

Center for Community-Based Resource Management (CBRM)

Natural Resources Institute, University of Manitoba

CBRM Database

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|----------------------|-------------|
| Date: | 12/08/2011 | Entry Number: | 1135 |
| Case Study Name: | Socioeconomics of individual transferable quotes and community-based fisheries management | | |
| Author: | Parzival Copes and Anthony Charles | | |
| Document Type: | Paper in scientific journal | | |
| Year: | 2004 | | |
| Language: | English | | |
| Document Location: | http://husky1.smu.ca/~charles/PDFS_2005/020.pdf | | |
| Full Citation: | Copes, P. and Charles, A. (2004) Socioeconomics of individual transferable quotes and community-based fisheries management, Agriculture and resource economics 33/2 (October 2004): 171-181 | | |
| Region: | North America | | |
| Country: | Canada | | |
| Ecosystem Type: | Aquatic ecosystems | | |
| Social Characteristics: | Fisheries communities | | |
| Scale of Study: | Global | | |
| Resource Type: | Fisheries | | |
| Type of Initiative: | Research driven project | | |
| Community Based Work: | Resource management | | |
| Keywords: | Co-management, Community-based management (CBM), Community economics, distributional impacts, | | |

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| | fishery policy, Individual transferable quotas (ITQ), property rights, sustainable fishing |
| Summary: | <p>In many fisheries around the world, the failures of centralized, top-down management have produced a shift toward co-management—collaboration and sharing of decision making between government and stakeholders. This trend has led to a major debate between two very different co-management approaches—community-based fishery management and market-based individual transferable quota management. This paper examines the debate over the relative merits of these models and undertakes a socioeconomic analysis of the two approaches. The paper includes (1) an analysis of differences in the structure, philosophical nature, and underlying value systems of each, including a discussion of their treatment of property rights; (2) a socioeconomic evaluation of the impacts of each system on boat owners, fishers, crew members, other fishery participants, and coastal communities, as well as the distribution of benefits and costs among fishery participants; and (3) examination of indirect economic effects that can occur through impacts on conservation and fishery sustainability. The latter relate to (a) the conservation ethic, (b) the flexibility of management, (c) the avoidance of waste, and (d) the efficiency of enforcement. The paper emphasizes the need for a broader approach to analyzing fishery management options, one that recognizes and properly assesses the diversity of choices, and that takes into account the interaction of the fishery with broader community and regional realities</p> |