

**Summary of Comparison of Sector Allocations with  
(Other?) Limited Access Privilege Programs – A. Kitts**

	<b>IFQ/ITQ</b>	<b>Fishing Community</b>	<b>Regional Fishery Association</b>	<b>Sector</b>
<b>Allocation</b>	<p>Allocation is to a “person”</p> <p>Person as defined by the Magnuson-Stevens Act includes, individual, corporation, partnership, association, other entity, or government</p> <p>Section 303A (LAPPs) further restricts this to <u>U.S.</u> citizen, corp., partnership, other entity, or permanent resident alien</p>	<p>Allocation is to a “fishing community”</p> <p>Definition: community substantially dependent or substantially engaged in harvesting or processing including vessel owners, operators, crew, and processors</p> <p>Eligibility: “<i>residents</i>” who conduct fish-related businesses (commercial and recreational harvesting, processing, and support)</p> <p>Place on map</p>	<p>Definition: association of “persons” engaged in harvesting, processing, or a business substantially dependent upon a fishery.</p> <p>Eligibility: “participants” who hold quota share (commercial, recreational, processing, support businesses, and fishing communities)</p> <p>Cannot receive initial allocation but may acquire</p>	<p>Allocation is to the sector</p> <p>In <u>groundfish</u>, sector’s share is sum of individual shares.</p> <p>Individual shares have no official standing after that point unless vessel leaves/joins sector (main distinction from IFQ/ITQ)</p> <p>The key difference between sectors and FCs/RFAs <i>may</i> be that membership changes require the sum of shares approach?</p>
<b>Re-allocation (transferability)</b>	<p>Re-allocation is accomplished through quota market.</p> <p>Quota owners buy/sell according to operating cost structure</p> <p>NMFS must have system for tracking individual shares and transfers</p> <p>Vessel level catch monitoring</p>	<p>Must submit a Community Sustainability Plan. Plan must address social and economic development needs including those that have not had the resources to participate in the fishery</p> <p>Not clear on who writes the plan</p> <p>Plan will determine how allocation is harvested. There are many available options such as effort allocation, trip limits, quota allocated by season, and quota allocated by vessel</p>	<p>Must submit RFA/operations plan</p> <p>Plan will determine how allocation is harvested. There are many available options such as effort allocation, trip limits, quota allocated by season, and quota allocated by vessel</p> <p>Negotiation of any re-allocation is internal to the group</p>	
<b>Management responsibility</b>	<p>NMFS, vessel level monitoring</p>	<p>NMFS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vessel level catch monitoring (only to track progress towards TAC)</li> <li>• Monitor other non-exempt rules</li> <li>• May assess fines/penalties to entire group (joint and several liability)</li> </ul> <p>FC/RFA/Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negotiate and enforce plan/agreement/contract</li> </ul>		
<b>New entrants</b>	<p>Must purchase through quota market</p>	<p>As specified in FC or RFA plan</p>		<p>Can accept new <u>member</u> with eligible permit – vessel share is transferred to new sector</p> <p>New <u>entrant</u> into the fishery must buy eligible permit</p>
<b>Advantages</b>	<p>Re-capture rents</p>	<p>Align economic and conservation incentives</p>	<p>Reduce regulatory complexity</p>	
		<p>Allows for greater balance of social and economic goals</p>		
		<p>Local decision making</p>	<p>Allows for “mixed management” approach</p>	
<b>Disadvantages</b>	<p>Forced to face allocation issue</p>	<p>Increased catch monitoring/tracking costs</p>		
	<p>Cost of quota market</p>	<p>Organizational costs</p>		
	<p>All or nothing</p>	<p>NMFS must keep track of varied plans</p>		
		<p>Common pool vessels forced into de-facto sector as more sectors form</p>		