

## Organization of talk

#### 1. Background

- The vital economic role of property rights
- The common property problem in fisheries
- Property rights in fisheries

#### 2. Individual transferable quotas, ITQs

- Properties of ITQs
- The spread of ITQs around the world
- The outcomes of ITQs

#### 3. Special issues

- The initial allocation of ITQs
- Special taxation of ITQs

# The vital economic role of property rights

- Most economic activity in the world is based on property rights (i.e. rights-based)
  - Property rights lead to markets (not the converse)
- · Markets have been economically very successful
  - Responsible for the great economic progress of modern times
  - In Europe, real incomes have risen 100-fold since 1800
  - Foundation for modern day material well-being
  - Non-existent or weak property rights  $\Rightarrow$  economic problems/inefficiencies
  - Many natural resources: e.g. ozone layer, climate ..and fish.

#### Weak property rights: The common property problem

- · Common ownership (or use rights) to resources
- Often economically and environmentally devastating
- This problem has been understood for a long time

#### Quote from Aristotle (Politics book II section 3).

There is a further drawback to common ownership: the greater the number of owners, the less the respect for the property. People are much more careful of their own posessions than of those communally owned."

### The Common Property Problem in Fisheries

• Leads to:

•

- -Excessive fishing effort
- -Excessive fishing fleets
- -Excessively diminished fish stocks
- -Little or no profits in fishing
- ... Loss of all attainable economic benefits!



# Dramatic overexploitation of global fish stocks

FAO: 75% of global fish stocks fully or overexploited

- The most valuable ones are the most overexploited
- Volume og global landings have been maintained by "fishing down the food-chain" (focussing on less valuable pray species)

# The Economics of Global Fishing

- Not only has there been a dramatic biological mismanagement of the global fishery, the economic mismanagement is even worse
- Global landed value is about USD 100 b. per year
- Real profits are negative, perhaps  $\approx$  USD -5 b.
- Subsidies are high, perhaps USD 10 b. (EU, Japan)
- Profits after subsideis, perhaps USD 5 b





















# Adoption of ITQs Worldwide

- Since the late 1970s, ITQs have been adopted in the world's fisheries at an increasingly fast rate.
  - Currently, ITQs are employed in hundreds of fisheries worldwide.
  - At least 22 fishing nations employ ITQs in their fisheries management.
     (New-Zealand, Australia, USA, Canada, Greenland, Iceland, Holland, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Estonia, Germany, UK, Portugal, Spain, Russia, Morocco, Namibia, South Africa, Chile, Peru, Falkland)
  - Close to 25% of the global catch is taken under ITQs!

	S	ITQs worldw Speed of add	ide:	
			Approximate	
		Adoption of ITQs:	volume of harvest	110
198	Decade	(no. of countries)	(m. metric tonnes)	198
	1970-79	2	0.2	
	1980-89	5	2.0	200
	1990-99	7	4.0	
	2000-09	8	14.0	
	Total	22	20.2	
		18 14 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	20000	

# Outcomes of ITQs worldwide - General patterns -

- · Economically and biologically quite successful
  - (1) Reduction in fishing effort (usually immediately)
  - (2) Fishing capital declines (but usually slowly)
  - (3) Biomass recovers (slowly) or stops declining
  - (4) Unit price of landings increases (often substantially)
  - (5) Profitability increases (often substantially)
  - (6) Quotas become valuable (quickly!)
  - (7) Resource stewardship; incentives to enhance stocks
  - (8) Discarding: Often reduced

More efficient harvesting under ITQs

# Outcomes of ITQs (cont.)

- Tendency for more concentration (fewer, larger companies)
   But really inevitable for an initially overexploited fishery
- (2) Tendency for reduction in fisheries employment
  - But often less than often expected (more quality, more value–added, further processing/marketing)
  - Also, probably an increase in total employment (increased GDP)
- (3) Tendency for some regional re-allocation of activity
   Depends on initial situation
  - More overall wealth in fishing regions
- (4) Tendency for altered distribution of income
  - Some get more of the social gains, some may lose

#### => possibly some social unrest

# Other important features of ITQs Stock rebuilding (relatively) easy under ITQs The ITQ-shares usually become quite valuable The value is maximized by 'socially optimal' harvesting ITQ-holders are automatically compensated for stock rebuilding!! TTQ-holders are in favour of stock rebuilding Ecosystem management (relatively) easy under ITQs

- Same reasons
- 3. ITQs offer a basis for accommodating (by bargaining)
  - Recreational fishing
  - Fish conservation demand



But, beware of reduced economic efficiency



# Initial allocation of ITQ-rights

- ITQ-systems in at least 22 countries
- Probably about a thousand (1000) ITQ fisheries
- · Initial allocation of quota-rights
  - (i) Grandfathering (almost always)
  - (ii) Administrative decision (very rare; in Africa)
  - (iii) Auctions (extremely rare; 4 cases, 2 discontinued)

# Why Grandfathering?

- 1. Expedience (fishers already there)
- 2. Legality (can't take away customary rights)
- 3. Fairness (society gains => why should fishers lose?)
- 4. Economic efficiency
  - Fishers probably the most efficient operators
  - Minimize transaction costs
  - Appropriate incentives (to build support for ITQs; genrating R&D, E&D; build trust in property rights)

# Administrative allocations

- A few cases (primarily in Africa)
  - Namibia, South Africa and possibly Morocco
- Apparent reason:
  - No clear prior rights (participation) by national/local fishers
  - Achieve political objectives (more native participation, promote local processing etc.)

# Auctions of ITQ rights Extremely rare; only four cases Russia and Estonia 2001-3 (discontinued) USA: Washington geoduck fishery (small shellfish fishery. Note: TURFs not ITQs) Chile: Some southern fisheries Apparent reason: Raise government revenue

- Unclear or weak prior rights (WA, Russia, Estonia)

# ITQ auctions in Estonia and Russia (2001-3)

- Introduced (2001) some years after having allocated ITQs by grandfathering
- Motivation: Raise government revenue
- Abandoned in 2003
- Reason: Didn't work well
  - · Greatly reduced industry profits, less competitiveness
  - · Industry opposition
  - · Industry collusion and even boycots of the auctions
  - Very fluctuating auction prices
  - · Auction markets didn't clear (at the reservation price)

# Initial allocation of ITQ-rights: - Broad pattern -

- If prior rights holders (i.e. fishers) exist
   ⇒ Grandfathering
- If weak or no prior rights
  - $\Rightarrow$  Administrative allocations or auctions

# Special taxation of ITQs - Global Pattern -

- 1. Payment for management costs (cost recovery)
  - Common in ITQ fisheries
  - Usually small (1-3% of revenues)
  - Usually insufficent to pay for all managment costs (1/3 to <sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>)
- 2. Net taxation (on top of normal income taxes)
  - Very rare
  - Namibia, Falkland
  - (Countries with a limited tax base)

# Why is special taxation rare?

- Economic reasons
  - Economically distortionary (=> reduces GDP)
    - In the fishing industry
    - Between industries
    - $\Rightarrow$  May not even increase overall tax collection
  - Reduces international competitiveness
- Socio-political reasons
  - Opposed by the fishing industry
- In many respects unfair
  - Often legally questionable

# Main points: Summary

- 1. Important that ITQs be high quality property rights
- 2. High quality ITQs work
  - Economically & biologically
  - Provide basis for self-management
  - Provide basis for optimal joint use of marine resources
- 3. Perceived drawbacks can be countered
- 4. Allocation of rights is almost always by grandfathering
- 5. Special taxation of ITQs is rare

