rises thereafter. The *mc* curve first declines, reaches its minimum for an effort level lower than e_∞, and rises thereafter. When the *avc* curve attains its minimum, *mc* equals *avc*. We recognise the form of these cost curves from the theory of the firm, with the important difference that in this case effort is the variable along the horizontal axis, whereas the corresponding variable in the theory of the firm is the firm's quantity of output. We may regard vessel effort as an intermediate output of the fish-harvesting firm – an output produced by use of regular inputs. However, how much of the final output, fish catch, the effort produces depends on the stock size and its availability, in addition to the effort. Once we know how much catch is produced by effort, cost per unit of harvest can also be calculated. (In chapter 3.1 we introduced the cost per unit of effort, a, and in chapter 4.2 the unit cost of harvest was introduced.) The distinction between (average and marginal) cost per unit of effort on the one hand and cost per unit of harvest on the other hand is crucial for the understanding of fisheries economics.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com




Figure 6.1. Two fishing vessels: short-run adaptation of effort for given cost structure, price of fish, catchability and stock level.

Figure 6.1 shows graphically the adaptation of effort for two profit maximising vessels, vessel *i* and vessel *j*. Panel (a) of this figure shows the marginal revenue of effort, *pqX*, for two levels of the fish stock, namely X_∞ and X_1. The optimal effort of vessel *i* is e_i^∞ for stock level X_∞. This effort is according to the optimality criterion in equation (6.5), that is, marginal cost of effort equals marginal revenue of effort. In this case vessel *i* does not make any profit, but just breaks even, since the marginal revenue of effort, pqX_∞, equals average variable cost. If the stock level is lower than X_∞ it will be optimal for this vessel to stop fishing since marginal revenue will be below the minimum average cost. In this case, without any fixed cost, it is better for the vessel to be idle with zero revenue and zero cost, than to operate with a negative result. Vessel *i* is a marginal vessel for stock level X_∞ since just a small reduction in the stock level will force the vessel out of operation.

Figure 6.1 panel (b) shows that vessel *j* has its maximal profit for effort e_j^∞ at stock level X_∞, and that profit equals the area ABCD in this case. This profit is called producer's surplus or quasi-rent in the theory of the firm and intra-marginal rent in fisheries economic theory.[10] The latter refers to rent earned by those vessels that are more cost efficient than the marginal vessel. In figure 6.1 vessel *i* is a marginal vessel at stock level X_∞ whereas vessel *j* is intra-marginal at this level. Note that vessel *j* would be able to operate with a positive profit even at a stock level somewhat lower than X_∞.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

If the stock level is X_1, instead of X_∞, by chance or by active management of the fishery, figure 6.1 shows that the profit maximising effort will be e_i^1 and e_j^1, for vessel *i* and *j,* respectively. In this case the profit for each of these two vessels will equal the single-shaded areas of panel (a) and panel (b). In other words, higher stock level means higher marginal revenue of effort, thus encouraging each vessel to increase its effort. How much vessel effort increases depends on the steepness of the marginal cost curve. If this curve is very steep the optimal effort will hardly be expanded if stock level increases, as is the case at stock level X_1 for vessel *i* in figure 6.1 panel (a).

6.2 Vessel behaviour in the long run

Up to this point we have not been specific about short run versus long run. Like any firm, a fish harvester may have different criteria for its short-run and its long-run adaptation.[11] In the short run it suffices to cover operation cost whereas in the long run a harvester will have to cover his fixed cost as well. This is illustrated in figure 6.2, where marginal and average cost curves are based on the total cost $tc(e) = c(e) + k$, with $c(e)$ as variable cost and k as fixed cost. Marginal effort cost is *mc(e)*, average variable cost of effort is *avc*(*e*) and average total cost of effort is *atc*(*e*).




Figure 6.2. Short-run and long-run adaptation of fishing effort may vary due to fixed costs.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Note that the marginal cost of effort curve intersects from below the two average cost curves at their minimum points. For obvious reasons the average total cost curve lies above the average variable cost curve at any effort level. However, the difference between average total cost and average variable cost narrows when effort expands since this allows the fixed cost to be divided by more units of effort. In the short run a vessel may operate if marginal revenue of effort is above pqX_M, which is equal to the minimum of its average variable cost. For given values of p and q this implies that the stock level at least has to be above X_M for fishing operations to take place on a commercial basis. In figure 6.2 X_1 is greater than X_∞, which is greater than X_M. In the long run a vessel will also have to cover fixed costs, which implies that the stock level has to be at or above X_∞ for the vessel to be able to cover its capital cost. We have used subscript ∞ to indicate that this is the stock level at which the marginal vessel breaks even under an open-access fishing regime. The marginal vessel, producing effort e_∞, will be able to cover all its costs, including normal capital return, but without earning any above normal profit. However, if effective management measures have been taken and the stock level is kept at, for example, X_1, the vessel will earn the gross profit ABEF shown in figure 6.2. This gross profit includes the super profit DCEF. In this case the super profit is the vessel's share of the resource rent.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

The optimal vessel effort depends on the marginal revenue, denoted pqX in figure 6.2, and on the marginal cost of effort curve. For a constant price of fish and a constant catchability parameter this implies that the marginal cost curve represents the vessel's supply curve for fishing effort. If the product of price, catchability and stock level, pqX, increases, the vessel's optimal effort will increase. For example, if a gill-net vessel experiences higher marginal revenue of effort, it could increase its profit by increasing its use of variable inputs, such as fuel necessary to increase the speed between the harbour and the fishing ground. A vessel has greater flexibility in varying its effort the gentler the marginal cost curve. Traditionally, in many parts of the world, fishing vessels have been designed and manned to be flexible to adapt to changing markets and resources. This means, in the context of figure 6.2, a moderate sloping marginal cost of effort curve.

6.3 Quota price and optimal effort

We shall now analyse how the optimal vessel effort and harvest depend on the harvest quota price. In Chapter 3.4 we analysed the market price of effort quotas and harvest quotas by use of downward sloping demand curves. Having seen above how the marginal cost of effort becomes the vessel's supply curve for fishing effort, we shall now have a closer look at the relationship between this supply curve and the demand of effort and harvest quotas. In particular we shall see how the market price of fish, harvest costs, technological efficiency and stock level affect a fishing firm's demand for harvest quotas. Let us assume that fish harvesters can buy any amount of harvest quota at the price of m \$ per tonne. The quota price may be given either in a competitive market or as a harvest tax determined by a fishery manager. Disregarding uncertainty, a profit maximising firm will adapt fishing effort and harvest as discussed above, but with the additional constraint that it has to pay for its quota in proportion to its harvest.

To simplify the graphical analysis we assume a linear marginal cost of effort curve, shown in figure 6.3 panel (a).[12] Based on this we shall derive the downward sloping demand curve for harvest quota in panel (c). In figure 6.3 panel (a), fishing effort is measured horizontally and marginal cost of effort, average total cost of effort and marginal revenue of effort are measured vertically. Since the fishing firm has to pay for its harvest quota, its net price of fish is $p - m$, and it is this net price that matters for the vessel's adaptation of effort. If the landing price of fish is 2.00 €/kg and the market price of quota is 0.75 €/kg, the net price of fish for the vessel equals 1.25 €/kg. When harvest quotas are for free ($m = 0$), the optimal level of vessel effort, e^0, is formed, in figure 6.3 panel (a), where the marginal cost of effort curve intersects the horizontal marginal revenue line at level pqX. Note that pqX is assumed to be constant throughout this analysis, whereas we discussed effects of changes in the stock level in figures 6.1 and 6.2. Figure 6.3 panel (b) shows the optimal effort as a function of the harvest quota price, including e^0 for the zero harvest quota price. Panel (c) shows the vessel's demand for harvest quota as a function of quota price. This is derived from panel (b) using the harvest function $h = qeX$. Catch h follows in a straightforward way when e has been derived, since, by assumption, qX is constant.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com




Figure 6.3. A vessel's demand for harvest quota depends on its cost structure, price of fish, catchability and stock level.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

In the same way as the optimal effort and the harvest quota were derived for the zero quota price, they can be derived for any quota price, including m^*. As noted above, in this case it is the net price of fish, $p - m^*$, that matters for the fishing firm. The harvest quota price m_M is the maximum price the vessel portrayed in figure 6.3 can afford to pay without losing money in the long run. If the harvest quota price is greater than m_M, the horizontal marginal revenue line will be below the maximum of the average total cost of effort curve. Thus in such a case the optimal vessel strategy is to stop fishing to avoid losing money through a negative net profit. In the short run, however, a vessel with an effort cost structure similar to what is shown in figure 6.3 panel (a) can operate for a while and earn a positive gross profit even if the harvest quota price is greater than m_M.[13] The combination of positive gross profit and negative net profit is most likely to appear for vessels with high fixed costs. This would imply a greater difference between average total cost and average variable cost, and a gradual phasing out of bankrupt vessels not able to meet their log-run capital obligations. On the other hand, capital-intensive vessels may be more efficient than other vessels, thus compensating for higher fixed costs with lower variable costs. To predict what kind of vessels would be most competitive in a quota market, one would need empirical information about fishing firm and vessel costs.



Click on the ad to read more
Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

6.4 A small-scale fisher's choice of leisure time and income

We have seen above how a fish harvesting firm adapts effort to maximise profit. The effort supply curve is typically upward sloping, implying that a vessel is used more intensively the higher the marginal revenue of effort. However empirical studies of small-scale fisheries in some cases seem to contradict this result, showing that effort may even decrease with increased marginal revenue of effort. Sociologists and anthropologists have attributed this to fishers' and their families' social and economic needs, which may differ between different people (see e.g. Maurstad, 2000). In economics we recognise differences in individual preferences, in particular in the theory of the consumer. Some people prefer to buy more apples than pears and some prefer to work part time instead of full time. Let us now use and adapt the theory of consumer behaviour to analyse how a small-scale fisher may chose to allocate his total available time between fishing – to earn income to buy consumer goods – and leisure time. In other words this is to analyse the choice between income and leisure. Since income – or consumer goods – and leisure are alternative sources of utility, an indifference map may represent the fisher's preference pattern between them, for example, such as one of the two shown in figure 6.4.

The following symbols are used

x = quantity of consumer goods
P = consumer price index
T = time constraint (total hours available)
e = fishing effort, in hours of fishing
z = hours of leisure time
w = income per hour of fishing

The fisher's utility is a function of consumer goods and leisure time

(6.10) $$U = U(x, z) .$$

The time constraint of the fisher is

(6.11) $$T = e + z .$$

The fisher's budget constraint is

(6.12) $$wT = Px + wz ,$$

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

since wT is the maximum income he could earn if he spent all his available hours on fishing. This is distributed across leisure time, wz, and consumer goods, Px. Thus the actual income from fishing is $we = wT - wz$. The small scale fisherman wants to maximize his utility, we assume, by choosing x and z. This means we should find the maximum of the utility function (6.10) given the budget constraint (6.12). This can be done by one of two methods. First, by substituting for x from equation (6.12) into (6.10), which makes utility a function of only one variable, z, and maximizing utility with respect to this variable, leisure time. Second, we can use the Lagrange method (see Box 6.1). The two methods lead to the same result that the necessary condition for the fisher's optimal adaptation is

$$\frac{U_z}{w} = \frac{U_x}{P}, \tag{6.13}$$

where

$$U_x = \frac{\partial U(x,z)}{\partial x} \text{ and } U_z = \frac{\partial U(x,z)}{\partial z}.$$

Dear student, you should now do the calculations that lead to equation (6.13).

The interpretation of equation (6.13) is that the marginal value of one dollar from fishing should be the same whether spent on leisure time or on consumer goods. In other words, at the margin the fisher is indifferent between a small increase in consumer goods or in leisure time.

The budget constraint may be rewritten

$$z = T - (P/w)x \tag{6.14}$$

to see that it is only the real value of income per hour of fishing that counts for the fisher.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Box 6.1 Using the Lagrange method

This method uses an assisting function, which combines the function we are going to maximize (utility) and the constraining function (budget), and has got its name after the French mathematician and astronomer *Joseph Louis Lagrange (1736–1813)*.

Maximizing the utility, $U = U(x,z)$, subject to the linear constraint, $wT = Px + wz$, we start by introducing a helping hand, the Langrangian multiplier λ, and formulate the Langrangian function

$$L = U(x,z) - \lambda(Px + wz - wT).$$

Note that what is in the parenthesis following λ equals zero. Thus maximizing the L-function will give the same result as maximising the U-function, but now we can be sure that the budget constraint is fulfilled.

The Langrangian theorem states that an optimal choice of (*x,z*) must satisfy the following three equations, the first order conditions,

(B6.1) $$\frac{\partial L}{\partial x} = U_x - \lambda P = 0$$

(B6.2) $$\frac{\partial L}{\partial z} = U_z - \lambda w = 0$$

(B6.3) $$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \lambda} = Px + wz - wT = 0$$

Using the first two of these equations we arrive at the condition

$\frac{U_z}{w} = \frac{U_x}{P}$, which is the same as in equation (6.13).

The three equations (B6.1)–(B6.3) can be used to find the three unknown variables x, z and λ. However, to find explicit solutions we would have to specify the utility function. In microeconomic texts you may find several examples of utility functions, such as the Cobb-Douglas function and the linear function.





Figure 6.4 Two examples of the small-scale fisher's choice between consumer goods and leisure time.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Let us now analyse what happens to the fisherman's choice between leisure time and consumer goods if fishing conditions improve. The preference map in Figure 6.4 panel (a) is such that the fisherman would like to reduce his leisure time if real value of income per hour increases from $\frac{w_1}{P}$ to $\frac{w_2}{P}$, and further to $\frac{w_3}{P}$. This implies that he increases his fishing time and the consumption of goods. In this case the fisher's labour supply curve – measured by his fishing time – is upward sloping. Figure 6.4 panel (b) shows the preference map of a fisher who will increase his leisure time when real value of income per hour of fishing increases. This fisher will decrease time allocated to fishing if the real value of his hourly income increases, in other words, his supply curve for labour is downward sloping.

Figure 6.5 shows two possible supply curves for fishing effort for a small-scale fisher who allocates his time between leisure and fishing – the latter to earn income to buy consumer goods. Thus, based on this theory we cannot tell whether a small-scale fisher will increase or decrease his fishing effort when the real value of his hourly income increases. This real value of hourly income is the fisher's opportunity cost of effort. Note the difference between this inconclusive result regarding the slope of a small-scale fisher's effort supply curve and the fishing firm's upward sloping effort supply curve derived in the previous section. This difference may also have implications for the design of management tools. It is not certain that the same management instruments will work efficiently for both industrial (large-scale) fisheries and for small-scale fisheries.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com




Figure 6.5. The effort supply curve in small-scale fisheries may be backward or forward bending, depending on the fisher's preferences for leisure time and consumer goods.

Exercise 6.1

A fishing vessel has harvest function $h = qeX$ (with q and X exogeneously given), price of fish p, fixed cost k, variable cost $vc(e) = ce + ae^2$ and unit cost of harvest quota m.

1. What is the optimal effort, expressed as a function of other variables and parameters?
2. What is the optimal harvest, expressed as a function of other variables and parameters?
3. What is the harvest quota demand function (inverse; m as a function of h)?
4. Draw a picture of what you found in question 3 for the following parameter values:

Symbol	Value	Unit
p	3000	€/tonne
m	min: 0 max: 1000	€/tonne
c	60	€/hour
a	0.045	€/hour^2
k	259 200	€/year
q	1.2×10^{-6}	1/hour
X	10^5	tonne
vc	-	€/year
tc	-	€/year

5. Draw a picture of marginal revenue of effort ($(p - m)qX$), marginal cost, average variable cost and average total cost as functions of effort, using data from question 4. What is the optimal vessel effort for $m = 0$ and $m = 1000$? For what effort level does the average total cost have its minimum?

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Exercise 6.2

A fishing vessel has harvest function: $h = q\ e\ X$ (with q and X exogenously given). The vessel has the following total cost function:

$$tc(e) = \frac{1}{3}e^3 - 50e^2 + 2530e + 81000$$

a) Find the expression for: $mc(e)$, $avc(e)$ and $atc(e)$ (marginal cost, average variable cost and average total cost).

b) Assume that the marginal revenue (mr) of effort is

$mr = pqX = 2055$

What is the optimal effort?

c) Suppose that stock and/or price reductions give another mr:

i) $mr = 1255$

ii) $mr = 655$

What is the optimal effort in these cases?

d) Draw a picture.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

7 Extension of the basic bioeconomic model

This chapter demonstrates that even in an open-access fishery rent may be generated if vessels are heterogeneous. An empirical example from Vietnam is given. Further, we extend the bioeconomic model to include areal distribution and migration of fish, on the background that marine reserves are established in many countries. The analysis includes achievements with a reserve and open-access harvesting outside with respect to stock protection, sustainable harvest, employment and rent.

7.1 Intra-marginal rent for the most efficient vessels

In this section we will study some management issues related to a fishing fleet of heterogeneous vessels. In most fisheries vessels vary with respect to size, engine power, gear-type, costs and other technical and economic characteristics. In the preceding chapter we have seen examples of how the cost structure of vessels may differ. However, when, in Chapters 3 and 4, we discussed open-access and managed fisheries, this was done for homogeneous vessels. The reason for this is the wish to start with the simplest model that may provide insight in the economics of fishing. From this we learned that the potential resource rent is wasted in an open-access fishery, but that sole ownership or other management measures can mitigate this and create resource rent. Now, what are the results when there are technically and economically heterogeneous vessels?

Figure 7.1 shows for each of twelve vessels the standardised effort along the horizontal axis and the average cost per unit of standardised effort along the vertical axis. The vessels are arranged from the left to the right according to their cost efficiency, with vessel no. 1 as the most cost efficient one and vessel no. 12 as the least cost efficient. We may choose, for example, vessel no. 9 as the standard vessel against which the efforts of the others are measured. Since the width of each vessel bar in Figure 7.1 illustrates the standardised effort of each vessel, we notice that, for example, vessel no. 3 produces about twice as much effort as the standard vessel, no. 9. This implies that vessel no. 3 would catch twice as much fish per day as vessel no. 9, when effort is measured in hours or days of fishing of the standard vessel. Further, we notice in Figure 7.1 that the average cost per unit of standardised effort is lowest for vessel no. 1, even though this vessel no. 1 produces the same effort as the standard vessel no. 9.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com




Figure 7.1. The increasing marginal cost of effort curve for a fishery is based on heterogeneous vessels. The fishing effort of each vessel is measured by the width of the bar whereas the height of the bar measures cost per unit of effort.

With several vessels in a fishery, we may substitute the cost bars in Figure 7.1 with a curve enveloping the bars. This curve is called the $MC(E)$ curve and is shown in figure 7.2 panel (b). Note that we use the concept Marginal Cost of Effort, $MC(E)$, in a particular way, namely at the fishery level, describing the addition to total cost of adding one more unit of fishing effort to the fishery. This is somewhat different from the concept of marginal cost at the vessel level, discussed in the preceding chapter. The total cost of effort, $TC(E)$, in figure 7.2 panel (a) is derived from the $MC(E)$ curve. In this case the $TC(E)$ curve is increasing progressively, since the $MC(E)$ curve is upward sloping. The $TR(E)$ curve in Figure 7.2 panel (a) is the sustainable long run total revenue curve, recalled from previous chapters, and the corresponding average revenue, $AR(E)$, and marginal revenue, $MR(E)$, curves are shown in panel (b).

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com




Figure 7.2. Equilibrium fishing effort, resource rent and intra-marginal rent under open-access and under maximum economic yield management in the case of heterogeneous effort.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Open-access equilibrium is found where $MC(E) = AR(E)$, for effort level E_{∞}. Under open access, vessels will enter the fishery if the average revenue per unit effort is greater than the marginal cost of effort, and exit the fishery if revenue is less than cost. The equilibrium of the open-access fishery is demonstrated in figure 7.2 panel (b). For the effort level E_{∞} the total revenue equals the square $AGOE_{\infty}$ and the total cost equals the area below the $MC(E)$ curve, namely the quadrilateral $ADOE_{\infty}$. This implies that there is an economic surplus in the fishery, equivalent to the area AGD, since $AGOE_{\infty} > ADOE$. This surplus is called intra-marginal rent or producer's surplus.[14] This rent accrues to those vessels that have lower costs than the marginal vessels at E_{∞}. Note that in figure 7.2 panel (a) the intra-marginal rent is the line segment R. Thus in this case, with a progressively increasing $TC(E)$ curve, the equilibrium point is to the left of the intersection between the $TR(E)$ and the $TC(E)$ curves, the difference between them being the intra-marginal rent.

The total rent of the fishery is defined as

$$\pi(E) = TRE(E) - TC(E) \quad . \tag{7.1}$$



Click on the ad to read more
Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

We discussed at length the maximisation of rent in Chapters 3 and 5, and know that figure 7.2 panel (b) is useful to illustrate the solution. The rent maximising effort level, E_{MEY}, is found where the upward sloping marginal cost of effort curve, $MC(E)$, intersects the downward sloping $MR(E)$ curve. The relationship between revenue, cost and rent is as follows:

Resource rent	$BHFC$
+ Intra-marginal rent	CFD
+ Total cost	$CDOE_{MEY}$
= Total revenue	$BHOE_{MEY}$

The total rent equals the area *BHDC*, in figure 7.2 panel (b), and this is clearly greater than the open-access intra-marginal rent for the open-access fishery, which equals *AGD*. We notice that even though total rent is greater for the effort level E_{MEY} than for E_{∞}, the intra-marginal rent is reduced. This may have some implications for management. In case of heterogeneous fishing effort, we have seen that the most cost-efficient vessels do make above-normal profit, called intra-marginal rent. If the fishery manager wants to reduce effort from E_{∞} to E_{MEY}, some vessels that have to leave the fishery will lose their part of the intra-marginal rent. This may result in objections to change of management objective. However, as demonstrated above, the total rent is highest for the E_{MEY} effort level, and some of this could be used to compensate those vessels that may be in danger of losing their previous intra-marginal rent. The advice to managers, as a result of this analysis, is to analyse carefully what distributional effects may follow a change in the management system. Otherwise it may be difficult to get the fishermen and the vessels to comply with rules and regulations.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Box 7.1 Economic efficiency of some gill-net fishing vessels in Vietnam

This figure presents an example of heterogeneous cost efficiency of vessels in an offshore fishery in a developing country, where some make a good profit and others a loss. Data for 2008 was collected to study gill-net vessels in Nha Trang, Vietnam, fishing mainly tuna and mackerel in the East Sea (South China Sea). The vessels are about 13-20 m long, have a crew of 8-12 men and an average trip lasts for 16 days. The total cost includes fuel, nets, labour, maintenance, depreciation and interest payment on loans, but excludes calculated interest on the vessel owner's capital. The height of the bars measures the average total cost per unit of standardized effort for each vessel. The unit of effort is put equal to the estimated average effort of the 58 vessels in the sample. The width of a bar indicates the relative effort of each vessel and the vessels are numbered arbitrarily from 1 to 58 (note the difference to the ordering in Figure 7.1). Thus the total effort of all 58 vessels equals 58.0 on the horizontal axis. The horizontal curves $AR_{ws}(E)$ and $AR_{os}(E)$ are the average revenue per unit of standardised effort with and without a lump sum subsidy, respectively, paid by the Government in 2008 only to compensate for the very high fuel costs that year. We see that vessels no.28 and no.49 just break even and that the relative effort of the former is much greater than the latter. On average vessels with the highest effort, which are usually the biggest ones, are also the most cost efficient ones – the bar widths are wider to the left than to the right. However, there are several exceptions, for example vessel no.47 (between no.37 and no.31) to the left and vessel no.13 towards the right. All in all this figure demonstrates what is quite common in the open access fishing industries globally – some vessels and fishermen make good money, others loose.

LIGS University
based in Hawaii, USA
is currently enrolling in the Interactive Online BBA, MBA, MSc, DBA and PhD programs:
- enroll by October 31st, 2014 and
- save up to 11% on the tuition!
- pay in 10 installments / 2 years
- Interactive Online education
- visit www.ligsuniversity.com to find out more!

Note: LIGS University is not accredited by any nationally recognized accrediting agency listed by the US Secretary of Education.
More info here.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com




Figure Box 7.1: The cost-efficiency of 58 vessels. In million VND per vessel per year (1 USD=16,950VND). Source: Duy et al., 2010.

7.2 Marine reserves[15]

Many countries have set aside marine areas for the protection of fish stocks, fauna and flora in the water and on the sea floor, often with the aim of increasing the harvest of fish outside these areas. Such areas are known as marine reserves, nature reserves, marine protected areas, marine managed areas, marine parks, marine sanctuaries, fishery reserves or closed areas, their nomenclature sometimes reflecting local purposes and rules and sometimes arbitrary. Here they are called marine reserves (MRs), indicating that they are protected from human exploitation of fish, either fully or against some types of fishing gear and vessels. Human activities and expansion have contributed to overuse of several terrestrial and marine populations and ecosystems around the world and some populations have even become extinct. Economic and legal instruments to mitigate such problems have been designed and implemented.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

In the previous chapters we have mainly focused on resource rent creation as the policy objective and input (licences, effort and capacity) and output (taxes, different types of fish quotas) control as economic policy instruments to achieve the objective. However, in actual policy creation there may be several other objectives, such as preservation of fish stocks and other living organisms in the ecosystem, maximum sustainable yield for food security, consumer and producer surplus, and employment locally or nationally (Box 4.1). As will be seen below marine reserves (MRs) may contribute to several such objectives, but also may not be particularly suitable for generating resource rent. Also important for the success of the MR are the rules for fishing and other activities outside the reserve. Are there restrictions on the fishermen regarding their choice of vessel, gear and target species? Do they have to pay resource taxes on input or output? Is it an open-access fishery with free entry and exit? To highlight the main features of the MR we will analyse the case of a fully protected fish stock inside the reserve and unrestricted open access outside it with reference to the analyses in chapters 3 and 5.

Marine reserve model

We should expect that the protection of part of a fish stock in one area, the MR, will result in increased biological and economic yields outside the reserve through spillover effects of fish eggs, juveniles and individuals of fishable size. A major question to be answered is how large a part of the total distribution area of the fish stock should be set aside for the MR? Should it be 5, 20 or 40%, for example? The remaining 95, 80 or 60% will be the harvest zone, HZ. The modelling approach is kept simple, so we can investigate analytically to what extent reserve size may be tuned to achieve biological and economic objectives. In the previous analytic chapters fish had no geographical distribution. Now it is distributed across two areas, the MR and the HZ. Even though there may be migration both ways, as indicated by the two uppermost arrows in figure 7.3, the net migration means that fish resources flow from the area with the highest density of fish to a low density area (density is e.g. gram per square metre or ton per square km). Otherwise fish within each area are homogeneously distributed. Without any fishing in the MR the fish density will be highest in this area and fish will spill over to the HZ to allow more resources for the fishing vessels. The analysis is limited to a single stock and questions related to multi-cohort, multi-species, by-catch and ecosystem interactions are not considered for the moment.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com




Figure 7.3. The main features of the marine reserve model and analysis. The choice of reserve size *m* is at the forefront of our discussion.

TURN TO THE EXPERTS FOR
SUBSCRIPTION CONSULTANCY

Subscrybe is one of the leading companies in Europe when it comes to innovation and business development within subscription businesses.

We innovate new subscription business models or improve existing ones. We do business reviews of existing subscription businesses and we develope acquisition and retention strategies.

Learn more at linkedin.com/company/subscrybe or contact
Managing Director Morten Suhr Hansen at mha@subscrybe.dk

SUBSCRYBE - to the future

Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

With reference to figure 7.3, before establishing the marine reserve we have a fish stock of size X (measured, for example, in tons) distributed across an area of unit size one (for example, 1.0 km^2). Thus the density of fish is also X (ton per km^2). The growth of this stock follows the logistic growth equation discussed in chapter 5, with natural growth equal to $F(X) = rX(1 - X / K)$, where r is the intrinsic growth rate and K is the carrying capacity. Now the total distribution area of the stock is divided into two parts, as shown in figure 7.3, and the marine reserve is of size m and the harvest area of size $1\text{-}m$. The corresponding sub-stocks are X_R and X_H, respectively, such that $X = X_R + X_H$. The density of fish in each sub-area now depends on both the sub-area size and the size of its sub-stock. Thus the density of fish in the MR and the HZ is X_R/m and $X_H/(1\text{-}m)$, respectively. Recall that in the previous chapters, we did not mention densities of fish, only the stock size, and harvest per unit of effort in the Schaefer harvest function (2.7) is proportional to stock size. As long as the distribution area of the stock stays the same, density will vary proportionally with stock size and implicitly we have taken care of the density of fish. Now, however, it is important to introduce explicitly the density concept since both migration of fish between the two sub-areas and the harvest rate will depend on the densities, and the former on the difference in densities.

Dispersal and migration of fish eggs, juveniles and grown-ups vary with factors such as species, ecosystem, sea current and season, and are the object of research of biologists and other marine scientists. The difference in density between the two sub-areas seems to matter for migration, and we shall assume that the net migration from the MR to the HZ is proportional to the density difference, $M=\sigma[X_R/m\text{-}X_H/(1\text{-}m)]$, where σ is the migration coefficient. Thus, if fish is removed from the harvest zone by fishing, the density difference increases and more fish will migrate from the reserve. The bigger σ is the greater is the migration of fish into the harvest zone. In figure 7.3, it is the lower arrow, indicating the net migration M, that is of importance in this analysis.

In our analysis, we treat σ as given. Note, however, that the shape of the MR (and the HZ) may affect this migration coefficient in actual cases. If, for example, the population distribution area is a river (like a very narrow rectangle) the migration coefficient is smaller with the two sub-areas downstream and upstream rather than along the left bank and right bank (Flaaten and Mjølhus, 2010).

Open-access harvesting in the HZ

Open-access harvesting takes place in the HZ largely as discussed in chapters 3 and 5. There are, however, a couple of differences. First, for the vessels in the HZ catch per unit of effort is proportional to the density of fish in this sub-area, and according to the Schaefer harvest function harvest now equals $H=qEX_H/(1\text{-}m)$ (figure 7.3). Note the difference between this and the harvest function (2.7), which we have used in previous chapters.[16] Second, the quantity and density of fish in the HZ depend on natural growth, as previously, but also on the migration from the MR. With this modelling approach some important management questions may be raised.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Can the marine reserve, combined with open-access harvesting outside, contribute:

- to preservation of fish stocks and other living organisms in the ecosystem,
- to maximum sustainable yield (MSY) for food security,
- to increased employment locally or nationally, and
- to generation of consumer and producer surplus?

Preservation

Stocks threatened by heavy depletion or even extinction by efficient and cheap harvesting, may be increased and preserved by the use of marine reserves. The relative reserve size m needed will vary with harvest efficiency and costs, as well as with the market price of fish. Recall from chapter 5 that the open-access stock level at equilibrium is $X_\infty = \frac{a}{pq}$, where a is the unit cost of effort, p is the price of harvest, and q is the catchability coefficient. Thus X_∞ is positive in the Gordon-Schaefer model with positive effort costs and will not be extinct. However, if costs are low and price and catchability high, the stock may well be heavily depleted. This is particularly so in the case of schooling species (e.g. anchovy, mackerel and herring) in fisheries with purse seine and advanced sonar fish-finding technology. In such fisheries, the threat of stock collapse is much higher than within the Gordon-Schaefer framework where catch per unit effort decreases as stock size is reduced.[17] In our marine reserve model the m needed to keep the equilibrium stock above a specified minimum level increases with p and q and decreases with a. It can also be shown that m has to be bigger the greater the migration rate and the lower the intrinsic growth rate (Flaaten and Mjølhus, 2005). The intuition behind this is as follows. Since the HZ sub-stock is depleted and since migration between the zones depends on relative densities, there will be migration from the nature reserve to the HZ, where the migrating population will then be depleted through harvesting. If the migration rate is greater than the intrinsic growth rate, then the MR sub-population leaves MR faster than reproduction occurs and the population will be heavily reduced, and in extreme case can even become extinct. A sufficiently large reserve will work to protect the overall stock.[18]

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Maximum sustainable yield (MSY) for food security

Securing enough protein and food for people nationally may be one of the objectives of fisheries management, though usually not favoured by economists since foodstuff can be efficiently traded internationally. However, let us discuss if marine reserves can contribute to this objective. In chapter 5 the maximum sustainable yield is derived, $MSY=rK/4$, in a single species context, for the Gordon-Schaefer model. Having discussed the ability of an MR to protect the overall stock level, we now ask if this, combined with open-access fishing in the HZ, can realize *MSY*? Is it possible to tune m^* such that effort in the HZ adjusts to what is needed to harvest *MSY*? It will be shown that this is the case but is conditional on economic, biological and technological parameters and also that post-MR growth equals pre-MR growth.[19] A man-made line dividing the habitat of fish into two parts, the MR and HZ (figure 7.3), in itself obviously does not change the growth and behaviour of fish, and this is the approach of this analysis. However, it could be that actually fishing the whole area or just a part of it would make a difference. With harvesting, the latter implies different densities of fish in the two areas with different possibilities for the fish to spawn, find prey and grow (it is left to the reader to investigate the literature for such alternatives; see Flaaten and Mjølhus, 2010 for some references).



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

For tuning m^* to achieve *MSY* see figure 7.4. Parameter c on the horizontal axis is the pre-reserve equilibrium normalized stock level $c = \frac{a}{pqK}$, varying between zero and one. In low-cost, high-price and technically efficient fisheries the stock will be biologically over-exploited, thus $c<0.50$. In such cases the possibility of tuning m^* to achieve *MSY* is of interest. Figure 7.4 gives, vertically, the m^* needed to realize MSY for different degrees of overfishing pre-reserve. Recall that both pre-reserve and post-reserve there is open-access fishing with equilibrium determined by the parameters. Two biological parameters are of importance for the conclusion, namely the migration coefficient, σ, and the intrinsic growth rate, r. In fact it is merely the ratio between them, $\gamma = \sigma/r$, that is of importance.




Figure 7.4 Reserve size m^* chosen to realize MSY; downward sloping curves show m^* as a function of the pre-reserve open-access stock level c, for two cases, relative migration $\gamma = 0$ .3 < ½ and $\gamma = 0.7 > ½$. Such tuning is not possible when $c > ½$. For the uppermost curve $c_{\min} = 1/2 - 1/4\gamma = 1/7$ (Flaaten and Mjølhus, 2010).

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Note some characteristics of the two curves in figure 7.4. First, only in the case when the resource is biologically overused from open-access harvesting, $c < 0.50$, will the establishment of a permanent MR succeed in realizing *MSY*. Both curves emanate at $c = 0.50$ on the horizontal axis, i.e. at the *MSY* normalized stock level. Second, only the curve for $\gamma = 0.30$ intersects the vertical axis, implying that the MR restricted open-access fishery can realize *MSY* even for very low levels of c, provided the MR size is close to 0.60. Third, in the case of a higher γ, $\gamma = 0.70$ in figure 7.4, no MR is large enough to realize *MSY* if c is low, $c < c_{min}$. If the stock has been fished down below c_{min}, in figure 7.4 equal to 0.15, a reserve will contribute to increased total stock and to increased harvest, but not enough to realize *MSY*. This is because of the high relative migration rate γ, indicating that the migration of fish from the reserve to the harvest zone is too fast compared with the intrinsic growth needed to build up the stock to the *MSY* level (recall $\gamma = \sigma/r$). In fact, it can be shown that this occurs when $\gamma > 0.50$ since the intersection of the possibility curves with the vertical axis is at $m^* = 2\gamma$ in figure 7.4 (Flaaten and Mjølhus, 2005). Fourth, an MR may help to achieve *MSY* even if γ is higher than 0.50 as long as $c_{min} < c < c_{msy}$, i.e. when on the curve connecting c_{min} at $m^* = 1$ and $c = 0.50$ at $m^* = 0$. To summarize, figure 7.4 demonstrates how MR size must be chosen to realize *MSY* for different combinations of migration, intrinsic growth and pre-reserve stock size – the latter determined by harvest efficiency, price of fish and cost of effort.


As regards nature reserves, monitoring, control and enforcement (MCE) costs may vary with reserve shape, in addition to size. In particular, high population density in a reserve may attract poachers, making reserve geometry of importance. Therefore, reserve design may act as an additional or joint management tool to decide reserve size. For simple geometric forms of the population distribution area the migration coefficient σ may be directly related to reserve size and shape. If, for example, the population distribution area is a river (like a very narrow rectangle) the migration coefficient is smaller with the two sub-areas downstream and upstream rather than along the left bank and right bank. Thus the reserve shape may affect migration between the MR and HZ as well as MCE costs.

Employment

In some countries fisheries are seen as important labour market buffers, particularly in poor countries (Bené et al., 2010), even though we acknowledge the need to restrict effort to create resource rent. Independently of the approach taken, however, it is important to know how effort and catch change when an MR is created. In fisheries, employment is both output-related and input-related; total employment in the sector depends both on effort used in capture and on catch landed for processing, which may be more or less labour-intensive. The possibility of designing an MR to maximize harvest was discussed above, and it is likely that post-harvest employment in processing and distribution of fish increases with harvest. Let us now discuss if effort-related employment at equilibrium changes because of the introduction of an MR. Fishing effort is a composite concept, designed for use in bioeconomic models where it bridges the gap between humans' fishing activities and nature's fish stocks through fishing mortality. In actual fisheries the composition of effort varies, but capital and labour are the core inputs, in addition to other variables such as fuel, gear, bait and ice. Empirical studies have demonstrated that labour increases with effort, proportionally or at a decreasing rate (Squires and Kirkley, 1999; Long et al., 2008).

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

A reserve is a restriction on the free movement of effort and in general this increases the need for effort in the fishery. This is also the case when *MSY* is achieved with reserve size m^*. Within the modelling approach in this chapter, an MR and open-access harvesting in an HZ may realize *MSY* through increased effort, thus increasing employment in both fish processing and harvesting (for details, see Reithe et al., 2014). For harvest levels other than *MSY* it is necessary to limit the analysis to numerical simulations, and to compare the post-reserve results with the pre-reserve effort and yield for different parameter sets. Higher effort is usually required in the case of an MR than in the pure open-access case. For high levels of effort pre-reserve, resulting in biological overfishing, the protective benefits of the MR ensure a bigger total stock and the migration results in spillover that secures a higher yield. Thus employment with a reserve will be greater than for the overall open-access fishery.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Consumer surplus

For open-access fisheries with constant price of fish and cost of effort, no resource rent, no consumer surplus (CS) and no producer surplus (PS) are generated in the analyses in this and the previous chapters. Then in that case, from an economic perspective, why bother establishing an MR if it does not generate any rent? We have already given some answers to this when discussing stock preservation, sustainable yield and employment. In addition, actual fishing fleets often display heterogeneous vessels and costs – implying PS (intra-marginal rent) in open-access fisheries (see sub-chapter 7.1, including Box 7.1). Also, fish markets often display downward sloping demand and the possibilities of CS, and we will now discuss this. The increased harvest following the creation of an MR, for a biological overfished stock, (see above) combined with a downward sloping demand curve allows for the creation of CS.[20] Now, let us investigate the case of consumer surplus to see how this changes the previous conclusions about zero economic rent. With a downward sloping demand curve for fish, we assume there is a unique stable equilibrium at overall open access. If this is for an overfished stock level, both stock and harvest will be lower the higher the fish price is, all other parameters being constant. This creates a backward bending supply curve, as opposed to a regular upward-sloping supply curve, known from the theory of production, where quantity increases with price. (Copes, 1970)

Disregarding processing and distribution costs, consumer price equals ex-vessel price and the downward sloping demand implies CS, measured by the area between the demand curve and the equilibrium price. As demonstrated above, tuning reserve size to realize *MSY*, under HZ open access, may or may not be possible, depending on biological and economic parameters. The case of biological over-exploitation pre-MR and open-access harvesting in the HZ post-MR implies increased harvest as well as increased consumer surplus when demand is downward-sloping. This is clearly an economic benefit of MR creation for over-exploited resources. Consumer surplus may be of great importance for some resources, such as those harvested and used for easily perishable food at local or national markets limited in size.

Producer surplus

We discussed heterogeneous vessels in sub-chapter 7.1. With such a fishing fleet, usually thought to be a more realistic assumption for modelling, total cost of fishing will be non-linear. The most efficient vessels will earn a super-normal profit in spite of open access. This rent, the intra-marginal rent or producer surplus (PS), is discussed in figure 7.2 and may be estimated from cost and earnings data (for an example of cost data see Box 7.1). Now the question is whether an MR as the only policy instrument can potentially increase PS. In the light of the analysis in Reithe et al. (2014) the answer is mainly affirmative.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Open-access equilibrium effort is found where average revenue *AR(E)* is equal to marginal cost *MC(E)* (chapter 3). With no MR and total costs now assumed to be quadratic in effort, $C = aE^2$, equilibrium open-access effort and stock will be given by $E^{\infty} = pr/(pr + 2\alpha)$ and $S^{\infty} = 2\alpha/(pr + 2\alpha)$, respectively. Thus, E^{∞} decreases and S^{∞} increases with the cost parameter α. In other words, this qualitative result is similar to that of the Gordon-Schaefer model with a linear total cost function; open-access equilibrium effort decreases and stock increases with the unit cost of effort, and PS decreases. The parameter α determines the open-access equilibrium both pre-reserve and post-reserve and PS will be greater the smaller α is. For a biological over-exploited stock pre-reserve an MR will increase PS when there is HZ fishing, for parameters discussed in figure 7.4; that is for an over-exploited stock and relative migration, α, between 0.3 and 0.7 (Reithe et al., 2014). An MR of any moderate size will cause equilibrium effort, and hence also PS, to increase. However, if the reserve is made "too large" effort and PS may decrease compared with the pure open-access case.

Concluding remarks

It is well known (see chapters 3 and 5) that no rent is generated under open access within the Gordon-Schaefer model with constant price of fish and homogeneous effort. However, we also know that small changes in the underlying assumptions may allow for rent generation, in particular consumer and producer surplus, as demonstrated in this chapter. (See Box 7.1 for a related empirical study.) We have discussed the possibility of such rent generation by use of a marine reserve with open-access fishing outside. However, maximizing total economic rent may of course not be the only objective of fisheries management. Therefore, this MR approach also considers what is usually classified as ecological objectives, namely resource conservation and restoration and maximum sustainable yield, as well as social objectives, such as employment and food security.

For developing countries, which typically have fisheries in tropical ecosystems characterized by a high number of species and mixed fisheries, limited resources available for fisheries management and a high degree of subsistence and small-scale fisheries, the management tools often used by industrialized countries are not suitable. Taxing or controlling the harvest of thousands of vessels, each catching a small amount which is sold on local markets, would be very demanding. Fisheries management does not come for free and monitoring, control and enforcement are not perfect, usually resulting in some IUU fishing (Schrank et al., 2003). As regards actual management the efficiency and costs of different instruments should be an integral part of the policy discussion. OECD fishing countries from 1987 to 2007 saw a decline in fish catches of about 2% per year on average, whereas the other fishing nations worldwide had an annual increase of about 2%, despite the more advanced instruments of the former (Flaaten, 2013). Because of overfishing and decline in catches in several member countries the OECD has instigated discussions and analyses to mitigate such problems (OECD, 2012 and 2013). Controlling fish in a particular area (MR) is easier and cheaper than conventional input and output control, but it is essential to know how closing an area will affect stocks, harvest, vessels and labour, and if any economic and social benefits could be generated by doing so (Reithe et al., 2014 p. 35).

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

In the fisheries management literature other factors, such as enhancing food security and food safety, inter-generational equity, reducing vulnerability to external shocks from foreign exchange fluctuations and extreme climatic events, have been suggested to play a role in the establishment and maintenance of marine reserves. Some may be included in a bioeconomic analysis of marine reserves, whereas others are beyond the scope of what economists can do; they are beyond the scope of this study and require environmental, social and political tools of analysis. From an economic perspective the long-term cost-effectiveness of marine reserves compared with other management tools should be at the forefront of analysis.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

8 Growth and yield of year classes

In this chapter we analyse the effects on yield and economic rent of changes in technical fisheries regulations by use of a year class model. It is shown that technical regulations such as minimum mesh size can realise greater long-term yield and economic rent if fishing mortality is controlled simultaneously. Fisheries biologists usually use year class models in their stock assessment and advisory work.

8.1 Growth and ageing

In Chapter 2 it was noted that the biological processes that generate bell-formed growth curves include individual growth, recruitment and natural mortality. Even though a fish stock may consist of several year classes, of which just the older ones spawn and ensure recruitment to the stock, and young fish may have a higher growth rate than the older ones, bell-shaped growth curves incorporate all such processes. In addition, as have been shown in the previous chapters, the growth curves form a good foundation for economic analysis of fishing. However, there are at least two reasons for also studying fisheries adaptation and management within a year class framework. First, a year class model may increase our understanding of the biological and economic effects of technical regulations. Second, fishery scientists in actual assessment and advisory work extensively use year class models. When working with detailed and complex year class models we must be aware that even in such models we can find the maximum sustainable yield (MSY) and the corresponding stock size, though these characteristics are not as apparent as in the aggregated biomass models. Fisheries management in many parts of the world is dominated by analysis and management advice from biologists and other natural science researchers, who base their work mainly on disaggregated models. Such models specify in more or less detail the three biological processes – recruitment, growth and mortality – of the year classes of the stock. Therefore, let us have a closer look at such population models and how they may be used for economic analysis.

A cohort is a group of fish of the same age belonging to the same stock. That is why year class models are often called cohort models. In the temperate zones of the world fish stocks usually have only one spawning season per year, thus producing one cohort per year. However, fish stocks in tropical areas, where spawning can take place throughout the year, may produce two or more cohorts annually.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Fish usually grow throughout their lives, but at a decreasing relative rate both with respect to length and weight. This contrasts with humans and many other animals whose growth ceases some time after adolescence. The growth of a single fish may depend on the available food, water temperature and other biotic and abiotic factors, in addition to its basic physiological characteristics. Even though there may be a great variation of growth within a cohort, it is useful to describe the average growth of fish by use of a graph or an equation. Figure 8.1 shows the estimated age-specific length and weight of Northeast Arctic cod, and figure 8.2 shows the estimated age-specific length and weight of Pacific mackerel. Note that length increases at a decreasing rate for both species throughout the life of the fish, whereas weight increases at an increasing rate until the age of around eight years for cod and five years for mackerel. Actual data will typically be dotted above and below the growth curve, with the curve depicting the average value at each age. That is why fish actually can be longer and heavier than the asymptotic values shown in these figures.




Figure 8.1. Average length and weight at age of Northeast Arctic cod portrayed by use of the von Bertanlanffy growth equation. Parameter values are: $k = 0.12$, $l_\infty = 130$ cm, $w_\infty = 17.00$ kg, $t_0 = 0$. Source: Parameter values from Sullivan (1991).

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com




Figure 8.2. Average length and weight of Pacific mackerel depicted by use of the von Bertanlanffy growth equation. Parameter values are: $k = 0.24$, $l_\infty = 44$ cm, $w_\infty = 1.00$ kg, $t_0 = 0$. Source: Parameter values from Sullivan (1991).

There are more than one species of both cod and mackerel, and several stocks, in both the Atlantic and the Pacific. Growth rates vary between areas due to differences in sea temperature, food availability, and other factors. Mackerel is a pelagic species that grows relatively fast at a young age and reaches maturity already after two to four years. Cod is a relatively slow growing but long-lived species that can reach the age of 20 or 30 years, and it reaches a significant length and weight.

This e-book
is made with
SetaPDF
SETASIGN
PDF components for PHP developers
www.setasign.com
Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

The length at age curves in figures 8.1 and 8.2 are calculated on the basis of the von Bertalanffy (1938) length growth equation

$$l(t) = l_{\infty}(1 - e^{-k(t-t_0)}) . \tag{8.1}$$

The weight at age curves in figures 8.1 and 8.2 are calculated on the basis of the von Bertalanffy weight growth equation

$$w(t) = w_{\infty}(1 - e^{-k(t-t_0)})^3 . \tag{8.2}$$

Each of equations (8.1) and (8.2) describes the growth of individuals by use of three parameters. Other functional forms have also been used for curve fitting of fish growth, but the von Bertanlanffy equations are the most common (see, for example, the FishBase web page). Parameter l_{∞} is the maximum length of the fish, to be reached only at a very advanced age – really at an infinitely high age, mathematically speaking. Parameter k, together with l_{∞}, contributes to the relative growth of fish. Note that even though k usually is called the growth parameter, length growth is really a function of both k and l_{∞}. The parameter k is usually smaller for big fish, such as cod and halibut, than for small fish, such as pilchard and sprat (for lots of examples see FishBase at http://www.fishbase.org/search.php). At a very young age, as larvae or juvenile, fish may have another growth pattern from that during the later stages of life. Parameter t_0 tells the hypothetical age at which the fish would have had length zero if growth followed the normal pattern throughout life. (To see that $l(t_0) = 0$, substitute t_0 for t in equation (8.1).) Technically, t_0 may be positive, negative or zero. However, for the growth curves shown in figures 8.1 and 8.2 t_0 has been fixed to zero, to simplify the estimation process, figures and comparison between species. (For a thorough review of estimation methods for parameters in growth functions, and in other fisheries equations and models, see Haddon (2001).)

If we follow a cohort of fish throughout time there will typically be a gradual reduction in the number of individuals from the birth of the cohort to the point in time when the last individual dies. There are great variations between stocks in how fast a cohort is reduced in size. Some marine species, for example, seals, have a few offspring with a low natural mortality, whereas others, for example, mackerel, have a huge number of offspring, with a high natural mortality. The most common cause of natural mortality of fish is predation from other fish, sea birds and sea mammals. The smaller a fish is the more individuals in the sea are able to eat it, thus implying a high rate of mortality from predation. It is not uncommon that mortality due to predation on fish eggs and fries exceeds 10–20 per cent per day. For adult fish, however, daily rates of mortality may be down to a fraction of one per cent. In addition to predation, other natural causes of death of fish include illness, starvation, parasites and poisoning. Such causes often weaken the fish to make it more vulnerable to predation – thus fulfilling the saying: one man's death is the other's life.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

For management purposes it is important to distinguish between natural mortality on the one hand and fishing mortality on the other. Fishing means removal of fish from the sea, thus adding to the total mortality of the cohort. For managers, an important question is how many fish should be removed from the cohort and how many should be left in the sea. (We shall come back to this at a later stage). Total mortality, denoted Z, consists of the sum of natural mortality, denoted M, and fishing mortality, denoted F. First, let us have a closer look at the effects of natural mortality on the surviving number of fish. Disregarding the very early stages of the life of a fish, natural mortality seems to be a relative constant fraction of the number of fish. This means that, disregarding fishing, for example, 20 per cent of the cohort will die from natural causes from one year to the next. However, fish typically die every day and minute throughout the year, and for this reason it has proved practical to count mortality on an instantaneous basis. Recalling Chapter 4 we have seen that, regarding discounting, it is rather a question of convenience whether we should use discrete or continuous time for the calculation of present value and compound[21] interest. The same applies to the development of a cohort over time. Fisheries biologists tend to use continuous time when calculating natural and fishing mortality in a management context. Therefore, we shall use the same approach.

Starting with N_0 fish, the number of fish will have decreased to

$$N(t) = N_0 \, e^{-Z\,t} \tag{8.3}$$

at time t if the total instantaneous mortality rate, $Z = M + F$, is constant.

For some species, such as salmon, most fish die after spawning, implying that M is extremely high during the post-spawning period. However, for most fish species of commercial value, natural mortality, M, is in the range of between 0.1 and 0.8.

Box 8.1 Fishing mortality in a fish farm

Farming of salmon, and other big fish, is an extreme example of single cohort fishing. For each new round of production, farmers usually put some thousands of juveniles of the same cohort into the cage. After having fed and tended the fish for a couple of years, the stock may be harvested during a very short period of time. Let us have a closer look at a numerical example to see how great the fishing mortality F can be in the case of fish farming. A cage contains 60 000 salmon at time t, that is N(t) = 60 000. The harvest takes place during five days, which implies that dN = 60 000 and dt = 5 / 365 = 0.0137 when time is measured in years. Neglecting natural mortality this implies

(1) $$dN / dt = -F \, N(t) \, .$$

Based on equation (1) and the data given above we derive F = 73.0. This is an extremely high fishing mortality compared with the harvesting of wild fish. However, F > 1 is not unknown in commercial fisheries, in particular in the case of fast growing short-lived species. Note that F =1 does not imply that the whole cohort is fished in one year (see exercise 8.1).

Small fish, such as sprat and pilchard, usually have higher M than bigger fish, such as cod and halibut.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Multiplying the number of fish in equation (8.3) with the individual weight in equation (8.2) gives the biomass at age t

$$B(t) = w(t)N(t)\,. \tag{8.4}$$

Figure 8.3 shows the development of a mackerel cohort in numbers and total weight, or biomass. In this case with a natural mortality $M = 0.4$ and no fishing ($F = 0$) the number of fish decreases from one billion recruits at time zero to approximately 200 million at the age of four and 135 million at the age of five. Thus after four years there will be only one in five fishes left in the cohort. The natural mortality used in this example fits the Pacific mackerel, but the number of recruits is arbitrarily chosen (low).



Deloitte.
Discover the truth at www.deloitte.ca/careers
© Deloitte & Touche LLP and affiliated entities.
Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com




Figure 8.3. The decline in number of fishes and the rise and decline of biomass in a given cohort of mackerel, without fishing. Parameters used are $N(0) = 1$ billion, $M = 0.4$ and growth parameters as in figure 8.2.




Figure 8.4. The decline in number of fishes and the rise and decline of biomass of a cod cohort, without fishing. Parameters used are $N(0) = 1$ billion, $M = 0.2$ and growth parameters as in figure 8.1.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Figure 8.4 shows the development of a cohort of cod in number and total weight, or biomass. In this case with a natural mortality $M = 0.2$ and no fishing ($F = 0$) the number of fish decreases from one billion recruits at time zero to approximately 420 million at the age of four and 200 million at the age of eight. Thus after four years there will be just above four in ten fishes left in the cohort and at the age of eight there will be two in ten fishes left. The natural mortality used in this example fits the Northeast Arctic cod. The number of recruits in figure 8.4 is arbitrarily chosen, but is within observed limits for this cod stock.

Multiplying number of fish by the individual weight gives the age-specific biomass curve shown in figures 8.3 and 8.4. Thus the total weight, the biomass of a cohort, depends on the weight of single fish and the number of fish. Biomass typically increases progressively (convex) during the early stage of life, then continues to grow but slower and slower (concave) until it reaches its maximum. From this maximum the biomass decreases gradually towards zero at the maximum age of the fish. This maximum age is usually much higher than the average age of harvested fish. The maximum age is the age a fish of a given stock could reach if it were left un-harvested by man and predators. The particular biomass curve shown in figures 8.3 and 8.4 are based on the weight curves of Pacific mackerel and Northeast Arctic cod, respectively. In the case of mackerel the cohort reaches its maximum biomass at the age of four years, whereas in the case of cod the cohort reaches its maximum biomass at the age of nine, in both cases with the assumption of no fishing. The age that gives biomass maximum of a cohort depends on the biological characteristics of the fish stock. Higher natural mortality M, ceteris paribus, means a lower age at biomass maximum.

As noted above the age-specific biomass curves shown in figures 8.3 and 8.4 are based on the absence of fishing. If and when fishing takes place, the biomass growth will be slower and the decline will be faster than shown. In actual fisheries the gear type in use often determines what sizes of fish are caught and what sizes escape. For example, a fisher's choice of gill-net mesh size usually depends on his targeted fish species and size. Small fish have a greater probability than big fish of avoiding being entangled in the net. This probability increases the smaller the fish is, since the little ones pass through the meshes more easily without being trapped. However, a big fish also has a positive probability of escaping the gill net, because it is not entangled or it has the power to free itself from the net. Thus a gill net typically catches most medium-sized fish, and this "medium size" depends on the mesh size. On the other hand, trawl has the property of keeping few of the small fish, most medium-sized fish and all the big ones that encounter the gear. For very small fish, trawl takes none at all. For example, bottom trawl used for cod-like fish does not catch shrimp, even if such a species is present on the fishing ground.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com




Figure 8.5. Selectivity curves for three types of fishing gear.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

The selectivity pattern varies across gear type and this pattern may be described by use of selectivity curves. Figure 8.5 shows three examples of selectivity curves, namely size dependent selectivity for gill-net and trawl as well as knife-edge selectivity. For analytical purposes it is often convenient to assume knife-edge selectivity to focus on the harvest potential of a fish stock. Even though knife-edge selectivity is hard to achieve in actual fisheries, bottom trawl with steel or alloy grids that substitute parts of the net may come close to this. The grid will stay open with a fixed distance between the bars, allowing all or most fish below a certain thickness to escape the gear independent of how many fish are in the cod-end of the trawl. Most gear has a somewhat more complicated selectivity pattern than knife-edge selectivity, for example, like bell-shaped or s-shaped curves. In conventional trawl, the net is gradually stretched and the real mesh size reduces as more and more fish accumulate in the trawl, thus effectively decreasing the selectivity properties of the gear. In general, the selectivity curve of gill-net is bell-shaped and that of conventional trawl is s-shaped. The values of the selectivity parameter vary between zero and one, telling the probability of a fish encountered by the gear being trapped as a function of the size of the fish. Knife-edge selectivity exists when the selectivity parameter is zero for small fish up to a given size and one for all sizes equal to or bigger than this minimum catchable size. Most gear types do not catch the very smallest fish. What "smallest" means varies across type of gear and mesh size.

With a direct relationship between fish size and age, as we see in figures 8.1 and 8.2, the first-age-of-capture, t_c, is the age that corresponds to the minimum catchable size. In the case of knife-edge selectivity the definition of t_c is clear, namely the age at which fish reaches its minimum catchable size. However, for practical purposes in the case of size variable selectivity of trawl t_c must be related to the age that gives, for example, $s(w) = 0.25$ and for gill-net t_c may be defined as the lower age for which, for example, $s(w) = 0.25$. Note that in the bell-shaped selectivity curve for gill-net there are two weight (age) classes of fish that give for example $s(w) = 0.25$, whereas for trawl there is only one.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

8.2 Sustainable yield and economic surplus

With knife-edge selectivity and constant fishing mortality throughout each cohort's life the yield from this cohort depends on the mesh size and the fishing mortality.

Figure 8.6 shows the yield curves for cod for three different age-of-first-capture, t_c. In this case we have drawn the picture of total yield (the eumetric yield is explained below). A quite similar picture would appear if we divide total yield by the number of recruits at t_0 and depict yield per recruit. In fact, in the biological literature yield per recruit is more common than total yield in this connection.[22] Note that the curves for zero and three years of first capture have a distinct maximum whereas the curve for nine years does not have such a maximum. This is because the biomass maximum of the cohort is reached at the age just below nine, at 8.6, as shown in figure 8.4. Any yield curve with t_c equal to or greater than the age of natural biomass maximum (without fishing) will be without a distinct maximum point. The fishing mortality that gives the maximum yield, for a given first age of capture, t_c, is called F_{max}. This is a biological reference point that tells what the fishing mortality should be for the fishery to produce maximum yield, given knife-edge selectivity and a specific age of first capture. In figure 8.6 we have two values of F_{max}, one for age 0 and one for age 3. Fisheries biologists use F_{max} and several other biological reference points in their assessment and advisory work (for a review, see, Caddy and Mahon, 1995).




Figure 8.6. Yield curves of cod for three different age-of-first-capture, namely 0, 3 and 9 year as well as eumetric yield, based on knife-edge gear selectivity. Parameter values of growth are as in figure 8.1, $N(0) = 1$ billion and $M = 0.2$.

Note that the catch will consist of fish at or above the age of first capture t_c, as long as the fishing mortality is within reasonable limits and the stock consists of several year classes. Some fish will survive fishing and reach an age well above t_c. A fish stock will typically consist of a higher proportion of old fish the lower the fishing pressure has been throughout some period of time.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Figure 8.6 clearly demonstrates that it is the combination of mesh size and fishing mortality that determines the possible yield of a cohort. If, for example, fishers use an extremely small mesh size, with the age of first capture close to zero, and a high fishing mortality, the yield from this cohort will usually be low. However, if the fishing mortality is kept low, even with such a small mesh size the yield may be significant. Figure 8.6 shows that the combination of age of first capture equal to zero and fishing mortality equal to 0.1 would yield almost 400 000 tonnes, which is about half of the maximum yield. However, to obtain the maximum yield it is necessary to have a high first-age-of-capture, almost nine years, and a high fishing mortality, about 1.0 or higher. Thus this cohort analysis demonstrates the need for simultaneous mesh size and fishing mortality control. So what combination should the manager aim at? To answer this question we shall have to include economic issues in the analysis of cohort fishing.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

For the mackerel cohort shown in figure 8.3 the maximum biomass occurs at the age of four and for cod shown in figure 8.4 the maximum occurs at the age of almost nine. However, such a maximum can be harvested only by use of an infinitely high fishing mortality exactly when the biomass reaches its maximum. Theoretically, at this point in time the total cohort is harvested by unlimited use of the knife-edge selective gear. However, from an economic point of view it is easy to understand that this is not a very useful concept of optimal fishing. Infinitely high fishing mortality and effort would imply infinitely high costs. Therefore, for an economic approach to cohort fishing we introduce the concept of eumetric yield curve.[23] For each value of F in figure 8.6 there exists some mesh size that gives the maximum sustained yield. The resulting curve through these maxima is the tangent to each of the size selective yield curves. We could also say that the eumetric yield curve is the envelopment of the individual mesh size conditional curves, as show in figure 8.6.

We discussed in chapter 2 how harvest may depend on stock size. One of the simplest relationships between stock size and harvest is the case of proportionality. For a cohort fishery this means that harvest is proportional also to the number of fish

(8.5) $$Y = FN,$$

where Y = catch in number of fish. If fishing mortality is proportional to fishing effort, E, we have

(8.6) $$F = qE,$$

where q is the catchability coefficient. Combining (8.5) and (8.6) gives the Schaefer harvest function in number of fish:

(8.7) $$Y = qEN,$$

in the case of cohort fishing. Since the eumetric yield is the greatest possible yield that can be obtained for each level of fishing mortality, F, this holds also for each level of fishing effort $E = F/q$.

Let us use these catch equations for an economic analysis of the cohort fishery, recalling that eumetric yield means that both fishing effort and mesh size are optimally adapted. If the fishing industry is a small part of the national economy it is reasonable to assume that effort can be expanded at a constant cost per unit and that fish may be sold at a constant price per unit harvest. Total cost is

(8.8) $$TC = aE,$$

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

where a = cost per unit effort. By combining equations (8.6) and (8.8) it follows easily that cost per unit fishing mortality is $a_F = a/q$. The actual value of a_F tends to be a large number since F is a small number, whereas the value of a depends on the choice of unit for measuring fishing effort. Whether effort is measured in, for example, trawler year or trawl hour makes a great difference to the value of a.

Figure 8.7 shows how revenue and costs may increase with fishing effort. In this case there are four revenue curves, corresponding to the three age-of-first-capture specific and the eumetric yield curves in figure 8.6. With a constant price, p, per unit harvest independent of fish size, the revenue curves in figure 8.7 is just a rescaling of the yield curves in the figure 8.6. For most types of gear the cost per unit effort varies very little with mesh size and selectivity pattern of the gear. This is why there is only one total cost curve in figure 8.7. In this case we assume that cost per unit effort and total cost are independent of mesh size and age-of-first-capture. Note that the main difference between figures 8.7 and 3.1 is that the former displays four possible revenue curves whereas the latter has only one. Even though biomass models are often used for analysis of multi-cohort fisheries, they do not explicitly consider selectivity effects.




Figure 8.7. Revenue and cost curves for cohort fisheries, with revenue depending proportionally on and cost independent of the type of yield curve.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Let us now use figure 8.7 to analyse and compare the open access (OA) and the maximum economic rent (MEY, where Y denotes yield) fishing regimes. For an OA fishery **with no technical regulations** we would expect fishers to catch any fish of commercial value. If even the smallest fish attracts the price p, fishers would choose the smallest mesh size available and keep for sale any fish they catch. In figure 8.7 this means that the OA equilibrium will be at A_0 for the rent dissipating effort level E^0_{00}. However, assume the fisheries manager introduces a technical regulation demanding all fishers use a mesh size that effectively increases the age of first capture to three years. This means that the R_3 curve in figure 8.7 will be the actual revenue curve for the fishery. OA fishing implies that the equilibrium changes from A_0 to A_3 with higher revenue, cost and effort compared to the OA fishery with no technical regulation. Technical regulations may contribute to the overall size of the fishery, but as the only management tool, no rent will be generated.[24] The resource rent is maximised for the effort level E_{MEY}, where we find the greatest distance between the R and C curves. To realise this optimum the management authority has to limit, directly or indirectly, the amount of effort in the fishery, and simultaneously limit the mesh size to achieve the eumetric yield. Compared with the economic analysis of the biomass fishery in the previous chapters, we now see the need for at least two management tools: firstly, a technical regulation to avoid harvest of small fish, and secondly, some control to avoid excessive fishing mortality. The latter may be achieved by input control or output control, as discussed in Chapter 3.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

The simplicity of figure 8.7 should not lead us to the conclusion that the only difference between a cohort model and a biomass model is the introduction of a first age of capture or a mesh-size parameter in the former. In fact, a cohort model with several year classes and a stock-recruitment relationship may be incredibly complex from a dynamic point of view (see Clark, 1990, ch. 9). The above analysis of a cohort fishery is based on the assumption of constant recruitment and fixed age-dependent individual growth. In other words there are no density-dependent processes that reduce recruitment at low stock levels or reduce individual growth at high stock levels. For actual fish stocks, recruitment usually depends on both spawning stock size and environmental conditions, and growth of individual fish may slow down at high stock levels due to competition for food. Fish has to grow for some years to mature and reproduce, therefore the number of recruits to the fishable stock depends on the spawning stock size one or more years before. The length of this time lag between spawning and recruitment varies across species and stocks. Adding multi-cohort, stock recruitment and time lag to the cohort analysis above could make the analysis too complex for analytical solutions to be found. A common solution to such problems is to use numerical model simulations. The need for technical regulations of a fishery is likely to become even more prevalent within such a framework.


Groups of year classes of a given fish stock may have different migration patterns due to different needs. The spawning cohorts, for example, need suitable spawning grounds at a time of the year when the chances of offspring survival is good. Juvenile cohorts grow relatively fast (as seen in figures 8.1 and 8.2) and they need a large amount of food. Therefore, younger generations of fish tend to migrate across season and area to find suitable and plentiful food. Migration of fish for spawning, feeding or other biological reasons may imply a need for additional management tools, such as area and seasonal restrictions on fishing. However, from an economic point of view, it is important to distinguish between management tools that increase the net revenue (resource rent) of a fishery and tools that mainly increase harvest costs. An example of the latter is when fishers are restricted from harvesting where and when the fish is easiest and least costly to catch. However, restricting access to harvesting the spawning stock through area and seasonal closure may be economically sound if this protects spawners and increases future recruitment. The stock-recruitment relationship is important for the long-term yield and the economic performance of the fisheries. It is important to stress that technical regulation of, for example, gear selectivity, area and seasonal closure, should be designed to increase the long-term profitability of the fishery. Unfortunately, in fisheries around the world there are several examples of actual regulations that inflict costs on the industry without increasing yield and revenues (see, for example, Shrank et al., 2003).

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Exercise 8.1.

In a cod fishery fishing mortality is proportional to fishing effort ($F = qE$) and the catchability coefficient is $q = 2.5 \cdot 10^{-4}$ per vessel-year, with unit of time equal to one year. The price of fish is constant (across volume and size of fish), $p = 2.00$ \$/kg, and cost per vessel-year is $a = 0.5$ million \$.

1. What is F when $E = 4000$ vessel-years?
2. Use figure 8.5 to sketch the corresponding graphs of eumetric revenue and total cost of fishing mortality (tip: see figure 8.6 and use cost per unit F, $c = TC/F$, to draw the total cost of fishing mortality curve, $C(F) = cF$).
3. Use the graphs to find approximate values for F_{∞}^{EU}, F_{∞}^{3}, F_{∞}^{0} and F_{MEY}. What are the corresponding number of vessels?



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

9 Multispecies and ecosystem harvesting

This chapter will introduce some important concepts and models being used in economic analysis of multispecies and ecosystem harvesting. We shall focus on predator-prey interactions that are a key to the understanding of more complex aquatic ecosystems and models of such systems.

A classic on multispecies management:

> *The amount of food for each species of course gives the extreme limit to which each can increase; but very frequently it is not the obtaining food, but the serving as prey to other animals which determines the average number of a species. Thus, there seems to be little doubt that the stock of partridges, grouse and hares on any large estate depends chiefly on the destruction of vermin. If not one head of game were shot during the next twenty years in England, and, at the same time, if no vermin were destroyed, there would, in all probability, be less game than at present, although hundreds of thousands of game animals are now annually shot.* (Darwin, 1882, pp. 53–54; quoted from Volterra, 1928, pp. 21–22).

9.1 Multispecies and ecosystem management

The purpose of this section is to introduce the reader to bioeconomic multispecies modelling and management. We shall do so by use of simple graphical analysis and examples from North Atlantic fisheries. The mathematical tool for deriving one of the key graphs is known to most students and will be used in the next section.

Each fish stock is a part of a greater ecosystem, interacting with its prey, predator and competitor species, in addition to being affected by other biological as well as physical conditions in the sea. A typical fish species targeted by man both consumes some species and serves as prey for others. Who eats whom may also vary on a temporal and spatial scale. For example, big adult fish may feed even on their own offspring in addition to prey where the individual fish is small. As the offspring grows bigger, individuals change from serving as feed to become predators on the next generation of offspring. Such cannibalistic behaviour is also an important part of many fish communities, including for cod (*Gadus morhua*) and herring (*Clupea harrengus*) in the North Atlantic. Marine ecosystems may be more or less complex and the number of commercially exploited species varies. In general, tropical systems seem to be richer in number of species than ecosystems in the temperate zones. For example, the Mekong river ecosystem has around 1400 species of fish and crustaceans whereas the Barents Sea ecosystem in the Northeast Atlantic has only a tenth of this.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Box 9.1 Hippopotamus management in the old Egypt

If we can trust the historic portrayal of the novel *River God* (Wilbur Smith, 1993) the old Egyptians managed actively their aquatic resources nearly 3800 years ago, in the 1790s BC under the reign of Queen Lostris.

The priests of Hapi had kept a strict count of the number of these great beasts in the lagoon, and had given sanction for fifty of them to be slaughtered for the coming festival of Osiris. This would leave almost three hundred of the goddess's flock remaining in the temple lagoon, a number that the priests considered ideal to keep the waterways free for choking weed, to prevent the papyrus beds from encroaching upon the arable lands and to provide a regular supply of meat for the temple. Only the priests themselves were allowed to eat the flesh of the hippopotamus outside the ten days of the festival of Osiris. "River God", p. 9.

Co-evolved species adapted to their environment may have complex dynamics that are difficult to fully comprehend. For biologists and other natural scientists there is hardly any limit to how much research is needed to describe and predict further development of each species, commercial or non-commercial, in its ecosystem. Nevertheless, for management of any single species or multispecies, objectives setting harvest quotas, limiting effort, collecting resource taxes and imposing technical restrictions are among the policy means available. A key question when it comes to ecosystem management is how much of the complex dynamics of nature do we have to know to manage those species we want to harvest or to protect from harvesting? Management costs are not negligible, in particular when it comes to ecosystem or multispecies research and management. For actual management, cost-benefit analysis of such approaches should be warranted.

9.1.1 Effort and stock levels

The main results of single species bioeconomic analyses are that the optimal level of fishing effort is less than the open-access level and that the optimal stock level is higher than the open-access level. These general results are valid whether the optimum is derived by maximising annual economic rent or the present value of all future rent. For static rent maximisation the main results of single species analysis are shown in Figure 9.1. Panels (a) and (b) show how the sustainable revenue and the total cost of harvesting vary with fishing effort and stock level, respectively. Generally speaking, the optimal level of fishing effort, E^*_{ss}, is less than the open access level, E^{oa}_{ss}, and the optimal stock level, X^*_{ss}, is higher than the open access level, X^{oa}_{ss}. These general results are valid whether the optimum is derived by maximising annual economic rent or the present value of rent.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com




Figure 9.1. Open access (OA) and optimal (*) effort (*E*) and stock level (*X*) in a single species (SS) model. Arrows indicate the most likely direction of change of optimal *E* and *X* if the stock is a prey or a predator, respectively.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

In single species models, the biological constraint to the optimisation problem is the yield-effort or yield-stock curves on which the revenue curves are based. Moving from single species to two species models, changes the biological constraint to, for example, the maximum sustainable yield frontier (MSF), shown in Figure 9.2. The MSF is derived (see the next sub-chapter, 9.2) by maximizing yield of species no.2 for a given yield of species no.1 when there are biological interactions between the two species. Maximising yield from each of the two species as if it were independent of the other, gives the combined yields at the point S in Figure 9.2. However, this is not a sustainable combination of yields since it is outside the MSF. Any point on or inside the MSF would be sustainable (see e.g. Flaaten, 1988 and 1991).

What combination of yield should be chosen depends in general on the management objective, as well as the price of fish and the harvest cost for each species.[25] In the biology literature, objectives for managing fish stocks are usually related to the maximum sustainable yield (MSY), yield per recruit (Y/R) or some related concepts. In cases of two or more biologically interdependent species, maximum sustainable yield frontiers (MSF) might replace the single-species MSY concept. However, the fallacy of biological management objectives is that they do not consider the economic benefits and costs of fisheries. Many fish stocks are deliberately not fished due to low market price and/or high catch cost. In the Barents Sea, for example, there are more than 100 fish species, but only about 10 are commercially targeted.




Figure 9.2. The maximum sustainable yield frontier (MSF) gives the maximum possible yield of one species for a given yield of the other.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Some international organisations and agreements have established their own objectives for fisheries management. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) formulated the following objective (see Box 4.1):

> *Recognizing that long-term sustainable use of fisheries resources is the overriding objective of conservation and management, states and subregional or regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements should, inter alia, adopt appropriate measures, based on the best scientific evidence available, which are designed to maintain or restore stocks at levels capable of producing maximum sustainable yield, as qualified by relevant environmental and economic factors, including the special requirements of developing countries.* (FAO, 1995.)

Thus, even though the FAO's Code of Conduct establishes the single-species concept, with maximum sustainable yield as the main management objective, it is qualified by relevant environmental and economic factors.

Contrary to the management objectives above, economic objectives are strongly related to social welfare theory that emphasises the net economic results to society of utilising natural resources. "Society" in this context usually means a country, but it could also mean a group of indigenous people, a region within a country, or a group of countries. The resource rent is the gross catch value minus the harvest costs. If stocks are jointly managed, the objective could be to maximise the combined resource rent, or the present value of all future rent from them. With respect to the effect that the relative net value of harvest has on the optimal combined harvesting, let us use two simplified examples to illustrate this. In both cases we assume that there are predator-prey interactions between the stocks and that they can be harvested independently of each other.

Example 1. Valuable predator and cheap prey

Let species 2 be a predator of high net value per unit harvest and species 1 a low net valued prey species. In this case the optimal combined yield is in the vicinity of B in figure 9.2 where the prey is mainly kept in the sea as feed for the predator. In this case the effort of the predator fishery does not have to be increased (much) compared with its single species effort shown in figure 9.1(a), whereas the effort of the prey fishery should be decreased. The effects on the stock levels are opposite to the effects on the effort levels.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Example 2. Predator of low net value and prey of high net value

If the predator is of low market value and/or expensive to harvest, its net value per unit harvest is low. Likewise, if the prey is of high market value and/or cheap to harvest its net value per unit harvest is high. In this case the optimal combined harvest is in the vicinity of A in figure 9.2 where the predator stock is fished down to leave more prey to be harvested by the fishermen. In some cases it even pays to subsidise the fishermen to harvest more predators than they otherwise would have done. In this case the optimal effort of the predator fishery should be increased and the stock level of the predator reduced compared with the single species case, as indicated by the arrows in figure 9.1.

Non-consumptive values of certain species of a marine ecosystem should also be included in a complete analysis, if such values are considered significant. The international discourse on, inter alia, whaling, sealing, dolphin by-catch and turtle excluder devices demonstrates the importance of integrating non-consumptive issues in the management objectives. Further analysis usually reveals the need for a trade-off between use (harvest) and non-use (protection) values, even more so when the non-use values are connected to top-predators that consume commercially valuable fish.



Click on the ad to read more
Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

9.1.2 Mixed catch and gear selectivity

In most fisheries catches consist of more than just the main targeted species. Mixed catches create other management problems in addition to the ones discussed above. This is especially the case when the catch consists of species of different size distribution and with different growth properties. The mixed catches of, inter alia, cod, haddock and whiting in the North Sea trawl fishery is an example of this. Figure 9.3 illustrates this problem. One particular type of gear may use either a small or a large mesh size in the net to catch two species simultaneously. The small mesh size gives MSF_A whereas the big mesh size gives MSF_B in figure 9.3.




Figure 9.3. The maximum sustainable yield frontier (MSF) in mixed fisheries may depend on the mesh size of the nets. A indicates MSF for small mesh size and B for big mesh size.

Species 1 may consist of plentiful small fish that easily escape gear with big meshes. Species 2 has fewer but bigger fish that are fished too young when small meshed nets are used. What combination of yield should be chosen depends in general on the management objective and on the ratio of cost of effort-price of fish between the two stocks. If the stocks are jointly managed, the objective could be to maximise the combined resource rent from them. Another solution would be to try to develop selective gear and fishing methods to avoid mixed fisheries.

After this brief and simple presentation of some results from bioeconomic single and multispecies theory, I will now give a few examples of modelling and management of North Atlantic fisheries and try to relate this to the theory.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

9.1.3 Examples from the North Atlantic

For many years, biologists and other scientists in the North Atlantic coastal states have undertaken research on marine multispecies interactions. There are also examples of bioeconomic multispecies analyses of fisheries in these areas (see, e.g., Eide and Flaaten, 1998). Russian and Norwegian researchers have conducted studies on "who eats whom" in the Barents Sea area and have modelled these multispecies interactions (see e.g. Rødseth, 1998). Two figures will give an example of why it may be important to also include economic aspects in multispecies modelling, instead of relying on biological reasoning only. Figure 9.4 shows the Northeast Atlantic cod's age-dependent average annual consumption of some commercially important prey species. Species included are shrimp, capelin, herring and cod (cannibalism) above 5, 10, 10 and 20 cm, respectively. The figures are in grams of prey per kg of cod, for each age class of cod from 1 to 7+ years. Figure 9.4 shows, for example, that 1 kg of two-year-old cod annually consumed 2000 grams of prey of these four species above the given size, and that about 75 per cent of this was capelin. For all age classes, capelin is the main prey among the species and size groups included in figure 9.4.




Figure 9.4. Arcto-Norwegian cod's age-dependent average annual consumption of some commercially important prey species. Species included are shrimp (*Pandalus borealis*), capelin (*Mallotus villosus*), herring (*Clupea harengus*) and cod (*Gadus morhua*) above 5, 10, 10 and 20 cm, respectively. In grams of prey per kg of cod, 1984–92. Calculations based on data from The Institute of Marine Research, Bergen.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com




Figure 9.5. Age-dependent average annual opportunity cost of Arcto-Norwegian cod's consumption of some commercially important prey species. Species included are shrimp (*Pandalus borealis*), capelin (*Mallotus villosus*), herring (*Clupea harengus*) and cod (*Gadus morhua*) above 5, 10, 10 and 20 cm, respectively. In NOK per kg of cod, in 1991–92 prices. Consumption data from 1984 to 1992. Sources: Calculations based on biological data from the Institute of Marine Research, Bergen, and economic data from The Directorate of Fisheries, Bergen.

LIGS University
based in Hawaii, USA
is currently enrolling in the Interactive Online BBA, MBA, MSc, DBA and PhD programs:
- enroll by October 31st, 2014 and
- save up to 11% on the tuition!
- pay in 10 installments / 2 years
- Interactive Online education
- visit www.ligsuniversity.com to find out more!

Note: LIGS University is not accredited by any nationally recognized accrediting agency listed by the US Secretary of Education.
More info here.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Taking the net opportunity cost of feed into consideration (see Flaaten and Kolsvik, 1995, for details) gives the results shown in figure 9.5. The net value of the prey is the net contribution that the fish in the sea could have given for the prey harvesters if they had less competition from the predator, the cod. The net value per unit of catch was found by Flaaten and Kolsvik (1995) to be 30 per cent of the quay-side price in these fisheries. In other words, if a predator eats fish that would have been worth € 1.00 at the quay, the fisher's net loss is only € 0.30 since he would have had to spend € 0.70, including labour costs, to catch the fish. Figure 9.5 shows, for example, that two-year-old cod had an annual feed cost of NOK 1.50 (€ 0.20) per kg of biomass, and that about 75 per cent of this was inflicted on the shrimp fisheries. Except for age class 7+, the opportunity cost of shrimp dominates the economic figures, whereas capelin dominated the biological results in figure 9.4.

The model MULTSPEC from the Institute of Marine Research (IMR), Bergen (see Tjelmeland and Bogstad, 1998) is a biological multispecies model for the Barents Sea fish/sea-mammal system. The MULTSPEC model includes cod, capelin, herring, minke whale (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*), harp seal (*Pagophilus groenlandicus*) and species of zooplankton. The ECONMULT model (see Eide and Flaaten, 1998) is a bioeconomic multifleet model to be used with more aggregated multispecies models than the very detailed MULTSPEC. MULTSIMP and AGGMULT are aggregated models (see Tjelmeland, 1990 and 1992; Eide and Flaaten, 1998). None of these models include shrimp, even though figures 9.4 and 9.5 indicate that shrimp should be included in the bioeconomic multispecies analysis of the Barents Sea fisheries.

9.1.4 Interactions of fish and sea mammals

Some species of whales and seals are important predators on fish in the North Atlantic. Icelandic, Norwegian and other scientists have for many years conducted research on the feeding ecology of whales and seals. Sigurjónsson and Vikingsson (1995) give an excellent review of much of the work done on whales, dolphins and porpoises in the area between Greenland, Iceland, Jan Mayen and the Faroe Islands until the mid 1990s (also see Sigurjónsson and Vikingsson, 1997). Their report also gives estimates, using two different methods, of annual consumption by these species in different parts of this area. On average, the consumption of commercially valuable fish is about 25 per cent of the total annual feed of whales. The total fish consumption exceeds 1.2 million tonnes per year in Icelandic and adjacent waters (mid 1990s). With regard to the implications for management of their results, Sigurjonsson and Vikingsson are careful with their conclusion:

> *The present analysis of consumption…is just one step towards a better understanding of the role of cetaceans in the marine ecosystem in these waters. The results show, however, that the amount of food consumed is substantial, while the implications of that conclusion require further study.* (Sigurjónsson and Vikingsson, 1995 p. 10).

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

For the Barents Sea and parts of the Norwegian Sea the paper by Schweder et al. (1998) investigates the effects on cod and herring fisheries of changing the target stock level of minke whales. Using a scenario modelling approach the biological model includes cod, herring, capelin and minke whales – with fish populations age and length distributed and minke whales age and sex distributed. The minke whale is an opportunistic forager that consumes plankton and other fish in addition to cod, herring and capelin. One of the findings is that a reduction of the minke whale stock from 72 per cent of carrying capacity to 60 per cent increases the annual catch of cod by some 100 thousand tonnes. This corresponds to an increase in the annual catch of cod by approximately 6 tonnes with a mean reduction in the whale stock of one animal. For herring no clear main effect was found on catch, due to the biological interactions between species and size groups. With respect to implications for fisheries management the authors conclude:

> *The results concerning the effects on the cod and herring fisheries must be taken as tentative since the ecosystem model used could be improved, and so could the strategies for managing the fisheries.* (Schweder et al., 1998 p. 77).

When it comes to predators like whales and seals, however, harvesting is often controversial, as the following quotation demonstrates:

> *An early exploration (of multispecies fisheries), May et al. (1979), has proved very influential, and now forms the basis for a very controversial piece of work, a bioeconomical analysis of the Barents Sea fishery by Flaaten (1988). Flaaten's work is controversial because of his conclusion that sea mammals should be heavily depleted to increase the surplus production of fish resources for man.* (Yodzis, 1994, p. 51.)

Harvesting is, however, not the only utility generated from sea mammals. It has long been acknowledged that non-use values included in the objective function may have implications for stock management. The following quotation demonstrates this:

> *It should, however, be stressed that this result* […*that the sea mammals should be heavily depleted to increase the surplus production of fish resources for man*…] *may be somewhat modified if the resource is assigned an optional value from people's willingness to pay for keeping the stock at higher level. A biological argument that also may weaken our result is the eventual existence of critical depensation for lower stock levels.* (Flaaten, 1988, p. 114.)

An alternative to comprehensive multispecies or ecosystem models is partial analysis. Flaaten and Stollery (1996) developed methods for the calculation of the net cost that predators inflicted upon the prey species fisheries. Applying one of the methods to the Northeast Atlantic stock of minke whales[26] predation of fish, we estimated the annual predation costs per minke whale, at 1991–92 prices, at between NOK 11,600 and NOK 15,100. This would amount to between approximately € 1950 and € 2550 per minke whale, using 2002 prices and exchange rates.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

9.1.5 An historical note

The examples I have given on multispecies modelling so far are all from the North Atlantic. The reason for this is simple – this is the area where I am working and that I know pretty well. There are, however, several examples of especially biological multispecies modelling of fisheries in other parts of the world. My final example is from the Mediterranean, and this is not just an ordinary example, but one of the most important ones in the history of multispecies modelling and management.

The first ever attempt, as far as I know, at conducting a multispecies analysis of fishing was by means of limit cycle models. Empirical studies of the Upper Adriatic Sea fisheries before, during and after the First World War found in D'Ancona (1926) were an important source of inspiration to the theoretical works by V. Volterra (1928) as demonstrated by this quotation:

TURN TO THE EXPERTS FOR
SUBSCRIPTION CONSULTANCY

Subscrybe is one of the leading companies in Europe when it comes to innovation and business development within subscription businesses.

We innovate new subscription business models or improve existing ones. We do business reviews of existing subscription businesses and we develope acquisition and retention strategies.

Learn more at linkedin.com/company/subscrybe or contact
Managing Director Morten Suhr Hansen at mha@subscrybe.dk

SUBSCRYBE - to the future

Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

> *Doctor UMBERTO D'ANCONA (D'Ancona, 1926) has many times spoken to me about the statistics which he was making in fishery in the period during the war and in periods before and after, asking me if it were possible to give a mathematical explanation of the results which he was getting in the percentages of the various species in these different periods. This request has spurred me to formulate the problem and solve it, establishing the laws which are set forth in § 7. Both D'Ancona and I working independently were equally satisfied in comparing results which were revealed to us separately by calculus and by observation, as these results were in accord; showing for instance that man in fisheries, by disturbing the natural condition of proportion of two species, one of which feeds upon the other, causes diminution in the quantity of the species that eats the other, and an increase in the species fed upon.* (Volterra, 1928, p. 4).

Based upon his empirical studies of the fisheries of the Upper Adriatic Sea, D'Ancona (1926) concluded that the predators of this sea, the sharks, ought to be decreased by increased harvest intensity. That would make it possible to increase the yields of more valuable prey stocks.

Hopefully, this section has shown that in some cases, at least, multispecies modelling is useful, if not necessary, for improved overall management. This is especially so when there are strong predator-prey or competitive biological interactions among species that can be harvested independently of each other. A biological multispecies model gives the biological restriction on the possible combinations of harvest rates for the species in a particular area. In addition, a bioeconomic multispecies model helps to pick the optimal combination of harvest rates. Multispecies models may also help understanding variations over time in catch and effort composition, as seen in the case of the Upper Adriatic Sea before, during and after the First World War.

9.2 More on predator-prey modelling

We shall in this section give a review of a two-species predator-prey model and derive its maximum sustainable yield frontier (MSF), analysed in May et al. (1979) and Flaaten (1988). Suppose there is a prey, W_1, on which the existence of a predator, W_2, is based. W_1 and W_2 can be thought of as biomasses. A simple model describing the dynamics of such a system is

$$\dot{W}_1 = dW_1/dt = r_1 W_1(1 - W_1/K) - aW_1W_2 \tag{9.1}$$

$$\dot{W}_2 = dW_2/dt = r_2 W_2(1 - W_2/\alpha W_1)\ , \tag{9.2}$$

where r_1 and r_2 are the intrinsic growth rates of the respective species. K is the carrying capacity of the total systems, at which the prey will settle in the case of no predator and no harvest.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

The per capita[27] growth rate of the prey decreases from r_1 for stock levels close to zero, to zero for stock levels equal to the carrying capacity in case of no predators. If predators exist, the per capita growth rate for the prey becomes zero for a stock level lower than its carrying capacity. The presence of predators reduces the per capita growth rate in proportion to the biomass of the predator. The predation coefficient, *a*, tells how much the per capita growth rate of the prey reduces per unit of the predator, or to put it another way, *a* tells which share of the prey stock one unit of the predator is consuming per unit of time. The total rate of consumption is expressed in the term of aW_1W_2. Note that the predator's consumption is similar to fishermen's harvest in the Schaefer harvest function discussed in Chapter 3.

The predator's per capita growth rate decreases from r_2 when its own stock level is close to zero, to zero for a stock level equal to its own carrying capacity, which is proportional to the level of the prey stock. The proportionality coefficient α is the equilibrium stock ratio.

Mathematical stability properties of the model (9.1)–(9.2) will not be discussed here. (It can be found in the literature of theoretical ecology, e.g., in Beddington and Cook (1982), May (1974) and May (1981), as well in mathematics texts for economists, e.g., Sydsæter et al. (2008).) However, it is easy to see, by letting $\dot{W}_1$ and $\dot{W}_2$ equal to zero in (9.1) and (9.2), that if an equilibrium point exists with both species being positive, the stock levels will be[28]

$$W_1 = \frac{K}{1+\nu}, \tag{9.3}$$

$$W_2 = \frac{\alpha K}{1+\nu}, \tag{9.4}$$

where $\nu = a\alpha K/r_1$.

It should be noticed that the intrinsic growth rate of the predator, r_2, does not affect the equilibrium values of either of the two species. The equilibrium values of both species increase with any increase in r_1 or K, ceteris paribus. From (9.3) and (9.4) it follows

$$W_2 / W_1 = \alpha . \tag{9.5}$$

The equilibrium stock ratio α determines the relative size of the predator stock to that of its prey, when there is no harvesting. Outside equilibrium the relative stock size differ from α except for along the predator isocline.

Even though r_2 does not affect the equilibrium values of the stocks, it is of importance to the behaviour of the system outside equilibrium. Defining the "natural return time", T^R, of the species as

$$T_i^R = 1/r_i \qquad i = 1,2 , \tag{9.6}$$

r_2 will affect the time the predator will need to reach equilibrium from a higher or lower level.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Suppose that the fish stocks are harvested independently with constant effort per unit of time, F_i, scaled such that $F_1 = 1$ corresponds to constant catchability coefficients equal to r_i. Then the catch rates will be

(9.7) $$h_1 = r_1 F_1 W_1$$

(9.8) $$h_2 = r_2 F_2 W_2 \ .$$

With harvesting introduced this will influence the growth rates in (9.1) and (9.2).

To simplify notation and the analysis a little we define the dimensionless stock levels $X_1=W_1/K$ and $X_2=W_2/\alpha K$. Then rewrite equations (9.1) and (9.2) as

(9.9) $$dX_1 / dt = r_1 X_1 (1 - F_1 - X_1 - \nu X_2)$$

(9.10) $$dX_2 / dt = r_2 X_2 (1 - F_2 - X_2 / X_1)$$

when harvesting, $y_1 = r_1 F_1 X_1$ and $y_2 = r_2 F_2 X_2$, is included. Here the dimensionless parameter ν is defined as $\nu = a\alpha K / r_1$.



Click on the ad to read more
Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

The equilibrium properties of this ecological system depend only on the fishing efforts, F_1 and F_2, and v. The dynamics additionally involve r_1 and r_2. The phase-diagram for the system (9.13)–(9.14) is shown in Figure 9.6. The isoclines are found by setting $dX_1/dt = 0$ and $dX_2/dt = 0$ in (9.9) and (9.10). This gives

$$X_2 = (1/\nu)(1 - F_1 - X_1) \qquad \text{for } dX_1/dt = 0 \tag{9.11}$$

$$X_2 = (1 - F_2)X_1 \qquad \text{for } dX_2/dt = 0\ . \tag{9.12}$$

If positive equilibrium values of X_1 and X_2 exist simultaneously they are found where the isoclines intersect, that is for

$$X_1 = \frac{1 - F_1}{1 + \nu(1 - F_2)} \tag{9.13}$$

$$X_2 = \frac{(1 - F_1)(1 - F_2)}{1 + \nu(1 - F_2)}\ . \tag{9.14}$$

X_1 and X_2 both equal $1/(1 + \nu)$ in the absence of fishing, and zero in the case of $F_1 = 1$. In addition, X_2 will equal zero if $F_2 = 1$. Thus there is a limit to how intensive fishing can be without causing extinction of the stocks. With fishing the relative stock size is $X_2 / X_1 = 1 - F_2$.




Figure 9.6. Phase diagram for a predator-prey model.

It is seen from (9.13) that only for $F_1 < 1$ will there exist a positive equilibrium value of the prey. If $F_1 \geq 1$ the prey-stock will be extinct, and so, of course, will be the predator, as seen from (9.14). The latter expression shows that only for $F_2 < 1$ and $F_1 < 1$ will the predator survive.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

The equilibrium values of both species increase with decreasing fishing pressure on the prey, i.e., for reduced F_1. More of the prey gives increased carrying capacity for the predator which can be kept on a higher level.

On the other hand, the effects on the prey and the predator from decreased fishing pressure on the predator are the opposite of each other. From (9.13) it is seen that the equilibrium value of the prey will decrease, and from (9.14) that the predator will increase. The increased stock level of the predator means heavier predation on the prey, and thereby a reduced equilibrium level for the latter.

Let us now investigate the MSF for this two-species model. It may be of interest from both a biological and an economical efficiency point of view to maximise the sustainable yield of one species for a specified constant sustainable yield level of the other. This problem is equivalent to that of welfare economics: deriving the production possibility frontier by maximising the output of one good for a specified amount of output of the other, for a fixed amount of factors of production. In the two-species biological system the limited amount of factors of production are embodied in the carrying capacity and the intrinsic growth rate of the model. In a marine ecosystem, the limited factor of production used for "production" of fish will usually be the zoo-plankton communities.

The problem of maximising

(9.15) $$y_1 = r_1 X_1 (1 - X_1 - \nu X_2)$$

subject to the constraint

(9.16) $$y_2 = r_2 X_2 (1 - X_2 / X_1) = \text{constant},$$

can be done by using the Lagrange method, as demonstrated in Beddington and May (1980).

The Lagrangian function of this problem is (also see Box 6.1)

(9.17) $$L(X_1, X_2) = r_1 X_1 (1 - X_1 - \nu X_2) - \lambda (r_2 X_2 (1 - X_2 / X_1) - y_2).$$

We shall use the first order conditions for the solution of the problem, and they are

(9.18) $$\frac{\partial L(X_1, X_2)}{\partial X_1} = r_1 - 2 r_1 X_1 - r_1 \nu X_2 - \frac{\lambda r_2 X_2^2}{X_1^2} = 0$$

(9.19) $$\frac{\partial L(X_1, X_2)}{\partial X_2} = -r_1 \nu X_1 - \lambda r_2 + \frac{2 \lambda r_2 X_2}{X_1} = 0 \ .$$

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

To eliminate λ we first rearrange equations (9.18) and (9.19) and get

$$\lambda = \frac{X_1^2(r_1 - 2r_1X_1 - r_1\nu X_2)}{r_2X_2^2} \tag{9.20}$$


$$\lambda = \frac{-r_1\nu X_1}{r_2(1-\frac{2X_2}{X_1})} \ . \tag{9.21}$$

From equations (9.20) and (9.21) we eliminate λ and derive the following quadratic equation:

$$2X_1^2 - (1+(4-\nu)X_2)X_1 + X_2(2-3\nu X_2) = 0 \ , \tag{9.22}$$

which has the following two solutions for X_1 for given values of X_2:

$$X_1^{1,2} = \frac{1}{4}(1+(4-\nu)X_2) \pm \frac{1}{4}\left[(1+(4-\nu)X_2)^2 - 8X_2(2-3\nu X_2)\right]^{1/2} \tag{9.23}$$



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

For each level of X_2 we calculate X_1 from (9.23), and the resulting yields, y_1 and y_2, are given by (9.15) and (9.16). The locus combining the yields of the two species is shown in figure 9.7 for $v = 2$. This is the maximum sustainable yield frontier (MSF), named so to emphasise the connections to the concepts used in welfare economics. MSF gives the absolute sustainable yield of either population for a specified yield of the other. All combinations of yields on or below this curve are sustainable, whereas yields to the northeast of the curve are possible for some period of time, but they are not sustainable. The star in the northeast corner corresponds to a combination of the largest possible yield of the prey and the largest possible yield of the predator, but such a combination of yields is definitely not sustainable.




Figure 9.7. The maximum sustainable yield frontier (MSF) of a two-species model shows sustainable combinations of yield of species 1 (SY_1) and species 2 (SY_2). Parameters used are $r_1 = 2.0$, $r_2 = 1.15$ and $v = 2.0$. Source: Flaaten (1988).

From the single species logistic growth model it is known that a given sustainable yield less than the maximum sustainable yield (MSY) can be harvested at two different stock levels, above or below the MSY level. These two ways of harvesting are called biological underexploitation and overexploitation, respectively. From a biological point of view the best way of harvesting is to harvest the MSY, whereas the economical optimal yield stock level, also depend on product price, harvesting cost and discount rate in addition to biological factors.

Unit harvesting cost is usually assumed to be a decreasing function of stock level, leading to the conclusion that the resource should be biologically underexploited to reduce costs. On the other hand, a positive discount rate leads to the conclusion that the resource should be heavily exploited since a given amount of net revenue "today" is preferred to the same amount "tomorrow". In other words, from an economic point of view, harvesting below, at or above the MSY stock level can all be optimal; it is a question of prices, costs and discount rates (see Chapter 4).

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

The smallest of the two solutions of equation (9.23) corresponds to a biologically inefficient harvest level, either underexploitation of the predator, or overexploitation of the prey. In the former case the predator is kept on the highest stock level of two possible ones, both giving the same sustainable yield of the predator. A higher predator stock means more consumption of the prey, thereby removing a potential prey yield. To achieve the highest possible sustainable yield of the prey for a given predator yield it is therefore obviously best to underexploit the predator. For similar reasons it is efficient to underexploit the prey to give more food to the predator. MSF harvesting thus means that the predator shall not be underexploited, and neither shall the prey be overexploited.

The terminal points of the MSF locus in figure 9.7, A and B, are related to specific stock levels of the predator and the prey. At point A the predator is extinct and the prey is at its single species biological optimum level:

(9.24) $$X_1|_{X_2=y_2=0} = 1/2 \ .$$

The absolute maximum sustainable yield of the predator, at point B in figure 9.7, occurs for an unharvested prey stock above, at or below its single species biological optimum, depending on the size of the dimensionless combination of parameters, v. The smaller v is, the higher will be the prey stock level. In fact it can be shown that

(9.25) $$X_1|_{F_1=y_1=0} \gtreqless 1/2 \qquad \text{if} \qquad v \lesseqgtr 3 .$$

At point B in Figure 9.7 there is no prey harvest and this entire species is left in the sea as natural feed for the predator.

From the definition of v we know that it will be smaller the lower the predation coefficient a and the equilibrium stock ratio α. In other words, the maximum stock level of the prey is greater the lower the predator pressure, which is in accordance with the quotation from Charles Darwin at the beginning of this chapter.

The maximum sustainable yield frontier (MSF) in Figure 9.7 pinpoints a key management issue for the case of multispecies harvesting. Should we aim at harvesting mainly then predator species and leave the prey in the sea as feed for the predators? Or should we mainly aim at harvesting the prey, by fishing down the predators? The latter would imply biological overfishing of the predator. Such questions are important in many of the world's fisheries, including the krill-sea mammals system in the Antarctica, the fish-fish-sea mammals system in the Northeast Atlantic and the fish-sea mammals system in the North Pacific. When it comes to in particular sea mammals the issue of non-consumptive value of charismatic species brings an additional dimension into management that we have not explored in this chapter (see e.g. Bulte and Von Kooten, 1999).

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Exercise 9.1

1) Assume the following two species interaction:

$$\frac{dX_1}{dt} = r_1 X_1 \left(1 - \frac{X_1}{K}\right)$$

$$\frac{dX_2}{dt} = r_2 X_2 \left(1 - \frac{X_2}{aX_1}\right)$$

a) Formulate a simple predator–prey model (put in missing segments in the above equations) with harvesting, and draw the isoclines in a phase plane diagram.

b) Explain what happens to stock levels and harvest when the harvest of the predator is increased.

c) Explain how you would manage this fishery if the predator has no value in the market.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

10 Recreational fishing

This chapter discusses recreational fishing, where people (consumers) are willing to pay to go fishing. The willingness to pay may depend on several environmental and resource characteristics. We focus on the demand for fishing days and quality and analyse the open-access, the competitive and the social optimal recreational fishery.

10.1 Recreational angling

Recreational fishing is fishing for fun. The view of what is fun in life differs from person to person, and some people do not think fishing is fun at all. Thus there are at the same time and in the same country some who participate in recreational fishing and some who do not. The fun usually depends on several characteristics of the fishing itself and on other amenities. The size of individual fish, the size of the catch per day fishing, the fishing process itself, the fish species available and the natural scenery at the fishing spot are among the characteristics recreational fishermen consider when contemplating whether to go fishing or not. Travel time and out-of-pocket costs matter. Of course income and the cost of fishing also matter for the demand for recreational fishing as for other goods and services, and we may, at the market level, analyse this good as we do for other goods. However, at the individual level the recreational fishing good is often a discrete good that is available only in integer units, for example when you have to buy fishing permits only for full days' fishing (e.g. $/day).

Other terms used for recreational fishing include sport fishing and hobby fishing. We shall, however, use recreational fishing and distinguish this from the commercial fishing and small-scale fishing discussed in the previous parts of this book, where the market value of the catch is balanced against the costs of the commercial firm or the opportunity costs of the small-scale fisherman. A person who takes part in recreational fishing will in this chapter be called an angler, since in most cases recreational fishing is conducted by use of hook and line. To fish for fun requires that people have earned income in other activities to spend on goods and services, including on recreational fishing. In actual cases we may find fishermen who combine recreational fishing with subsistence fishing to gain food for the household and/or small-scale commercial fishing to obtain cash. Here, however, we shall focus on recreational fishing proper.

From an economic point of view recreational fisheries may be treated as any other good that gives utility for the consumers and resource owners. However, the fish in the water is a common pool resource implying that any catch of one recreational fisherman has an effect on the stock, thereby reducing the harvest potential for the other recreational fishermen. In this respect recreational fisheries share the externalities characteristic of the commercial fisheries discussed in the previous chapters. Consumers choose to buy or not to buy a good, and if they buy they also have to decide on the quantity. Thus, for recreational fishing as a consumer good, we may ask who the fishermen are, what species and how much they catch, how they catch (gear type), where they go fishing and at what time or season.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Why should we from an economic point of view be interested in recreational fisheries? Is this not just a minor hobby activity for a few people? Like fisheries discussed in the previous chapters, also recreational fisheries demonstrate externalities. These require management for at least three reasons. First, recreational fishing is a popular activity that gives fun, pleasure and exercise to lots of people. Globally recreational fisheries are a big and still increasing part of fisheries. In some countries they are even bigger than the commercial fisheries sector if we compare expenditures in recreational fisheries with the landing value in the commercial sector (see articles in Aas, 2008). In a recent survey of seven developed countries' recreational fisheries, participation rates varied from five (Germany) to fifty-five (Lithuania) per cent of the total population. Finland and Sweden both had a participation rate of more than thirty per cent (Ditton, 2008). Considering that some people are too young or too old to go fishing, these numbers indicate that recreational fishing is a widespread spare-time activity. Of course some people fish only once a year, but others fish regularly. Second, in some areas there are increasing conflicts between commercial and recreational fishing. As the commercial sector is more and more restricted in its activities, it is also natural to look into recreational fishing and its effects on resources in the commercial sector to minimize conflicts and to increase the total social benefits from the natural resource. Third, if a tourist industry develops based on recreational fisheries' guests we may have a commercial fisheries sector and a tourist sector competing for the same fish and fishing grounds.

10.2 Short-run analysis

In the short run we may neglect possible effects on the fish resource from anglers. However, in the long run such effects have to be included if the anglers' catch is of some importance compared with the size of the fish stock and its growth potential. Let us start with the simplest task – the short-run analysis of recreational fishing.

Assume that the demand for recreational fishing, measured by days of fishing, D, depends on:

- The price of the fishing permit (money per day of fishing, *$/D*)
- The quality of fishing, defined as the quantity of fish per day of fishing (*Q=kg/D*)
- The income and prices of alternative goods, assumed to be constant
- Recreational fishing being a normal good (demand increases with income)
- Utility maximization of a representative consumer
- A fish stock that is limited in size and potential yield – in other words, a scarce resource

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

We have a recreational fisheries sector with several resource firms and a competitive numeraire sector comprising the remaining economy. All in all there are n recreational fishermen (consumers), each with a utility function that is separable and linear in the numeraire good. Thus there are no income effects in the recreational fisheries and we can perform a partial equilibrium analysis. We shall analyse and compare competitive open access with a profit-maximizing resource owner. In some recreational fisheries the resource is limited to that of a lake or a river. This entity may be unique in the sense that recreational fishers' willingness to pay for fishing is different from for fishing in nearby lakes and rivers. In other cases a lake is a lake and a river is a river from the recreational anglers' point of view.

The variables we are going to use are shown in Table 10.1.

This e-book
is made with
SetaPDF
SETASIGN

PDF components for PHP developers
www.setasign.com

Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Symbol	Definition	Unit (*)	Value (for Exercise 10.1)
	Exogenous:		
r	Maximum (intrinsic) growth rate	$Year^{-1}$	0.5
K	Carrying capacity	Kg	$4*10^3$
q	Catchability coefficient of the angler fishery	Kg/day^2	$4*10^{-5}$
α	Constant of the linear demand function	$/day	99.0
β	Slope of the linear demand function (the marginal willingness to pay for an angler day)	$/day^2	$3.125*10^{-3}$
γ	Quality constant of the linear demand function (the marginal willingness to pay for quality)	$/kg	6.25
c	Constant marginal cost of issuing permits	$/day	20.0
	Endogenous:		
X	The fish stock level	Kg	
H	Total catch per year (**)	Kg/year	
D	Total number of permits (angler days) per year	Days	
Q	Quality of fishing (catch per angler day)	Kg/day	
P	Price per angler day (price per permit)	$/day	
d	Number of permits per representative consumer	Days	
n	Number of anglers (consumers)	Number	

Table 10.1. Variables in the recreational fishery analysis
(*) One day means one angler day, which is one angler who fishes for one day.
(**) One year consists of a given number of days' angling.

In the previous chapters we have mainly worked with a constant price of fish to simplify the analysis, but without loosing track of the main bioeconomic issues. For the recreational fishery, however, we shall revert to the downward sloping demand curve, so well known from the micro economic theory. In general there are several possibilities for demand functions, including linear demand and constant elasticity demand. We shall stick to the former[29] and derive, from the consumer's utility-maximizing behaviour, the following linear inverse demand function:

$$p = p(D,Q) = \alpha - \beta D + \gamma Q, \text{ for } Q>Q^0 \tag{10.1}$$

where Q^0 is the lowest fishing quality that attracts anglers to this particular fishery. The parameters α, β and γ are all positive. The inverse demand for recreational fishing is downward sloping in the number of fishing days and is positively affected by an increase in the quality of the fishing. Quality by definition depends on the catch rate, the catch per angler day. To simplify we now assume that quality equals the catch per angler day, which is $Q=H/D$. In this case γ expresses the marginal willingness to pay for catch per angler day and β expresses the marginal willingness to pay for an angler day.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com




Figure 10.1. Demand and supply of angler days, short run

Figure 10.1 shows the downward sloping demand curves for two levels of quality, Q^1 and Q^2 with $Q^1<Q^2$. In this case the anglers' demand curves represent inverse demand for daily fishing permits for the given quality levels. With the quality of fishing equal to the catch per angler day, for the price p^*, the anglers want to purchase D^* permits if the quality equals Q^1, and D^{**} permits if the quality equals Q^2. For this price p^* the consumer surplus corresponds to the triangle CBA for the low quality and the triangle CFG for the high quality Q^2. There is no producer surplus in this case with the horizontal supply curve. Note that the demand curves in Figure 10.1 are for the short run when we neglect that the stock level is negatively affected by the recreational fishery.

The supply curve of angler permits reflects the aggregate marginal cost of issuing and handling permits and in Figure 10.1 this is drawn as a horizontal line at p^*. This means that the total cost of producing permits equals $C(D)=cD$, where c is the cost per permit. The marginal cost of permits is $C'(D)=c$. In other words the average and the marginal costs of issuing permits are the same. In a competitive market for fishing permits, as illustrated in this figure, the equilibrium price is limited from the cost side since $p=c$. We now easily derive the competitive number of angler days, $D^* = \frac{\alpha + \gamma Q - c}{\beta}$, for quality Q^1 and D^{**} for quality Q^2, where $D^*<D^{**}$. Thus the number of angler days at equilibrium increases with the quality of the recreational fishery and decreases with the cost of producing permits. The anglers' perception of quality is reflected in γ, implying that the competitive number of angler days increases with their marginal willingness to pay for quality. In this case with a linear demand curve there is a limit to how many days the anglers would like to go fishing, to be found where the demand curves intersect the horizontal axis, for $p=0$ in Figure 10.1.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

In most countries recreational sea fishing is free of charge, but still the number of angler days is not infinitely large (see the case studies in Aas, 2008). To go fishing the angler will usually have to travel to the port, have suitable fishing gear and own or rent a boat – all costly activities. Thus the private costs of recreational fishing may set a limit to how many people actually go fishing, even if the fishery is free. However, as we have seen in the previous chapters, the harvest affects the fish stock to a greater or lesser extent, depending on the amount of effort targeting the resource. In the case of recreational fishing the total effort, equal to D above, equals the number of anglers times the average number of fishing days and it may well be that this significantly affects the resource. So far we have not included this important issue in the analysis. In some fisheries, for example in rivers and creeks, free access could easily cause heavy biological overfishing and also the extinction of fish stocks. We shall return to the resource issue below.

In the case of inland fisheries, in lakes and rivers, there usually exists some kind of private property where fishing rights are owned, or controlled, by landowners, farmers or local commons bodies (again, see Aas, 2008). In such cases the rights owner can achieve more than discussed above where the competitive solution did not generate any producer surplus, but only consumer surplus. Assuming that there is a unique source of fishing the willingness to pay is taken care of by a downward sloping demand curve as in Figure 10.1. For a given quality Q the total profit for the resource owner is

$$\pi(D,Q) = p(D,Q)D - c(D) = \alpha D - \beta D^2 + \gamma QD - cD. \tag{10.2}$$



Deloitte.

Discover the truth at www.deloitte.ca/careers

© Deloitte & Touche LLP and affiliated entities.

Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Maximizing π with respect to D, treating the quality, Q, as given, implies that the resource owner should strive for a solution where the marginal revenue equals the marginal cost, as we know from the theory of the monopoly. With the profit function (10.2) this implies that

(10.3) $$\alpha + \gamma Q - 2\beta D = c,$$

and the resource owner aims at $D^M = \frac{\alpha + \gamma Q - c}{2\beta}$ angler days by selling this number of licenses. Note that D^M is smaller than the competitive number of angler days, D^2, discussed above for quality Q^2. In fact with linear demand the resource owner should, to maximize his profit, aim at only half of the competitive number of angler days where anglers pay only the costs of supplying the permits. This is demonstrated in Figure 10.2. The consumer surplus is now reduced from the triangle CFN to the triangle LMN, whereas the producer surplus is increased from zero to the square CNML. This means that the social surplus is reduced by the triangle NFM.

As explained above the analysis related to Figure 10.1 and Figure 10.2 excludes any effect the anglers' fishing might have on the resources. Is this a realistic analysis? Well, in some cases it may be sufficient not to include the resource in discussing recreational fisheries management. For example, if anglers just exploit the fringes of a big fish resource, which is mainly utilized by commercial fishermen, and they do this in one or a few scenic localities, their demand is really for the joint amenities and fish resource. If each locality has something unique to offer anglers, who differ in preferences, there may be a separate demand curve for each of them. In such cases the proper quality of the recreational fishery is determined by the commercial fishery, through its fishing pressure and effect on the stock. However, local communities or landowners may exert some market power and make money from the anglers' willingness to pay for the joint product of fishing and terrestrial amenity.




Figure 10.2. The sole owner's adaptation

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

10.3 Long-run analysis

How can we include in a simple way the stock and the fishing pressure in the analysis of recreational fisheries, knowing that in some actual fisheries this is an issue of interest? The demand curves in Figures 10.1 and 10.2 are downward sloping in angler days, D, for a given quality of the fishery, measured by Q. The more angler days, the more the stock will be negatively affected and the quality of the fishing reduced via the average catch per angler day, Q. Thus in the long run the demand curve will shift inward, instead of staying constant as we assumed for the short-run analysis in the two figures discussed above. This is demonstrated in Figure 10.3 where the uppermost curve corresponds to the demand curve for the constant Q^2 and the lowermost curve is the resource adjusted demand curve that we have to consider in a long-run analysis. The latter reflects that for each level of angler days there exists a long-run equilibrium level for the fish stock and this stock level determines the catch per angler day, the recreational fishery quality *Q*. How much the long-run demand curve differs from the short-run curve depends on the biological productivity and on the anglers' efficiency and willingness to pay for quality. Let us have a closer look at this by including an explicit growth model in the analysis. To make it simple we shall use a familiar growth model, the logistic growth used extensively in Chapter 5 in the Gordon–Schaefer model.[30]

The growth function is $\dot{X} = rX(1-\frac{X}{K})$, with X as the fish stock level, *r* is the intrinsic growth rate and *K* is the carrying capacity for the stock. The angler harvest function is *H=qDX*, where *q* is the catchability constant and, recalling the analysis of the Gordon–Schaefer model in Chapter 5, we have (see equations 5.2–5.7) that the long-run productivity will vary with the number of angler days in this way:

$$Q = Q(D) = \frac{H}{D} = qK(1-\frac{qD}{r}), \tag{10.4}$$

assuming that angling is the only type of fishing occurring.[31] The angler harvest function in (10.4) corresponds to the long-run harvest function *H(E)* used extensively previously, including in Chapters 3 and 5. Substituting for *Q* from (10.4) into (10.1) gives

$$P(D) = \alpha - \beta D + \gamma qK(1-\frac{q}{r}D) = a - bD, \tag{10.5}$$

where $a = \alpha + \gamma qK$ and $b = \beta + \frac{\gamma qK}{r/q}$. Thus the resource adjusted angler demand curve, in (10.5), shown in Figure 10.3, is steeper than the short-run demand curve in (10.1), since $b>\beta$, but also this curve is linear in the angler days, *D*. The resource adjusted demand curve is corrected for the resource effect of angling, which is the negative effect angling has on the stock and on the catch per angler day. These effects can not be neglected in the "long" run.

The student should now complete exercise 10.1.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

In Figure 10.3 the short-run demand curve has the negative slope β and the resource adjusted demand curve has the steeper negative slope b. The difference between the two slopes increases with the anglers' willingness to pay for fishing quality (measured by γ) and with the angling productivity, which equals the catchability constant q. The biological characteristics of the stock, represented by r and K, also affect the resource adjusted demand curve, as seen from equation (10.5). The willingness to pay for an angling day, $P(D)$, is higher the more productive the resource is, measured by r and K.




Figure 10.3. The resource adjusted angler demand curve and the short-run demand curve. The latter is shown for $Q=qK$ implying that in this special case the intersection point on the vertical axis is the same for all three curves.



Click on the ad to read more
Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

What we called the competitive solution in Figure 10.2, for D^{**} with permit price P^{*} is not a sustainable solution. It is not a bioeconomic equilibrium since the limits of the fish stock production are excluded from the analysis. Thus the resource adjusted demand curve implies that D_L in Figure 10.3 is the maximum number of permits that could be issued at the price P^{*}. For D_L there will be equilibrium in both the market for permits and in the sea for the stock. We may call this the competitive angling equilibrium.

If the owner of the angling resource maximizes the net value of the fishery, the number of angling permits should be reduced to D_L^M in Figure 10.3, based on the same reasoning as we used in Figure 10.2. With D_L^M permits the market price will be P_L^M, which is considerably higher than P*. Note that the surplus of the resource owner, equal to the square CNML in Figure 10.3, is smaller than the corresponding surplus in Figure 10.2. The important difference between the two is that only that of Figure 10.3 is sustainable. From this we conclude that if the anglers of a recreational fishery affect the resource this effect must be taken into account when considering the number of permits that should be issued.

We commenced this chapter by defining recreational fishing as fishing for fun, and continued by including days of fishing and quality as two major variables in the analysis. As the indicator for quality we chose catch per day of fishing and demonstrated that this is affected by the activities of the anglers. This way the recreational fishery can be analysed within the framework of bioeconomic modelling, now well known from the previous chapters. Our analysis includes the basics that distinguish recreational fisheries from commercial fisheries. However, recreational fisheries around the world vary in the type of natural resources, property and user rights and the way these fisheries are governed (many examples are given in Aas, 2008). Compared with our model above, one type of difference has to do with the biology of the targeted fish stock. For example, in salmon fisheries in the North Atlantic the majority of fish die after spawning and the stock growth function is skewed to the left with the maximum sustainable yield at a lower stock level than half of the carrying capacity (see Olaussen and Skonhoft, 2008). Another type of difference has to do with the utility function of the anglers. Some consumers may prefer tranquillity, with their utility being negatively affected by the number of anglers and angler days. If their willingness to pay for this is sufficiently high some resource owners, for example of salmon rivers, may find it profitable to market their services to the high-paying few rather than to the mass market. This seems in particular to be the case if the average size of the fish matters and not just the weight of the catch – the angling market value of fishing a ten kg salmon may be much higher than the aggregated value of ten salmon or trout of one kg each. In a survey of Norwegian rivers, 92 per cent of sport fishermen reported that the quality of the river in terms of the average catch per day was important. In addition, 72 per cent reported that the price of fishing permits was important (Fiske and Aas, 2001, quoted from Olaussen and Skonhoft, 2008). The issues mentioned here, and several others, have been discussed in the literature (see e.g. McConnell and Sutinen, 1979; Bishop and Samples, 1980; Anderson, 1983 and 1993; Rudd et al., 2002; not to forget two major books, Pitcher and Hollingworth, 2002 and Aas, 2008).

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

There is a great variation around the world in institutional arrangements regarding property rights and governance for the resources in recreational fisheries. This is partly reflected in the many ways recreational fisheries are managed. We have analysed the case of trade in fishing permits per angler day. Related measures could be to combine this with other measures, such as free or inexpensive access for members of a local commons and auction to the highest bidder of some fishing days, if the river or lake is owned in common by a community. Output control could also be used, for example a bag limit on the size of catch per angler per day. In addition to the permit price anglers might have to pay a fee per fish or per kg of fish. A more controversial way of limiting the catch is to use the catch and release method. If for example the stock consists of few big spawners that are necessary for the long-run sustainability of the fishery the anglers might have to release such fish into the water immediately after catching them. This may be controversial mainly for two reasons: first, uncertainty about the survival rate of the released fish; second, some people do not like the idea of having fish nearly killed just for the pleasure of man, even though hunting and fishing have for thousands of years given pleasure, food and money to people. Recreational fisheries management remains to be just as rich and complex, if not more, in theory and actual cases to give pleasure and challenges to generations to come of students and researchers.

Exercise 10.1

The demand for angler days in a recreational fishery can be described with the linear inverse demand function in equation (10.1). This recreational fishery is regulated by the use of angler day permits. In the short run the harvest depends on the number of angler days and the stock level, and we assume this is according to the Schaefer harvest function $H=qDX$, with the definition of symbols given above in this chapter. The growth of the stock follows the logistic growth law (see Chapter 5) and the long run equilibrium harvest equals the growth, $H(X) = rX(1-\frac{X}{K})$. By use of the variables and values in Table 10.1, answer the following questions:

1. Draw a figure of the short-run demand curves for Q_1=0.06 and Q_2=0.15 (see equation (10.1).
2. Derive the long-run average catch per angler day, which is an indicator Q of the quality of the fishery (tip: see Chapter 5, equations (5.2)–(5.7), in particular the catch per unit of effort equation).
3. Derive the long-run demand function (price as a function of angler days), first by use of symbols, then plot this demand curve into your figure with the two short-run demand curves.
4. Give a verbal explanation of why there is a difference in the slope of the short-run and long-run demand curves for angler day permits.
5. Prove and explain why the long-run and short-run demand curves intersect the P axis at the same point for $Q=qK$.
6. What is the competitive(long-run equilibrium) number of permits if the constant marginal cost of issuing permits is $c=10.0$ \$/permit?
7. What is the maximum value of the quality indicator, $Q=Q_{max}$?

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

References

Aas, Ø. (Ed.) (2008): *Global challenges in recreational fisheries*. Blackwell, Oxford.

Andersen, P. (1982): Commercial fisheries under price uncertainty. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 9, 11–28.

Anderson, L.G. (1983): The demand curve for recreational fishing with an application to stock enhancement activities. *Land Economics* 59(3), 279–287.

Anderson, L.G. (1986): *The Economics of Fisheries Management*. Johns Hopkins, London.

Anderson, L.G. (1993): Toward a complete economic theory of the utilisation and management of recreational fisheries. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 24: 272–295.

Armstrong, C.W. (2007). A note on the ecological–economic modelling of marine reserves in fisheries. *Ecological Economics* 62 (2), 242–250.

Baranov, F.I. (1918): On the question of the biological basis of fisheries. Nauchnyi issledovatelskii ikhtiologicheskii Institut, *Izvestiia,* 1(1), 81–128.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Beddington, J.R. and R.M. May (1980): Maximum sustainable yields in systems subject to harvesting at more than one trophic level. *Mathematical Biosciences* 51, 261–281.

Béné C, B. Hersoug and E.H. Allison (2010). Not by rent alone: Analysing the pro-poor functions of small-scale fisheries in developing countries. *Development Policy Review* 28: 325–358.

Berck, P. and K. Sydsæter (1991): *Economists' Mathematical Manual.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

Beverton, R.J.H. and S.J. Holt (1957): On the dynamics of exploited fish populations. Her Majesty's Stationery Office, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. *Fishery Investigations,* Ser. II, Vol. XIX. London.

Bishop, R.C. and K.C. Sample (1980): Sport and commercial fishing conflicts. A theoretical analysis. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 7, 220–233.

Bjørndal, T. (1987): Production economics and optimal stock size in a North Atlantic fishery. *Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 89, 145–164.

Bohm, P. (1988): *Samhällsekonomisk effektivitet*. SNS Förlag, Stockholm.

Budsjettnemda (1992): Lønnsomhetsundersøkelser for fiskefartøyer 13 m l.l. og over. Fiskeridirektoratet, Bergen.

Caddy, J.F. and R. Mahon (1995): Reference points for fishery management. Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations (FAO), Rome.

Clark, C.W. (1990): *Mathematical bioeconomics: the optimal management of renewable resources.* 2nd edition, John Wiley & Sons, New York (1st edn. 1976; 3rd edn. 2010). A comprehensive key classical text on fisheries economics for students with a good background in mathematics, including dynamic optimization.

Clark, C.W. and G.R. Munro (1975): Economies of fishing and modern capital theory: a simplified approach, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management,* 2, 92–106. This often quoted article analyses in a stringent form the investment issues in fisheries management.

Conrad J.M. (1999) The bioeconomics of marine sanctuaries. *Journal of Bioeconomics,* 1: 205–217.

Copes, P. (1970): The backward-bending supply curve of the fishing industry. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy,* 17, 69–74.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Copes, P. (1972): Factor rents, sole ownership and the optimum level of fisheries exploitation. *The Manchester School of Social and Economic Studies,* 40, 145–163.

D'Ancona, U. (1926): Dell' influenza della stasi pescherecchia del periodo 1914–18 sul patrimonio ittico dell' Alto Adriatico. (On the influence on the fishstocks in the Upper Adriatic Sea from the abolition of harvesting in the period 1914–18). Memoria CXXVI, of R. Comitato Talassografico Italiano.

Darwin, C. (1882): *The origin of species by means of natural selection, or the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life.* 6th edn., with corrections to 1871. John Murray, London.

Ditton (2008): In Aas, Ø. (Ed.) *Global challenges in recreational fisheries*. Blackwell, Oxford.

Dupont, D.P. (1990). Rent dissipation in restricted access fisheries. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 19(1) 26–44.

Duy, N.N., O. Flaaten, T.N. Kim Anh and K.N.T. Ngoc (2010): On the economic performance and efficiency of offshore gillnet vessels in Nha Trang, Vietnam. In The Proceedings of the International Institute of Fisheries Economics and Trade (IIFET) conference July, 2010, Montpellier, France.

Eide, A. and O. Flaaten (1998): Bioeconomic multispecies models of the Barents Sea fisheries. In Rødseth, T. (ed.), *Models for Multispecies Management,* pp. 141–172. Physica-Verlag, Heidelberg and New York.

Eide, A., F. Skjold, F. Olsen and O. Flaaten (2003): Harvest functions: the Norwegian bottom trawl cod fisheries. *Marine Resource Economics* 18, 81–93.

FAO (1995): Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries. Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations, Rome. The internationally approved compromise text on most issues of fisheries management.

FAO (2010): The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture (SOFIA). Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations, Rome.

Flaaten, O. (1988): The economics of multispecies harvesting – theory and application to the Barents Sea fisheries. *Studies in Contemporary Economics.* Berlin – Tokyo. Springer-Verlag.

Flaaten, O. (1991): Bioeconomics of sustainable harvest of competing species. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 20, 163–180.

Flaaten O. (2010). Fisheries rent creation and distribution – the imaginary case of Codland. *Marine Policy* 34: 1268–1272.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Flaaten O. (2013). Institutional quality and catch performance of fishing nations. *Marine Policy* 38: 267–276.

Flaaten, O. and E. Kolsvik (1995): On the optimal harvesting of a wild population when the opportunity cost of feed is considered. Paper presented at the annual conference of the European Association of Environmental and Resource Economists, June 1995, Umeå, Sweden. The Norwegian College of Fishery Science, Tromsö.

Flaaten, O. and K. Stollery (1996): The economic costs of biological predation – theory and application to the case of the Northeast Atlantic minke whale's (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*) consumption of fish. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 8, 75–95.

Flaaten, O., A.G.V. Salvanes, T. Schweder and Ö. Ulltang (1998): Objectives and uncertainties in fisheries management with emphasis on three North Atlantic ecosystems. *Fisheries Research* 37(1–3), 1–310 (Guest Editors – Special Issue).

Gordon, H.S. (1954): The economic theory of a common property resource: the fishery. *Journal of Political Economy* 62, 124–142.

Grafton, Q.R., T. Kompas and V. Schneider (2005) The bioeconomics of marine reserves: a selected review with policy implications. *Journal of Bioeconomics* 7:161–178.



Click on the ad to read more
Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Haddon, M. (2001): *Modelling and quantitative methods in fisheries.* Chapman and Hall, Boca Raton, Florida.

Hagen, K.P. and A. Sandmo (1983): *Kalkulasjonsrente og prosjektvurdering.* Universitetsforlaget, Oslo, Bergen and Tromsø.

Hamre, J. (1986): Fiskebestander i norske farvann. Naturgrunnlag og beskatning. Universitetet i Tromsø, Norges fiskerihøgskole. Serie B: Ressursbiologi. no. 2.

Hannesson, R. (1978): *Economics of fisheries.* Universitetsforlaget, Oslo.

Hannesson, R. (1993). *Bioeconomic analysis of fisheries*. Fishing News, Oxford

Hannesson R. (1998). Marine reserves: What would they accomplish? *Marine Resource Economics,* 13: 159–170.

Hardin, G. (1968): The tragedy of the commons. *Science* 162, 16–30.

Havets ressurser og miljø (2015): Havets ressurser og miljø, Havforskningsinstituttet, Bergen.

Holland, D.S. and R.J. Brazee (1996) Marine reserves for fisheries management. *Marine Resource Economics* 11:157–171.

Jakobsen, T. (1992): Biological reference points for North-east Arctic cod and haddock. *ICES Journal of Marine Science,* 49, 155–166.

Jensen, F. and N. Vestergaard (2002). Moral hazard problems in fisheries regulation: the case of illegal landings and discard. Resource and Energy Economics 24(4) 281–299.

Jensen, F. (2008): Uncertainty and asymmetric information: An overview. *Marine Policy* 32: 89–103.

Jentoft, S. (1989): Fisheries co-management: Delegating government responsibility to fishermen's organizations. *Marine Policy,* 3, 137–154.

Johansen, L. (1968): Production functions and the concept of capacity. In: *Recherches récentes sur la fonction de production.* Centre d'Etudes et de la Recherche Universitaire de Namur, Namur.

Johansen, L. (1972). Production functions – an integration of micro and macro, short run and long run aspects. North-Holland, Amsterdam.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Kristmannsson, S. (1985): Norsk vårgytende sild – en bioøkonomisk analyse av fremtidig ressursforvaltning. Fiskeriteknologisk forskningsinstitutt, Tromsø.

Long L.K., O. Flaaten and N.T. Kim Anh (2008). Economic performance of open-access offshore fisheries – the case of Vietnamese longliners in the South China Sea. *Fisheries Research* 93: 296–304.

Maurstad, A. (2000): To fish or not to fish: small-scale fishing and changing regulations of the cod fishery in Northern Norway. *Human Organization,* 59, 37–47.

May, R., J.R. Beddington, C.W. Clark, S.J. Holt, and R.M. Laws (1979): Management of multispecies fisheries. *Science* 205, 267–277.

McKonnell, K.E. and J.G. Sutinen (1979). Bioeconomic models of marine recreational fishing. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 6, 127–139.

NOU (1983): Bruk av kalkulasjonsrente i Staten. NOU 1983:23.

Nøstbakken, L. (2012). Investment drivers in a fishery with tradable quotas. *Land Economics* 88(2): 400–424.

OECD (1997): Towards sustainable fisheries: Economic aspects of the management of living marine resources. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris.

OECD (2000): Transition to responsible fisheries – economic and policy implications. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris, 2000.

A study by the OECD Fisheries Department and Committee on management and mismanagement, based on the experience of more than twenty fishing nations. Includes recommendations on how member states and other fishing nations should proceed to achieve responsible fisheries.

OECD (2012). Rebuilding fisheries – The way forward. OECD Publishing, Paris, DOI:10.1787/9789264176935–en

OECD (2013). Review of Fisheries: Policies and Summary Statistics, OECD Publishing, Paris, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/rev_fish-2013–en

Olaussen, J.O. and A. Skonhoft (2008): A bioeconomic analysis of different management regimes in recreational fisheries. In Ø. Aas (Ed.) *Global challenges in recreational fisheries*. Blackwell, Oxford.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Olsen, B.E. and T. Vassdal (1983): Sild til konsum – marked og konkurrentanalyser. Fiskeriteknologisk forskningsinstitutt, Tromsø.

Ostrom, E. (1990): *Governing the commons. The evolution of institutions for collective action.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.


Pearl, R. (1925): *The biology of population growth.* Alfred A. Knoph, New York.

Pedersen, T. (2002): Våre fiskebestander. Kompendium, Institutt for akvatiske ressurser og miljøbiologi, NFH, Universitetet i Tromsø.

Pezzey, J.C.V., C.M. Roberts and B.T. Urdal (2000). A simple bioeconomic model of a marine reserve, *Ecological Economics* 33: 77–91.

Pitcher, T.J. and P.J.B. Hart (1982): *Fisheries ecology.* Reprinted 1992. Chapman & Hall, London.

Pitcher, T.J. and C.E. Hollingworth (Eds.) (2002): *Recreational fisheries: Ecological, economic and social evaluation*. Blackwell, Oxford.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Reithe, S., C.W. Armstrong and O. Flaaten (2014). Marine protected areas in a welfare-based perspective. *Marine Policy* 49: 29–36.

Ressursoversikt (1993): Fisken og havet. Særnummer 1, 1993. Havforskningsinstituttet, Bergen.

Ricardo, D. (1821): *Principles of political economy and taxation.* 3rd Edn 1965, Dent Dutton, London.

Ringstad, V. (1993): Samfunnsøkonomi 2. Makroøkonomiske emner. Bedriftsøkonomisk forlag, Oslo.

Rødseth, T. (ed.) (1998): *Models for Multispecies Management.* Physica-Verlag, Heidelberg and New York.

Sanchirico, J.N. and J.E. Wilen (2001). A bioeconomic model of marine reserve creation. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 42, 257–76.

Schaefer, M.B. (1957): Some considerations of population dynamics and economics in relation to the management of marine fisheries. *Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada,* 14, 669–681.

Schrank, W.E., R. Arnason and R. Hannesson (Eds.) (2003): *The cost of fisheries management.* Ashgate, Hants.

Schweder, T., G. S. Hagen and E. Hatlebakk (1998): On the effect on cod and herring fisheries of retuning the revised management procedure for minke whaling in the greater Barents Sea. *Fisheries Research* 37, 77–95.

Scott A.D. (1955): The fishery: the objectives of sole ownership. *Journal of Political Economy,* 63, 116–124.

Scott A.D. and G.R. Munro (1985): The economics of fisheries management. In: A.V. Kneese and J.L. Sweeney (Eds.) *Handbook of Natural Resources and Energy Economics.* Elsevier Science, Berlin.

Scott A.D. and G.R. Munro (1985): *The economics of fisheries management, in Handbook of Natural Resources and Energy Economics,* A.V. Kneese and J.L. Sweeney, eds. Elsevier Science, Berlin. (A classical review article on fisheries economics and management, including resource capital and investments issues.)

Sigurjónsson, J. and G.A. Vikingsson (1995): Estimation of food consumption by cetaceans in Icelandic and adjacent waters. Report. Marine Research Institute. Reykjavik.

Sigurjónsson, J. and G.A. Vikingsson (1997): Seasonal abundance of and estimation of food consumption by cetaceans in Icelandic and adjacent waters. *Journal of Northwest Atlantic Fishery Scie*nce 22, 271–287.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Singh, N. and X. Vives (1984). Price and quantity competition in a differentiated duopoly. *The RAND Journal of Economics,* 15(4), 546–554.

Smith, W. (1993). *River God.* Macmillan. London.

Smith M.D. and J.E. Wilen (2003). Economic impacts of marine reserves: the importance of spatial behaviour. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management,* 46: 183–206.

Squires D. (1987). Fishing effort: Its testing, specification, and internal structure in fisheries economics and management. *Journal of Environmental Economics and management* 14(3) 268–282.

Squires D. and J. Kirkley (1999). Skipper skill and panel data in fishing industries. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 56: 2011–2018.

Sullivan, K.J. (1991): The estimation of parameters of the multispecies production model. *ICES Marine Science Symposia* 193, 185–193.

Sydsæter, K. (1981): *Topics in mathematical analysis for economists.* Academic Press, London and San Francisco.

Sydsæter, K., P. Hammond, A. Seierstad and A. Strøm (2008): *Further mathematics for economic analysis*. Prentice Hall, Harlow.

Tjelmeland, S. (1990): *MULTSIMP: A simplified multispecies model for the Barents Sea*. Working paper. Institute of Marine Research. Bergen.

Tjelmeland, S. (1992): AGGMULT. A documentation. International report, Institute of Marine Research, Bergen.

Tjelmeland, S. and B. Bogstad (1998): Biological modelling. In T. Rødseth (ed.), (1998) *Models for Multispecies Management,* pp. 69–92. Physica-Verlag, Heidelberg and New York.

Varian, H.R. (2003) : Intermediate Microeconomics – a modern approach. Norton, New York – London.

Verhulst, P. F. (1838): Notice sur la loi que la population suit dans son accrossement. *Correspondance Mathematique et Physique,* 10, 113–121.

Vestergaard, N. (1999): Measures of welfare effects in multiproduct industries: the case of multispecies individual quota fisheries. *The Canadian Journal of Economics/ Revue canadienne d'Economique 32(3), 729–743.*

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Volterra, V. (1928): Variations and fluctuations of the number of individuals in animal species living together. *Journal du Conseil,* III, 1–51. (Conseil Permanent International pour L'Exploration de la Mer).

von Bertalanffy, L. (1938): A quantitative theory of organic growth. *Human Biology* 10, 181–213.

Yodzis, P. (1994): Predator-prey theory and management of multispecies fisheries. *Ecological Applications* 4, 51–58.

Ørebech, P. (1991): Om allemannsrettigheter. Osmundsson, Oslo.

Ørebech, P. (1992): Har allemannsrettighetene rettsvern i Norge? In N.C. Stenseth m.fl. (Ed.) (1992). *Forvaltning av våre fellesressurser – Finnmarksvidda og Barentshavet i et lokalt og globalt perspektiv.* Ad Notam, Oslo.

Ørebech, P. (1996): Public, common or private property rights: Legal and political aspects. In S. Arnfred and H. Petersen (Eds) *Legal change in North/South perspective. International Development Studies.* Roskilde University, Roskilde.

Ørebech, P. and F. Bosselman (2002): *Customary law and sustainable development.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.



Click on the ad to read more

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

Endnotes

1. See e.g. Andersen (1981) for a bioeconomic analysis of price uncertainty, and Flaaten et al. (1998) and Jensen (2008) for overview and analyses of several types of uncertainty in fisheries.
2. For alternative texts and further reading see Anderson (1986), Clark (1990) and Hannesson (1993).
3. Pitcher and Hart (1992) give a thorough review of fisheries biology and fisheries biological models as well as a review of fish stocks globally. Hamre (1986) and Pedersen (2002) give reviews of fish stocks in the North Sea and Norwegian waters.
4. Measuring of fishing effort can be complicated. For a scientific contribution, see Squires (1987).
5. Substitution between inputs in the effort production function (2.2) have proved to create problems in actual fisheries management where one or a few inputs are restricted – see Dupont (1990).
6. A common definition of capacity often used in productivity studies is that of Johansen (1968): "The maximum amount that can be produced per unit of time with existing plant and equipment, provided the availability of variable factors of production is not restricted".
7. However, one corner solution in figure 3.2 would be zero effort and the virgin fish stock, in the case where effort cost is too high for there to be an intersection between the MC(E) and the AR(E) curves. Another corner solution would be for zero effort cost, implying extinction of the stock and zero effort after the "extinction process" is finished.
8. Our use of only two firms is of course to make the model and the discussion as simple as possible, even though we know it takes more than two to create a competitive market.
9. The following part of this section is adapted from OECD (2000) where the target state of fisheries is called responsible fisheries. FAO (1995) describes the concept of "responsible fisheries" and its development. Discard of fish and other unwanted/illegal adaptations to regulations by fishermen are discussed in the literature, including in Jensen and Vestergaard (2002).
10. Sometimes intra-marginal rent refers to rent related to the average total cost curve, shown in figure 6.2. However, the main point is that intra-marginal rent is a surplus that accrues to those vessels that are more cost efficient than the marginal one.
11. Ex-ante, before a vessel is designed and built, the owner has a wide range of sizes and technological solutions to choose from, but ex-post, after completion, the vessel's major technical characteristics, such as length, weight, hold size and engine power are fixed. Thus we may say that a fishing vessel capacity is flexible ex-ante, but not ex-post, whereas fishing effort is flexible also ex-post. Such characteristics of production is often called "putty-clay" – can you guess why? (see Johansen, 1972). How flexible effort is depends on the technical characteristics built in to the vessel. Effort measured in days and hours of fishing is definitely variable ex-post.
12. With fixed cost, k, quadratic variable cost of effort curve $vc(e) = ae^2$ and total cost $tc(e) = ae^2 + k$, we get the linear marginal cost curve $mc(e) = 2ae$.
13. Note that with variable cost of effort equal to $vc(e) = ae^2$, average variable cost is $avc(e) = ae$, which is a straight line with half the slope of $mc(e) = 2ae$ shown in figure 6.3. Thus in this particular case there is no intersection between $mc(e)$ and $avc(e)$ to act as the short-run brake on vessel operations.
14. Producer's surplus in fisheries was discussed first in Copes (1972).

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com

15. This sub-chapter is based on, with some direct quotations from, Flaaten and Mjølhus, 2010 and Reithe et al., 2014. These two articles give many references to the a quite comprehensive literature on MRs, including Holland and Brazee,1996; Hannesson, 1998; Conrad, 1999; Sanchirico and Wilen, 2001; Pezzy et al., 2003; Grafton et al., 2005; Armstrong (2007).
16. Even though both catchability coefficients are denoted by q, they differ because of the difference between X and $X_H/(1-m)$.
17. Migration of a schooling species between two parts of its habitat area may however have other causes than those discussed here with density difference as the driving force.
18. The m needed to keep the stock above a specific level depends on economic, biological and technical parameters – for details see Flaaten and Mjølhus, 2010 and Reithe et al., 2014.
19. For the proof see Flaaten and Mjølhus, 2010.
20. Pezzey et al., 2000 mention additionally, in the case of marine reserves, the possibility of a shift in demand caused by "more desirable fish". However, this is not pursued in this book.
21. Recall figure 4.1, which shows the discount factor for discrete and continuous time. By adjusting the discount rates to each other the discount factors may be almost the same.
22. For calculation of yield per recruit, the number of recruits is usually estimated at the age of first capture and not at the age of zero. This means that for the cod example shown in figure 8.5, the number of recruits would equal $N(3)$ since three-year old cod is about the smallest size to be caught in commercial fisheries using the legal minimum mesh size. In the case of Northeast Arctic cod, $N(3) = 605$ million is the mean recruitment for 1950–1982 (Jacobsen, 1992).
23. This concept was introduced in Beverton and Holt (1957). Dictionaries tell that "eu" is a prefix meaning "good", "well", occurring chiefly in words of Greek origin.
24. When cost per unit effort increases with effort, implying the existence of intra-marginal rent (IMR) in the OA fishery, the total IMR may increase as a result of technical regulations only.
25. Welfare economic measurement is more complex in the case of multispecies harvesting (see Vestergaard, 1999).
26. This stock comprises the minke whale in the North Sea, Norwegian coast, Norwegian Sea, Barents Sea and Spitsbergen area.
27. The term "per capita" is used, even though we mean per unit of biomass.
28. In a logistic single species model, the equilibrium stock level with no harvesting always equals the carrying capacity.
29. In the case of a quadratic and strictly concave utility function this gives rise to a linear demand structure (Singh and Vives, 1984). For the case of two goods the implication is that the demand for permits reduces to equation (10.1) when there is no explicit price of the quality.
30. Since most of the salmon die after spawning, Olaussen and Skonhoft (2008) and others use another type of biological recruitment model.
31. We could of course have combined the effects on the stock from angling and commercial fishing, but have chosen to stick to the former only to keep the analysis as simple as possible.

Download free eBooks at bookboon.com