Quota prices, discarding and rents in a multispecies fishery

> Aaron Hatcher University of Portsmouth, UK

IIFET Conference, Seattle, 16-20 July 2018

Quota prices in multispecies fisheries

- Modelling quota prices where there is joint production (limited targeting)
- How can we model a quota market equilibrium during a season?
- Species-specific TACs may not correspond to typical catch ratios
- Hence "choke" species and discarding
- How do quota (lease) prices and (inframarginal) rents arise, and change?
- Squires/Kirkley (various), Turner (JEEM, 1997), Vestergaard (CJE, 1999), Singh & Weninger (JEEM, 2009)

Fishing vessel behaviour

Harvest function:

$$H_{i} \equiv \sum_{j} \beta_{ij} (k_{i}, X_{1}, ..., X_{M}) H_{i} (e_{i}, k_{i}, X_{1}, ..., X_{M})$$

where β_{ij} is the proportion of species *j* in the catch Fifort decision:

$$E_i \ge e_i^* > 0: \quad \sum_j [p_j - r_j] \beta_{ij} H'_i(e_i^*) - C'_i(e_i^*) = \lambda_i^* \ge 0$$

where r_i is the quota lease price for species j

Discard decision:

$$d_{ij}^{*} > 0: \quad r_{j} = p_{j} + heta_{ij}, \quad j = 1, 2, ..., M$$

where $\theta_{ii} \geq 0$ is a discard cost

Quota compliance:

$$q_{ij}^{*} = \beta_{ij}H_{i}(e_{i}^{*}) - d_{ij}^{*}$$

Quota market equilibrium model

Quota price bounds:

$$0 \leq r_j \leq p_j + heta_j$$

- ► All quota held by firms (endowments ≠ demands)
- Assume quota only placed on market when r_j > 0
- All quota markets clear (no excess supply)
- In the case of chokes $r_j = p_j + \theta_j$
- The quota pricing problem in the model is

$$\min_{r_j} \left\{ \sum_i \left[\sum_j [p_j - r_j] \beta_{ij} h_i - c_i \right] \right\}$$

s.t.
$$\sum_j [p_j - r_j] \beta_{ij} h_i - c_i = \lambda_i \ge 0, \forall i, \quad r_j \le p_j + \theta_j, \forall j$$

Quota market equilibrium model

- With harvest and costs linear in effort, the λ_i indicate inframarginal rents
- We have *M* quota species and *N* (different) vessels/technologies
- With the λ_i as slack variables, solutions to the quota pricing problem have the equality

$$(variables)$$
 $M' + N' = M'' + N$ $(constraints)$

where $M' \leq M$ is the number of *positive* quota prices, N' < N is the number of positive shadow prices (λ_i) , and M'' < M is the number of *binding* quota price ceilings

Quota market equilibrium: M=N

- We have a set of positive, interior*, quota prices and no vessels earn inframarginal rents
- If one or more of the quota price ceilings binds, as a TAC is exhausted, then one or more of the λ_i will be positive and these vessels will earn inframarginal rents
- *we cannot rule out a quota market equilibrium with corners (0 or p_j + θ_j) even if a TAC is not exhausted (one or more of the λ_i will then be positive)

Quota market equilibrium: M > N

- One or more quota prices must *either* be constrained at its price ceiling (even if the TAC is not exhausted) *or* equal to zero - no inframarginal rents
- If a TAC is exhausted, so that its quota price reaches the price ceiling, vessels earn inframarginal rents only where the total number of vessel constraints plus binding quota price ceilings becomes less than the number of TACs

Quota market equilibrium: M < N

- One or more of the λ_i will be positive and these vessels will be earning inframarginal rents
- If a species TAC is then exhausted, so that its quota price is constrained at its price ceiling, this will increase the number of vessels earning inframarginal rents

Simulation: 3 species, 3 vessels



Simulation: 3 species, 3 vessels



^{10/15}

Simulation: 3 species, 3 vessels



Simulation: "deemed value" (50% EVP)



Simulation: "deemed value" (50% EVP)



Simulation: "deemed value" (50% EVP)



Concluding remarks

- Equilibrium quota prices and rents sensitive to relative numbers of species and vessel technologies
- We should not be surprised to observe corner prices, particularly where the number of quota species is large
- Inframarginal rents increase with fleet heterogeneity
- Impact of chokes and discarding
- Quota price controls can change allocation of surplus