Available online at www.sciencedirect.com
ScienceDirect
Marine Policy 32 (2008) 867–876
MARINE POLICY
www.elsevier.com/locate/marpol

Evaluating collaborative fisheries management planning: A Canadian case study

Neil A. Davis*

c/o Paul Wood, Centre for Applied Conservation Research, University of British Columbia, 2424 Main Mall, Vancouver, Canada V6T 1Z4

Received 3 January 2008; accepted 4 January 2008

Abstract

Governing agencies increasingly employ collaborative forms of decision-making in fisheries management to improve decision quality and legitimacy. However, crafting fair and effective collaborative processes that will achieve these benefits is often difficult. In an effort to identify keys and obstacles to success, this research examined participants' evaluations of a collaborative planning process in Canada's Pacific groundfish fisheries. Results indicate that an incentive to participate, consensus decision-making, and independent facilitation were essential to ensuring the fairness and effectiveness of the process. Together, these elements motivated agreement while providing security against process manipulation by both participants and governing agencies.
© 2008 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Fisheries management; Collaborative decision-making; Consensus; Stakeholder participation; Groundfish

1. Introduction

Resolving conflicting objectives among stakeholders regarding the use of limited fisheries resources is one primary challenge for sustainable fisheries management [1]. Developing well-informed management strategies in a way that respects tenets of procedural justice is another [2]. Collaborative forms of planning have demonstrated promise for addressing challenges like these and their use is growing [3–13]. However, research has also found that crafting fair and effective collaborative processes is often difficult, and not simply a matter of 'more' stakeholder involvement [14].

Despite the difficulties and their growing use, collaborative fisheries planning processes have rarely been the subject of systematic evaluation that comprehensively assesses their performance. This paper begins to address that gap. It evaluates the Commercial Groundfish Initiative, a recent multi-sectoral planning process tasked with reforming the management of Canada's Pacific groundfish fisheries. The evaluation focuses on fairness and effectiveness, two procedural attributes frequently associated with high-quality collaborative decision-making processes [4,15–19]. Using a framework of criteria derived from empirical literature, the research sought participants' perceptions of the performance of the planning process on these attributes. Participants' perspectives are useful for designing collaborative processes that are acceptable to stakeholders—an important criterion in considering a process model's suitability for future use [20,21]. Collaborative planning also demands significant commitments of time and money from participants and sponsoring agencies. Determining whether and why these processes are successful can help ensure that both of these limited resources are spent effectively [22]. Results provide early feedback on a decision-making format that has been promoted for Canadian fisheries in recent legislation and policy reviews [23,24].

The balance of the paper is divided into five sections. It begins with a review of the rationale for, and challenges of, collaborative planning, and then provides a case description. The methods and results sections follow. The paper closes with a discussion of keys and obstacles to success and the practical implications of participants' evaluations for collaborative fisheries planning process design.

*Tel.: +01 604 731 1811; fax: +01 604 822 9106.
E-mail address: nadavis77@gmail.com

0308-597X/$ - see front matter © 2008 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.marpol.2008.01.001

2. Theoretical background: collaborative planning

Collaborative planning approaches are a subset of participatory planning types distinguished by their delegation of some or all responsibility for planning to stakeholders [25]. This responsibility may or may not be accompanied by the authority to ratify agreements. Emphasizing interest-based negotiations and consensus-building, collaborative planning has developed partly in response to the shortcomings of other participation models that provide for only one-way information flows and insufficient stakeholder involvement [26,27]. Their early applications as short-term interventions in issue-specific conflicts have evolved to include more recent use as longer-term, relationship-building initiatives addressing multiple issues at broad scales [28]. The adoption of collaborative fisheries planning approaches is one aspect of broader fisheries management reforms towards decentralized decision-making authority and stakeholder participation noted in many parts of the world [29].

Conflict resolution and planning literatures provide an overview of the benefits of collaborative planning. First, collaborative approaches help observe the normative principle that those affected by a decision should be able to contribute to the decision's formulation [30,31]. Second, collaboration can contribute substantive benefits where stakeholders identify problems and solutions to policy issues that experts or authorities are unaware of, thereby facilitating the development of better informed management [32,33]. Third, collaboration can help ensure that all stakeholders' interests are addressed, reducing conflict and increasing the representativeness and responsiveness of decisions [5,34]. This in turn contributes to the legitimacy and acceptability of decisions, increasing compliance [35,36]. These claims are the basis of an instrumental benefit to collaborative planning as a means to the end of successful policy implementation.

Realizing these benefits in fisheries planning has proven difficult. Issues related to the adequacy and breadth of representation, power imbalances, varying capacities to participate among stakeholders, incompatible participant interests, and uneven incentives to negotiate are just some of the obstacles that have frustrated collaborative fisheries planning efforts [29,37–40]. These difficulties have negatively affected trust among stakeholders, and between stakeholders and governing agencies [38]. Stakeholders have also perceived decisions made by governing agencies following ineffective or inadequate collaboration as unfair, diminishing the legitimacy of management measures, and leading to non-compliance [41].

3. The case

3.1. The commercial groundfish sector

Canada's Pacific groundfish fishery involves approximately 500 vessels and is the coast's most valuable commercial fishery sector, with landed values exceeding $140 million (Cdn) annually [42]. Seven principal fisheries make up the sector and vary by gear employed, size, value, and licensing and management histories (Table 1). This variation is correlated with disparities in the wealth and degree of political organization among the fisheries. The individual transferable quota licensing regimes introduced throughout the 1990s to the halibut, trawl, and sablefish fisheries by Canada's marine fisheries management agency, Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO), were followed by trends towards fleet consolidation and increased user involvement in management [43–45]. All three fisheries have industry-funded associations which share fishery management costs and responsibilities through formal agreements with DFO [44]. In contrast, the lingcod, dogfish, and rockfish fisheries have historically been less valuable and fleet-level organization has been more recent

Table 1
Groundfish sector structure (pre-integration)

Fishery (gear[a])	Limited licenses	ITQ[b]	Annual value[c] (million Cdn)	Active licenses[c]	Industry association (year established)
Dogfish (LL)	No	No	$1.5	44	Dogfish Association (2001)
Lingcod (HL)	No	No	$1.6	66	Lingcod Association (2003)
Inside rockfish[d] (HL)	Yes	No	$2.3	25	None
Outside rockfish[d] (HL)	Yes	No		77	None
Trawl (Tr)	Yes	Yes	$56.4	78	Groundfish Research & Conservation Society (1994)
Halibut (LL, HL)	Yes	Yes	$50.1	221	Pacific Halibut Management Association (1997)
Sablefish (LL, T)	Yes	Yes	$23.7	30	Canadian Sablefish Association (1987)

Source: Refs. [45,48].

[a]LL, longline; HL, hook-and-line; Tr, trawl; T, trap.

[b]ITQ, individual transferable quota licensing.

[c]Numbers are averages of years 2002–2005. Values refer to the fishery, not species, as some species are caught in multiple fisheries. The number of active licenses is based on vessels reporting landings within the license type and likely overestimates vessels dedicated to the capture of dogfish and lingcod.

[d]Inside and outside rockfish fisheries are prosecuted along geographically separated areas of the coast, but the individual values of their catch are not distinguished in available DFO data.

دریافت فوری ← متن کامل مقاله

ISIArticles
مرجع مقالات تخصصی ایران

- ✓ امکان دانلود نسخه تمام متن مقالات انگلیسی
- ✓ امکان دانلود نسخه ترجمه شده مقالات
- ✓ پذیرش سفارش ترجمه تخصصی
- ✓ امکان جستجو در آرشیو جامعی از صدها موضوع و هزاران مقاله
- ✓ امکان دانلود رایگان ۲ صفحه اول هر مقاله
- ✓ امکان پرداخت اینترنتی با کلیه کارت های عضو شتاب
- ✓ دانلود فوری مقاله پس از پرداخت آنلاین
- ✓ پشتیبانی کامل خرید با بهره مندی از سیستم هوشمند رهگیری سفارشات