#### "Nascent Developments in Arctic Fisheries: Managing the Red King Crab in the Barents Sea"



#### Present and emerging Arctic fisheries

#### Brooks Kaiser<sup>1</sup>, <u>Melina Kourantidou<sup>1</sup></u>, Linda Fernandez<sup>2</sup>

#### IIFET 2016 Wednesday 13/07/2016, Aberdeen

1 University of Southern Denmark 2 Commonwealth Virginia University

## Distribution & Management Overview



- ✓ East Finnmark coast
- Purposeful Introduction at Kola, from N.Pacific
- ✓ 12% Barents coverage



# History of Invasive Red King Crab



# Tradeoffs of a profitable invader



## Scarce Empirical Observations

- Inevitable Uncertainties
  - Stock (X)
  - Growth F(X)
  - Damages DM(X)
  - Control Costs
- Trade off-Sign of  $\lambda$ 
  - X or h source of future benefits ?
  - Value from investing in this asset or divesting in this liability

$$MaxV = \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-\delta t} \left[ Ph_t - C(X_t)h_t - DM(X_t) \right] dt$$
$$F'(X_t) - \left( \frac{DM'(X_t) + C'(X_t)F(X_t)}{P - C(X_t)} \right) = \delta$$

*s.t*.

$$\dot{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{F}(X_t) - h_t$$
$$0 \le h_t \le X_t$$
$$X_0 \le X(0)$$

$$\lambda = \frac{\dot{\lambda} - DM'(X) - C'(X)h}{\delta - F'(X)}$$

## Cost Function

- 2016 NO Registry & 2002-2007 dataset
- Individual effects: Variation in costs across vessels
- Regression Analysis: explanatory variables: annual X, Vessel Length (VL), harvest (monthly)
- Overview of how output and X affect variable unit costs  $CPUEmales = 0.0085X^{0.4482}$
- Annual Operational Costs sorted by VL (S:8-9.9m, M: 10-14.9m, L: 15-20.9m)
- Fixed Weighted Averaged Cost for every year

$$\overline{C}_{t} = AC_{t}^{S} / \sum_{S} T_{t} + AC_{t}^{M} / \sum_{M} T_{t} + AC_{t}^{L} / \sum_{L} T_{t}$$



- %CQi fraction of crab quotas when compared to overall other quotas
- AC annual cost; weighted average of annual VL classes
- *SPD is the sum of Pot days (for every individual trip) of every vessel i.*



## Broadening the Perspective

Multiple Fisheries managers (RU/NO) goals incomplete Full Ecological Economic Story includes Damages and Externalities, and Unknowns

- Different Costs, Incentives
  - Bycatches
    - removing baits, losing target species, entagling & destroying nets
  - Predation upon commercial species
    - Capelin (Mallotus villosus)
    - Arctic lumpsucker (*Cyclopteropsis macalpini*)
    - Icelandic Scallop (Chlamys islandica)
  - Ecosystem Damages
    - Benthos
    - Competition with native species
    - Parasites & Commensal





epifaunal communities are impoverished



trawl catch at 110 m depth in non invaded nearby fjord

### Icelandic Scallop habitat

# Pro's and Cons of Commercial harvesting as a means of control for ecological goals

- ✓ Quotas: Compensation for Damages
- Market Benefits grow larger as invasion develops
- ✓ Increasing economic dependence
- ✓ Additional pressure on Social Planner
- ✓ Myopic strategies may justify larger steady state X\*
- ✓ RKC < 0.8kg not commercial
- Måsøy: Expand the border to give access to Quota Regulation!
- ✓ E/W Discard policy differs too
- Norwegian violations of international policy on invasive species?





Thank you very much for your attention mkour@sdu.dk, baka@sdu.dk, Imfernandez@vcu.edu

## Blunt management tools: Need for refinement?



#### Spatially explicit concerns ✓ West

Reduce X (With Investment beyond OA outcome):

- own damages
- International Spatial spread/Mitigation?
- ✓ East
- Reduce X (With Quota?) for
- own damages (if any)
- Within Norway Spatial spread/Mitigation?

- ✓ RKC expanding spatially & in density
- Management pushing down X
- ✓ Laksefjord (close to 26°): unstable. Increased harvest maybe ?
- ✓ Posangerfjord & other fjørds ?!

