

Environment for Development

Discussion Paper Series

January 2021 ■ EFD DP 21-01

Sustainability Comparisons in the Triple Bottom Line for Chinese Fisheries

Lijun Liu, Jingjie Chu, James L. Anderson, and Jintao Xu



Central America

Research Program in Economics and Environment for Development in Central America Tropical Agricultural Research and Higher Education Center (CATIE)



Colombia

The Research Group on Environmental, Natural Resource and Applied Economics Studies (REES-CEDE), Universidad de los Andes, Colombia



Universidad de los Andes

India

Centre for Research on the Economics of Climate, Food, Energy, and Environment, (CECFEE), at Indian Statistical Institute, New Delhi, India



South Africa

Environmental Economics Policy Research Unit (EPRU) University of Cape Town



Uganda

EfD-Mak, School of Economics and Department of Agribusiness and Natural Resource Economics, Makerere University, Kampala



MAKERERE UNIVERSITY

Chile

Research Nucleus on Environmental and Natural Resource Economics (NENRE) Universidad de Concepción



UNIVERSIDAD DE CONCEPCION

Ethiopia

Environment and Climate Research Center (ECRC), Policy Studies Institute, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia



የፖሊሲ ጥናት ኢንስቲትዩት
Policy Studies Institute (PSI)

Kenya

School of Economics University of Nairobi



Sweden

Environmental Economics Unit University of Gothenburg



School of Business, Economics and Law UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG

USA (Washington, DC)

Resources for the Future (RFF)



China

Environmental Economics Program in China (EEPC) Peking University



Ghana

The Environment and Natural Resource Research Unit, Institute of Statistical, Social and Economic Research, University of Ghana, Accra



Nigeria

Resource and Environmental Policy Research Centre, University of Nigeria, Nsukka



Tanzania

Environment for Development Tanzania University of Dar es Salaam



Vietnam

University of Economics Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam



Sustainability Comparisons in the Triple Bottom Line for Chinese Fisheries

Lijun Liu, Jingjie Chu, James L. Anderson, and Jintao Xu*

Abstract

This paper uses Fishery Performance Indicators (FPIs) to compare nine Chinese fisheries in terms of their triple bottom line (ecological, social, and economic sustainability) with the top 10% performing fisheries within the global FPIs database. It shows that the largest differences between the Chinese fisheries and top-performing fisheries globally are in ecological sustainability, followed by harvest sector performance and economic performance. The gaps in community sustainability and post-harvest performance are smaller. The paper also compares nine different Chinese fisheries with each other to assess their relative performance. Zhejiang province shows signs of better fishery management, with its stronger enforcement and stricter measures to tackle illegal fishing. As a result, this province scores higher than others in ecological and some economic and social dimensions

Keywords: sustainability; triple bottom line; China; fisheries

JEL Codes: Q22; Q28

*Lijun Liu (corresponding author: lijunliu.06@gmail.com), National School of Development, Peking University, Beijing, China. Jingjie Chu, The World Bank, Washington, DC, US. James L. Anderson, Institute for Sustainable Food Systems, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, US. Jintao Xu, National School of Development, Peking University.

1 Introduction

China is the world's largest seafood producer, both in capture fisheries and aquaculture, accounting for 35 percent of global seafood production [1]. By value, China is the world's largest seafood exporter and the third largest importer [1, 2]. China is also a significant distant water fishing nation [3, 4] with a reported catch of 2.26 MMT in 2018 [1]. Hence, what occurs in the Chinese seafood sector is important not only for China, but also for global fisheries. However, there is a huge knowledge gap and little research readily available in English to assess the triple bottom line (ecological, social and economic sustainability) of Chinese fisheries. Recent reviews traced China's fisheries management history back to 1949, when the People's Republic of China was established [5, 6], and since 1978, the beginning of the Chinese economic reforms [7]. These works have characterized the evolution of the fisheries institutions from open access towards regulated restricted access; the transition from planned economy to market economy; and the shift of priorities from economic outcomes to environmental conservation and community welfare enhancement. Our work contributes to the understanding of how the fisheries perform on ecological, economic and community dimensions for different fishery management systems in China and how they perform relative to reference global fisheries. A better understanding of the current performance of Chinese fisheries could contribute to a more sustainable development of the fisheries in China and other parts of the world.

In recent years, China has committed to a new national strategy, namely the 'Ecological Civilization', as a response to China's environmental degradation and global climate change [8-10]. As part of this national transformation towards environmental sustainability, fishery and aquaculture management authorities have started putting more effort into balancing development and ecological conservation. The administration has gradually shifted its goals from quantitative growth to quality and efficiency improvement. A series of reform actions have been taken to push the institutional change toward better defined rights-based fisheries management [5-7, 11, 12]. Will China's plans to reform fisheries help China approach the best managed fisheries in the world?

In this paper, the Fishery Performance Indicators (FPIs) [13] were used to assess nine Chinese fisheries to understand the evolving trends of the management system in China. We compare these nine fisheries with the top 10 % performing fisheries (14 fisheries out of 145) in the global FPIs database for insights as to where the Chinese fisheries have been doing well and where improvements are needed.

This paper is organized as follows. In the next section, the methodology and the details of the nine Chinese fisheries are presented. The top performing fisheries in the FPI database have also been introduced as benchmarks for further comparisons. In the third section, the nine Chinese fisheries are compared with the top performing fisheries to identify gaps for improvement. A sub-section on Chinese fisheries management is included to provide the reader with the basics of Chinese marine

fisheries management. Comparisons among the nine fisheries are then conducted, focusing on the regional differences. The last section discusses possible explanations of the differences and potential implications.

2 Methods and Data

The FPIs are a set of rapid assessment indicators designed to capture the ecological, economic, and community features of individual fisheries and their enabling conditions based on the best knowledge available from both data and expert opinions [13]. The FPIs have been used to compare fisheries systems at a global scale [14], for specific species complexes [15] and for specific fisheries management projects [16]. Nine Chinese fisheries have been assessed, representing key characteristics of Chinese fisheries, such as fishery scale, species, region, and gear types (Table 1). The chosen Chinese fisheries do not represent a random sample, but were chosen based on existing projects and the authors' research network.

These nine Chinese fisheries were assessed by different researchers from 2014 to 2018 through desktop research as well as field trips, workshops, and interviews with government officials, industry leaders, community representatives, and researchers of Chinese marine fisheries biology, ecology and policies. The FPI manual (in English and Chinese) was followed for the assessments [17].

Table 1 Summary of the nine Chinese fisheries assessed.

Location and Fishery	Species	Gear Type	Year Assessed	Production Volume (000 MT)
Zhejiang Swimming Crab	Gazami crab	Gillnetter/pot	2017	172
Zhejiang Mackerel	Chub mackerel, blue mackerel	Light luring purse seiner	2017	188
Zhejiang Shrimp Trawl	Spear shrimp, kuruma shrimp, razor mud shrimp, whiskered velvet shrimp	Shrimp trawl	2017	340
Zhejiang Hairtail	Hairtail, small yellow croaker, small pomfret, silver pomfret, Bombay duck	Double trawl/single trawl/canvas stow netter^/ longliner	2017	404
Shandong Spanish Mackerel	Spanish mackerel, sting fish, chub mackerel, silvery pomfret, hairtail	Trawl and gillnet	2015	165
Fujian Swimming Crab	Red swimming crab, three spot swimming crab, ridged swimming crab, crucifix swimming crab, and horse crab	Trawl and gillnet	2014	117

Guangdong Cuttlefish-Squid	Swordtip squid, Indian squid, mitre squid, golden cuttlefish, needle cuttlefish	Longline, trawl and purse seine	2014	51
Guangdong Wanshan Islands	Finfish; multi-species	Trawl and purse seine	2016	8.2
South China Sea	Multi-species	All gears operating in the region	2015	3757*

Note: ^Canvas stow netter: stow netter with canvas-made spreading devices.

* The figure was based on the total domestic marine catch of South China Sea reported in the China Statistics Yearbook for Fisheries and Aquaculture. This volume includes the catch from Guangdong Province, Guangxi Province, Hainan Province, and about 10% of the catch from Fujian Province[18].

These nine fisheries represent about 40% of Chinese total domestic marine fishery harvest. The South China Sea fishery alone accounts for approximately 30% of the total domestic marine catch. Seven of these assessments focus on fisheries with specific gear (e.g., shrimp trawl) or a species group (e.g., swimming crab, mackerel, hairtail) within a province (first seven in Table 1). Two fisheries have been assessed at a broader scale and consider all fishing activities in the corresponding regions (Wanshan, small islands in Guangdong Province and the vast South China Sea, including Guangdong, Guangxi, and Hainan Provinces) (Figure 1). Trawling is most commonly used in Chinese waters for almost all species. However, trawling accounts for small proportions of the catch in the gazami crab and mackerel fisheries in Zhejiang and thus catch from trawling was not included in the assessments.




Figure 1 The nine Chinese Fisheries assessed are distributed along the Chinese coastline. Base map is retrieved from the Standard Map Service by Ministry of Natural Resources, P.R. China.

The top 10% performing fisheries in the global FPI database were chosen as a

benchmark for comparison to see where Chinese fisheries have weaknesses compared to the best ones (Table 2). They were identified by ranking fisheries according to their total FPI score, calculated by giving equal weight to ecological, economic and social pillars.

Table 2. Top 10% performing fisheries in the global FPIs Database.

Fishery	Assessment Year
Iceland Nephrops Lobster	2010
Iceland Cod	2017
Australia Western Zone Abalone	2011
US Alaska Pollock	2013
Japan Wagu Lobster	2016
Australia Southern Zone Rock Lobster	2012
Japan Ofunato Set Net Salmon	2016
Australia Spencer Gulf Prawn	2011
Norway Purse Seine Herring and Mackerel	2010
Japan Toyama Bay Set-Net Yellowtail	2016
Norway Whitefish Trawl	2010
New Zealand Hoki	2011
Faroe Islands Distant Water Fleet Cod and Haddock	2018
US California Spot Prawn	2015

After comparing the performances of Chinese fisheries and the top 10% performing fisheries, these nine Chinese fisheries have been grouped into two for further comparisons: those of Zhejiang Province and non-Zhejiang fisheries. The purpose of such comparisons is to identify whether Zhejiang fisheries perform differently than the other Chinese fisheries. Though not reflected in academic literature, Zhejiang is well-known by practitioners for being more responsible in fisheries management and having stronger enforcement capacity than other provinces along the Chinese coastlines. Zhejiang is also the first and only province in China with a provincial fishing ground restoration plan [20].

The FPI scores were cross-checked by the staff who manage the global FPI database to control quality and assure standardization in the scoring. One feature of the FPI approach is that the evaluator provides a quality score that reflects the evaluator's confidence in the accuracy of each score.

For the Chinese fisheries, the quality scores are either an 'A' (assessor is certain of the score) or a 'B' (assessor is certain the score is within one point) for 95.4% of the 68 output scores and 98.4% of the 54 input scores. A quality score of 'C' (assessor is highly uncertain of the score) is associated with 4.6% of the output scores and 1.6% of the input scores. The scores with 'C' quality are most commonly associated with output indicators related to Fish Stock Health & Environmental Performance, Risks of the Harvest Sector, and Market Performance in the Post-Harvest Sector. The scores

with 'C' quality with input indicators are associated with Collective Action, Management Methods, and Markets & Market Institutions. Zhejiang Swimming Crab and Zhejiang Mackerel fisheries have the highest score quality (100% of the scores are either 'A' or 'B' quality) and the South China Sea fishery has the lowest score quality (92.6% of scores were 'A' or 'B' quality).

3 Results

3.1 Comparison of Chinese fisheries with Top-Performing Fisheries

Figure 2 shows the average scores in three pillars of sustainability as well as by sector for the Chinese fisheries and top 10% performing fisheries in the FPI database, followed by a statistical test to see whether there are significant differences between scores. It was found there were significant differences for the three sustainability pillars and harvest and post-harvest performance (Table 3). The Chinese fisheries scored statistically lower than the top-performing fisheries in all cases. The largest differences between the Chinese and top-performing fisheries are in ecological sustainability (average score of Chinese fisheries (ACF) was 3.02 and average score of the top-performing fisheries (ATF) was 4.47), followed by harvest sector performance (3.65 vs. 4.18) and economic performance (ACF 3.47 vs. ATF 3.98). The gaps in community sustainability (ACF 3.92 vs. ATF 4.26) and post-harvest performance (ACF 3.9 vs. ATF 4.15) are smaller but still significant.

Figure 2: China Fisheries compared to the Top 10% in the Global FPI Database





Table 3. Significance tests for differences in mean scores of the three pillars of sustainability and harvest and post-harvest performance for China and the top 10% performing fisheries

	t	p-value
Ecology	-7.990	<0.001
Economic	-5.706	<0.001
Community	-2.524	0.020
Harvest Sector	-4.933	<0.001
Post-Harvest Sector	-3.420	0.003

Figure 3 shows the average scores in the 14 output dimensions for Chinese fisheries and the top 10% performing fisheries. Statistically significant differences in means were found for 7 out of the 14 output dimensions (Table 4). The Chinese fisheries scored higher than the top 10% in three dimensions – post-harvest assets performance, managerial returns and local ownership – but the difference was not significantly significant.

Figure 3: Output Comparison (Top 10% compared to selected China Fisheries)



Significant differences in the performance of the Chinese fisheries systems compared to top-performing fisheries were in the dimensions of stock health (ACF 3.03 vs. ATF 4.47), harvest performance (ACF 3 vs. ATF 4.27), international trade (ACF 2.86 vs. ATF 4.14), product form (ACF 3.63 vs. ATF 4.13), health and sanitation (ACF 4.44 vs. ATF 4.95), local labor (ACF 3.06 vs. ATF 4.07) and career (ACF 3.33 vs. ATF 3.88). The generally poor condition of Chinese fish stocks is not surprising, because most Chinese fisheries are overcapitalized, and past attempts to reduce fishing effort have been ineffective or poorly designed, such as the buyback program in the early 2000s [21-23].

Given that China is the largest world’s exporter of seafood, it is somewhat surprising that Chinese fisheries scored below the top-performing fisheries in international trade. Two reasons may contribute to the lower score. First, China is the world’s largest consumer of seafood and several of the Chinese fisheries (e.g., swimming crab and hairtail) primarily target the domestic Chinese market instead of the export market. In addition, several of the species caught in Chinese fisheries do not have well-developed markets in high-income countries. Second, many of China’s exports are from aquaculture, such as shrimp, while other high-value exports are actually imports that are processed and re-exported [2, 24, 25].

Table 4. Significance tests for differences in mean scores of output dimensions for China and the top 10% performing fisheries

	t	p-value
Stock Health	-7.990	<0.001
Harvest Performance	-5.557	<0.001
Harvest Asset Performance	-0.939	0.360
Risk	-0.489	0.630
Trade	-5.248	<0.001
Product Form	-2.384	0.033
Post-Harvest Assets	1.240	0.231
Managerial Returns	0.047	0.963
Labor Returns	-1.566	0.138
Health & Sanitation	-4.577	0.001
Community Services	-1.524	0.159
Local Ownership	0.644	0.526
Local Labor	-3.043	0.008
Career	-3.409	0.004

Chinese fisheries scores were not significantly different from top-performing fisheries in dimensions of harvest asset performance (ACF 3.59 vs. ATF 3.74), risk (ACF 3.66 vs. ATF 3.78), post-harvest assets (ACF 3.83 vs. ATF 4.07), managerial returns (ACF 4.43 vs. ATF 4.42), labor returns (ACF 3.22 vs. ATF 3.57), community services (ACF 4.63 vs. ATF 4.83) and local ownership (ACF 4.33 vs. ATF 4.11). It is interesting that, despite the overfished status of several fish stocks and relatively weak harvest performance, Chinese fishers and processors are earning wages above regional averages, as in the top-performing fisheries. It is also interesting to note that, despite having a slightly higher proportion of local ownership in Chinese fisheries, the proportion of local labor is well below top-performing fisheries. It should be noted that the non-local labor for Chinese fisheries is not foreign immigrant labor, but Chinese labor from the nation's interior districts. This is due to the better economic development along the coastal regions, which motivates the migration of labor from other areas to the coastal areas; this is a general phenomenon for many sectors. It also fits in with the fact that fishers' wages have to be competitive, as is evident in a number of other countries [26].

Figure 4 compares the average scores of the 15 input dimensions for the Chinese fisheries and the top 10 percent performing fisheries. The top-performing fisheries scored statistically higher than the Chinese fisheries in all input dimensions except for the gender and infrastructure dimensions, indicating that improvements can be made in many dimensions (Table 5). The largest differences between the Chinese and top-performing fisheries are in dimensions related to national governance and national economic conditions. This is reflective of the advanced economies and governance conditions in which the top-performing fisheries operate, such as the United States, Australia, Iceland, Norway and Japan. The Chinese fisheries also score low in harvest

rights, because none of the Chinese fisheries assessed are managed with harvest rights, such as catch shares. The score for access rights is low for Chinese fisheries, because illegal fishing and excess capacity reduce the exclusivity of fishing rights, and Chinese licenses also have less transferability and flexibility.

Figure 4. Input Comparison (Top 10% compared to selected Chinese Fisheries)




Table 5. Significance tests for differences in mean scores of input dimensions for China and the top 10% performing fisheries

	t	p-value
National Environment	-18.028	<0.001
Environmental Risk	-3.329	0.006
National Governance	-50.839	<0.001
National Economics	-25.931	<0.001
Access Rights	-4.027	0.001
Harvest Rights	-4.754	<0.001
Collective Action	-5.767	<0.001
Participation & Support	-2.994	0.007
Leadership & Cohesion	-4.426	<0.001
Gender	0.573	0.573
Management Capacity	-6.278	0.002
Data	-4.514	<0.001
Management Methods	-3.494	<0.002
Markets & Market Institutions	-4.324	<0.001
Infrastructure	-1.684	0.108

The Chinese fisheries scored statistically lower in three out of the four community-related dimensions (collective action, participation and support, and leadership and cohesion), indicating that cooperative, bottom-up management is

limited in China's fisheries management. In general, fishers are not well organized in China. Fishery government officials occasionally consult with key fishers or fishery leaders for their feedback regarding policies, but it has not been systematic, and input has not reflected all fishers' opinions. The leadership score is low partly because some fishermen live in more urban areas, which undermines the close relationship among fishers and the fishing culture, compared to some underdeveloped rural fishing communities. The score of gender dimension indicate that men are the primary participants in the Chinese fisheries, and this is also the case for the top-performing fisheries worldwide. The Chinese fisheries scored lower on all management-related dimensions compared to the top-performing fisheries. This is not surprising as none of the Chinese fisheries assessed are currently managed using catch limits, the cornerstone of more advanced fisheries management. Chinese fisheries performed as well as the top 10% fisheries in the infrastructure dimension, reflecting China's efficiency in logistics and shipping services. The relatively high score in the infrastructure dimension of China's fisheries indicates high post-harvest sector performance.

China has engaged in several measures that will close much of the gap between Chinese fisheries systems and the world's best. In the next section, we will explore some of these reforms to address the input factor limitations.

3.2 Chinese Fisheries Management

The FPI framework includes several components relevant to the essentials of fisheries management. To illustrate the variation of China's domestic fisheries management, this section discussed performance of the nine Chinese fisheries in the following components: "Property Rights & Responsibility", "Community", and "Management."

3.3 Property Rights & Responsibility

The fishing access rights component of FPI consists of six measures: "Proportion of Harvest Managed Under Limited Access", "Transferability", "Security", "Durability", "Flexibility", and "Exclusivity". The harvest rights component has a similar structure. The nine Chinese fisheries received an average score of 3.6 for their fishing access rights, which is moderately strong but still significantly less than the average score of 4.2 for the top performing fisheries in the FPI database. Specifically:

- Proportion of Harvest Managed Under Limited Access: Strong (average score of 4.33). Virtually all of the nine Chinese fisheries assessed were managed with restricted access rights. It must be noted that fishing access rights in the FPI include both regulatory and *de facto* access rights
- Transferability: Weak (average score of 2.55). The fishing license itself may not be transferred [29]. However, the key components of the license (i.e., fishing vessel and horsepower quota of the fishing vessel) can be transferred. Thus, fishing

access is transferable, within limits. For example, transfers from one province to another or transfers to trawlers, canvas stow netters and deep water seiners are not allowed [30].

- **Security & Durability:** Strong (average scores of 4.55 and 4.33 respectively). The fishing license must be renewed every five years. Stakeholders (fishermen, administrators, and researchers) interviewed in this project suggest strong security and durability of access rights. For trawlers, canvas stow netters and deep-water seiners, their licenses will not be renewed once the vessels reach a certain age, which is a way for China to reduce those destructive fishing methods. If they want to keep fishing, they must change to more environment-friendly methods to receive a license.
- **Flexibility:** Moderate (average score of 3.11). To receive a marine fishing license, the vessel registration and inspection information, fishing methods employed, and fishing grounds where the vessel will operate have to be specified [23].
- **Exclusivity:** Weak (average score of 2.77). This evaluation score is based on the facts that too many licenses were issued and the access rights are not exclusive. The total number of fishing licenses issued is supposed to be determined by the conditions of the fisheries resource and environmental capacity. However, given that no Total Allowable Catch (TAC) system has been put in place so far, this prerequisite has not directly affected the fishing license distribution [6, 7]. The number of fishing licenses is constrained mainly by the caps for fishing vessels and gear, which is referred as a “double control” policy (caps for total count of fishing vessels and total engine power).

Harvest rights are becoming an increasingly important fisheries management tool globally [31]. However, all Chinese fisheries received a score of 1 for the measure “Proportion of Harvest Managed with Rights-Based Management”, as virtually none of the harvest was managed with right-based management. The total allowable catch (TAC) system has been written into law since 2000 [6, 29], but up to now no fisheries within the Chinese EEZ have been managed with harvest rights. Since 2017, there have been some attempts to introduce rights-based fishery management through experimental pilot projects. From 2017 to 2019, the four most important provinces for marine fisheries have launched five TAC pilots to cultivate managerial capacity for rights-based fisheries management. Those projects are small relative to their corresponding fisheries. For example, the first TAC pilot project launched was for the swimming crab fishery in Zhejiang Province in 2017. The total catch from this project was 1,612 MT in 2017, less than 1% of the total catch in the province (177,183 MT). In preparation for rights-based management, the fisheries administration also has launched a pilot project for port-based fisheries management in 2019. Some of the expected deliverables from this pilot, including improving traceability of harvest and the quality of fishing logs and establishing a landing report system, are essential for right-based management.

3.3.1 Community

The fisheries communities were assessed for input dimensions: ‘Collective Action,’ ‘Participation,’ ‘Leadership’ and ‘Gender.’ The average for ‘collective action’ was only 2.4 compared to 3.8 for the top performing fisheries. However, the last five-year plan (2016-2020) for fisheries and aquaculture highlighted the promotion of harvester organizations in the fisheries communities [11]. The harvester organizations have a huge potential to influence the fisheries in management and marketing in China, but there is a long way to go. Cooperatives are common in the fisheries communities. Most of them handle business that was previously handled by government agencies, such as harvest safety, vessel checks, etc., but have only a limited voice in management and access. Coordination of harvest is conducted mostly via interpersonal networks rather than the organizations.

Stakeholder participation and support for fisheries management scores an average of 2.2 compared to 3.6 for the top performing fisheries. Stakeholder meetings are rare and irregular. Some fishermen (a very small portion of the community) have attended short consultation sessions initiated by either the fisheries managers or researchers to provide feedback on specific projects or policies. There is no industry financial support for management, as the administrative entities are not supposed to receive funds from industry.

Leadership in fisheries communities scored an average of 3.1 compared to 4.3 for the top performing fisheries. At village level, fishers or heads of the cooperatives have shown some level of leadership. However, when it comes to the provincial level, no strong leadership has been identified. The fishery communities generally perform well in terms of social cohesion. However, with the rapid urbanization in China in recent decades, the fishery communities have been shrinking and fewer young people have stayed in fisheries, skewing the average years of experience toward an older group.

Overall, females have lower influence in business management and resources management, especially for the industrialized fisheries. Participation in harvest is not common. Women are more active in post-harvest sectors.

3.3.2 Management

This component in FPIs consists of three dimensions: ‘Management Capacity,’ ‘Data,’ and ‘Management Methods.’ Management capacity scored an average of 3.4 compared to 4.4 for the top performing fisheries. Within the Chinese EEZs, the jurisdictions have been divided into two parts by the “no-trawling” line. The provincial enforcement has jurisdiction over the waters to the continental side of this line, and the enforcement bodies for the three sea regions (the Bohai & Yellow Sea, the East China Sea, and the South China Sea) have jurisdiction over the state water offshore. The enforcement capacity is not enough overall. Among the coastal provinces, Zhejiang Province has the strongest capacity to regulate fishing activities, but is still understaffed. Informants identified challenges in coordinating enforcement in state

waters, especially with the frequent shifts of sea region enforcement bodies¹. Most fishing vessels receive fuel subsidy and some subsidy for renewing the vessels (i.e., retiring the old vessel and buying or building new a vessel). The Chinese government has committed to reduce the fuel subsidy to 40% of the 2014 level by 2019 and to cancel the fuel subsidy for three types of fishing vessels that pose high threats for the marine environment (paired trawler, canvas stow netter and deep water seiner) in 2020 [32].

The score on the Chinese data system was moderate (3.4), but significantly lower than the top performing fisheries (4.2). Although a landing reporting system has not been established in Chinese domestic fisheries, fishermen are required to fill in fishing logs. However, there is no quality control for the logs. There is no national fisheries resource monitoring program, but some research institutes run regular fisheries-independent surveys and fisheries-dependent monitoring programs that collect harvest and fishing behavior information with small samples. Fish price data are collected in the major wholesale markets on a daily or weekly basis, varying by the markets and species. These data have not been fully utilized in management.


Management methods scored an average of 2.2, significantly less than the 3.2 for the top performing fisheries. Management methods vary in sea regions and provinces, but, in general, input controls are mostly used, such as moratoria, area closures, and mesh size limit. Among these tools, the most important one is the summer moratorium. Additionally, China has been increasing MPAs and sanctuaries, with a target of adding 58 national fisheries resources protected areas and five provincial or national aquatic natural protected areas between 2015 and 2020 [11]. Mesh size limits have been put in place since 2014 [33]; however, interviews with practitioners in the field indicate that enforcement is very challenging.

3.4 Chinese Fisheries Performance Comparison

It is interesting to see differences among the nine Chinese fisheries. Figure 5 shows they performed relatively well in the economic and community pillars, with the exceptions of the economic score for Wanshan Island and the community score for the South China Sea fisheries (Figure 5). Zhejiang is selected for comparison with other fisheries for two reasons. One, Zhejiang is considered one of the best performing provinces in China in terms of marine fishery management. Two, the assessments for Zhejiang's four fisheries were conducted in 2017, and the other fisheries were assessed between 2014 and 2016, before action plans for marine fisheries management reform were put into effect, based on China's accelerated environmental focus [12].


¹ The enforcement bodies of the sea regions have changed several times in the past few years. For example, in the East China Sea region, the Bureau of Fisheries Enforcement (Ministry of Agriculture) used to take responsibility for enforcement of fishing activities in the offshore state waters and would coordinate several provincial enforcement bodies in task forces to combat IUUs. From 2015 to 2018, the fisheries enforcement body was the East China Sea Coast Guard. Since the government reorganization in 2018, the Coast Guard has been merged into the Armed Police Force.

Figure 5: Chinese fisheries performance in the three pillars of sustainability.




When looking at output performance in detail (Figure 6), all Chinese fisheries are doing relatively well in the dimensions of harvest assets, risk, post-harvest assets, managerial returns, health and sanitation, and community services (over 3.5). Zhejiang received higher scores on average in stock health, harvest performance, trade, post-harvest assets, labor returns and local ownership, but has fallen below in product form. This might be due to the following reasons. First, the assessed fisheries operate at different scales. For example, the Wanshan Island fishery produces only about 8,000 MT of fish, while the South China Sea fisheries involved many more species and areas, which is likely to contribute to the lower stock health scores. Second, the Zhejiang coastal area may have better natural conditions with higher productivity. Third, three of the Zhejiang fisheries focus on fast-growing and short life-span species (crab, mackerel, and shrimp) and received relatively good scores in ecological performance. The Zhejiang hairtail has a low score in stock health, but it is a recovering fishery with over twenty years of restoration effort. Since the 1980s, Zhejiang has started a summer moratorium for trawlers, in addition to several MPAs that protect important habitats for the hairtail [34]. The stock is expected to continue recovering. After investing in marine fisheries management and fisheries restoration since 2013 [20], there is some evidence to show a degree of recovery of Zhejiang’s four most famous species – yellow croaker, small yellow croaker, hairtail, and spineless cuttlefish – which have been overfished for decades. As of 2019, pelagic finfish landings in Zhejiang have increased fourfold compared to the landings in the late 1990s [20].

Figure 6: Output comparison (Zhejiang compared to other Chinese fisheries)



For the input conditions, it is not surprising to see that Zhejiang scores higher on management-related indicators, such as management and capacity, data, management methods, and access rights. The variation in Management Methods is introduced by the lower scores for MPAs and sanctuaries in Wanshan and South China Sea fisheries. Two reasons might have caused such differences: possible assessors' bias and the fact that the South China Sea had shorter moratoria than other sea regions. Zhejiang generally scored lower than other Chinese fisheries in the collective action, participation and support, leadership and cohesion, and gender components (Figure 7). The lower scores may reflect the fact that Zhejiang fishing fleets are more industrialized compared to other fisheries (average engine power of fishing vessels in Zhejiang is two times higher than the national average [19]), with fewer women participating and less organization.

Figure 7: Input Table (Zhejiang Fisheries compared to other Chinese fisheries)



4 Conclusions

China is the largest seafood producing country in the world and has a national objective to improve fisheries management. In this paper, we compare performance of nine Chinese fisheries with the top 10% performing fisheries in the global FPI database for the three pillars of sustainability as well as harvest and post-harvest performance. All measures indicate that there is significant room for China to improve. Comparisons with the top performing fisheries globally help identify where the improvements are needed. Input factors such as strengthening harvest rights, stronger fishery community participation and leadership, improved management capacity (enforcement), management methods (setting TAC and spatial management) data collection and analysis, and better market institutions are all areas that, if improved, are likely to strengthen China's fishery management systems towards triple bottom line sustainability.

There are five pilot experiments on rights-based fishery management in China which will help identify the conditions that are necessary to implement harvest rights effectively. Pilots are a common approach in China before scaling up programs, because each province or community has its own characteristics. These experiments will help educate and prepare fishery managers and researchers for the new management model. It will be interesting to use FPIs to assess these experimental rights-based fisheries in a few years, especially those which have implemented either Territorial Use Rights for Fishing (TURFs) or quotas, to see whether there is a significant difference in terms of their performance.

Among the nine fisheries management systems evaluated in China, Zhejiang Province performed better in most dimensions compared to other fisheries, including fish stock health, fishery harvest performance, post-harvest performance, managerial returns, labor returns, and degree of local ownership. Some of their management experiences are regarded as role models for other provinces. However, the long-term effectiveness might be compromised because the policy design lacks sufficient incentives for behavioral changes by the fishers. Concerns have been raised that once the enforcement has weakened, illegal fishing activities could rapidly come back [35]. As the FPI results suggested, more effort should also focus on the community level, which will help achieve the goal of long-term behavioral change.

References

- [1] FAO, The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2020. Sustainability in action, Rome, 2020.
- [2] Yang, B., J.L. Anderson and F. Asche (2020) Determinants of China's seafood trade patterns. *Marine Resource Economics*, 35(2); 97-112.
- [3] D. Belhabib, U.R. Sumaila, P. Le Billon, The fisheries of Africa: Exploitation, policy,

and maritime security trends, *Marine Policy* 101 (2019) 80-92.

[4] D. Belhabib, U.R. Sumaila, V.W. Lam, D. Zeller, P. Le Billon, E. Abou Kane, D. Pauly, Euros vs. Yuan: comparing European and Chinese fishing access in West Africa, *PLoS one* 10(3) (2015) e0118351.

[5] S. Su, Y. Tang, B. Chang, W. Zhu, Y. Chen, Evolution of marine fisheries management in China from 1949 to 2019: How did China get here and where does China go next?, *Fish and Fisheries* 21(2) (2020) 435-452.

[6] S. Huang, Y. He, Management of China's capture fisheries: Review and prospect, *Aquaculture and Fisheries* (2019).

[7] L. Cao, Y. Chen, S. Dong, A. Hanson, B. Huang, D. Leadbitter, D.C. Little, E.K. Pikitch, Y. Qiu, Y.S. de Mitcheson, Opportunity for marine fisheries reform in China, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114(3) (2017) 435-442.

[8] State Council P.R. China, Integrated Reform Plan for Promoting Ecological Civilization, Beijing, 2015.

[9] Y. Gu, Y. Wu, J. Liu, M. Xu, T. Zuo, Ecological civilization and government administrative system reform in China, *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 155 (2020) 104654.

[10] B. Jiang, Y. Bai, C.P. Wong, X. Xu, J.M. Alatalo, China's ecological civilization program—Implementing ecological redline policy, *Land Use Policy* 81 (2019) 111-114.

[11] Ministry of Agriculture P.R.China, China's 13th five-year plan for fisheries and aquaculture, Beijing, 2016.

[12] Ministry of Agriculture P.R.China, Notice on further enhancing fishing vessel management and implementing total allowable catch for marine fisheries, Beijing, 2017.

[13] J.L. Anderson, C.M. Anderson, J. Chu, J. Meredith, F. Asche, G. Sylvia, M.D. Smith, D. Anggraeni, R. Arthur, A. Guttormsen, The fishery performance indicators: a management tool for triple bottom line outcomes, *PLoS One* 10(5) (2015).

[14] F. Asche, T.M. Garlock, J.L. Anderson, S.R. Bush, M.D. Smith, C.M. Anderson, J. Chu, K.A. Garrett, A. Lem, K. Lorenzen, Three pillars of sustainability in fisheries, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115(44) (2018) 11221-11225.

[15] J.K. McCluney, C.M. Anderson, J.L. Anderson, The fishery performance indicators for global tuna fisheries, *Nature Communications* 10(1) (2019) 1-9.

[16] J. Chu, T.M. Garlock, P. Sayon, F. Asche, J.L. Anderson, Impact evaluation of a fisheries development project, *Marine Policy* 85 (2017) 141-149.

[17] J.L. Anderson, C.M. Anderson, J. Chu, J. Meredith, *Fishery Performance Indicators Manual (Version 1.4)*, 2016.

[18] Bureau of Fisheries P.R. China, National Fisheries Technology Extension Center, Society of Fisheries, *China Statistics Yearbook for Fisheries and Aquaculture*, Agriculture Press, Beijing, 2016.

[19] Bureau of Fisheries P.R. China, National Fisheries Technology Extension Center, Society of Fisheries, *China Statistics Yearbook for Fisheries and Aquaculture*, Agriculture Press, Beijing, 2019.

- [20] Zhejiang Province Fisheries Management and Enforcement Department, Accomplishment in Zhejiang Fishing Ground Restoration, 2020. http://www.zjagri.gov.cn/art/2020/4/10/art_1630653_42543076.html. (Accessed May 4th 2020).
- [21] Z. Zhang, S. Wu, S. Li, J. Cao, S. Ge, Effectiveness Evaluation and Policy Recommendations for China's fishing vessel "Double Control" system, *China Fisheries* (4) (2018) 34-40.
- [22] H. Ou, C. Yu, The research on effectiveness of fishing vessel "Double Control" system, *Journal of Zhejiang Ocean University (Natural Science Edition)* 30(432-5) (2011) 470.
- [23] S. Liu, Reflections and Suggestions for Improving China's "Double Control" System, *Chinese Fisheries* (7) (2009) 24-25.
- [24] J.L. Anderson, F. Asche, T. Garlock, Globalization and commoditization: The transformation of the seafood market, *Journal of Commodity Markets* 12 (2018) 2-8.
- [25] F. Asche, C.A. Roheim, M.D. Smith, Trade intervention: Not a silver bullet to address environmental externalities in global aquaculture, *Marine Policy* 69 (2016) 194-201.
- [26] M. Nielsen, F. Asche, O. Bergesen, J. Blomquist, E. Henriksen, A. Hoff, R. Nielsen, J.R. Viðarsson, S. Waldo, The myth of the poor fisher: evidence from the Nordic countries, *Marine Policy* 93 (2018) 186-194.
- [27] Xinhua News, Restore Zhejiang Fishing Grounds: over 13,000 unregistered fishing vessels confiscated with in a year, 2015.
- [28] Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs P.R. China, Special Task Force for Fisheries Enforcement Beijing, 2018.
- [29] P.R.C. National People's Congress, Fisheries and Aquaculture Law of People's Republic of China, Beijing, 2000.
- [30] Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs P.R. China, Fishing License Management Regulation, in: M.M.o.A.a.R.A.o. China) (Ed.) Beijing, 2018.
- [31] A.M. Birkenbach, M.D. Smith, S. Stefanski, Feature—taking stock of catch shares: lessons from the past and directions for the future, *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy* 13(1) (2019) 130-139.
- [32] Ministry of Financing P.R. China, Notice on adjusting fuel subsidy and promoting sustainability for domestic fisheries and aquaculture, Beijing, 2019.
- [33] M.o.A. P.R.China, Notice on implentmening mesh size limits for approved and transitional fishing gears, Beijing, 2013.
- [34] H. Xu, Z. Liu, H. Song, Y. Zhou, States of the East China Sea moratorium and Suggestion for Management Improvement, *Modern Fisheries Information* 18(1) (2003) 22-26.
- [35] Z. Nie, B. Shui, K. Tian, J. Qiu, L. Zhang, X. Han, S. Yu, Investigation and Research on the Rehabilitation and Revitalization of Zhejiang Fishing Grounds: Taking -'One-Three Improvement'Special Enforcement Action for Example, *Marine Development and Management* (6) (2018) 76-81.

