

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**THE SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF
THE NEW ZEALAND LONGFIN EEL:
A BIOECONOMIC ANALYSIS**

**A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of Master of Applied Economics at Massey University,
Palmerston North, New Zealand.**

Graeme John Doole

2002

ABSTRACT

Annual recruitment of the New Zealand longfin eel (*Anguilla dieffenbachii*) has declined by around 75 percent since heavy levels of commercial fishing began in the early 1970s. Longfin eels live in freshwater for many years, sometimes over one hundred, before reaching sexual maturity and migrating to oceanic spawning grounds. Longfin eels are semelparous, in that they die after making only a single reproductive contribution following migration. Late maturation and semelparity render longfin populations extremely sensitive to recruitment overfishing. Consequently, poorly defined property rights and fragmented regulation have permitted multiple user groups, but primarily the commercial fishery, to reduce these stocks to the point of near-collapse.

In this research, a deterministic multiple-cohort bioeconomic model is developed and applied to a longfin eel population to investigate sustainable management strategies for the fishery, subject to its biological and economic characteristics. The optimisation framework incorporates density-dependent growth and spawner-recruitment relationships and a delay-difference equation to express the significant lag between the sexual maturity of adults and the vulnerability of corresponding young to the fishery. The model also permits the investigation of alternative weight restrictions and a price that varies with age/size.

The model demonstrates the insufficiency of using past harvests to calculate sustainable catch, as done recently for the South Island fishery. The model results also indicate the need for a minimum weight restriction higher than that maintained under the existing regulatory system. The importance of no maximum weight restriction is also identified. Additionally, the model results indicate that there is a significant inverse relationship between the level of exploitation and the annual breeding population, since no harvested eel has ever spawned. The sensitivity of longfin eel populations to recruitment overfishing is greater in reality due to uncertainty, competition among harvesters, price and harvest incentives, and this specie's biology. These factors suggest that the use of any harvest-based regulatory system without significant investment in area closure will fail to protect longfin eel stocks through the recovery and maintenance of spawning biomass.

The analysis identifies the need for an integrated management strategy, incorporating area closures, for rebuilding and maintaining spawning biomass, and the use of ITQ management in open fisheries to aid the allocation of fishing rights among users. Efficient management of these open areas requires a higher minimum weight limit than under the current management system, and no maximum weight restriction. The calculation of sustainable harvest levels remains problematic due to poor information; however, active adaptive management may be used to work towards their identification. This approach might be aided by density-dependent growth, which would assist the recovery of populations if sustainable harvest were overestimated. Additionally, spawners from closed populations would help to safeguard against recruitment overfishing during the investigation of sustainable exploitation rates. This integrated policy represents a biologically sound and economically relevant management strategy that has the potential to sustain longfin populations and their harvest indefinitely.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the help of the following people for their assistance in formulating this analysis and the presentation of this thesis: Rob Alexander for his enthusiasm and guidance throughout the entire project; Dave Allen, Raymond Necklen, Eric Graynoth, Don Jellyman, Mark Kuitjen, Matthew Keene, Simon Hoyle, and Peter Todd for the provision of data and helpful advice regarding this study; William Kolberg, Marino Gatto, Michael Harte, Jon Conrad, Stephen Schott, and Chris Fleming for participating in useful discussion in regard to both the general analysis and the formulation of the developed model; Waikato eel harvesters, who, through their participation in a survey, provided valuable insight into the problem; participants at the World Resource Modelling Association (RMA) and International Institute of Fishery Economics and Trade (IIFET) Conferences in 2002 for comments on papers arising from this work, especially Simon Mardle and Robert McKelvey; Massey University and the Goodman Family for the provision of funding; Sheila Alexander for her editing of the final draft; my wife, Cynthia, and family for their encouragement and support; my father, Vic Doole, for alerting me of the need for this analysis over fifteen years ago.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	ix
LIST OF FIGURES.....	x
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiii
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Management policies.....	3
1.3 Objectives of this research.....	5
1.4 Organisation of this research.....	6
2. BIOLOGY OF THE LONGFIN EEL	7
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 General biology	7
2.2.1 Distribution.....	7
2.2.2 Feeding	9
2.2.3 Natural mortality	10
2.3 Reproductive biology	10
2.3.1 Recruitment	10
2.3.2 Sexual maturity.....	13
2.4 Growth rates	14
2.5 Conclusions	15
3. THE COMMERCIAL HARVEST OF LONGFIN EELS.....	16
3.1 Introduction	16
3.2 Development of the commercial fishery	16
3.3 Economic benefits of commercial harvest	20
3.4 A description of commercial harvesting activity.....	21
3.5 The effect of harvest on eel populations.....	24
3.6 Management of the New Zealand freshwater eel fishery.....	26
3.6.1 Minimum weight restrictions	26
3.6.2 Maximum weight restrictions.....	27
3.6.3 Gear restrictions.....	28
3.6.4 Restrictions on fishery size.....	28

3.6.5 ITQ management	29
3.6.6 Area closures	32
3.7 Summary.....	35
4. THE OPTIMAL HARVEST OF MULTIPLE-COHORT POPULATIONS	36
4.1 Introduction	36
4.2 Early analyses of the optimal exploitation of age-structured populations	38
4.3 Development of harvesting theory within the Leslie and Beverton-Holt frameworks	40
4.4 Overcoming the limitations of the Leslie and Beverton-Holt frameworks	43
4.5 Investigations into the effects of price on multiple-cohort harvest profiles	45
4.6 Incorporation of greater analytical complexity	46
4.7 Use of numerical methods to study age-structured fisheries.....	49
4.8 Summary and conclusions.....	52
5. THE ANALYTICAL MODEL.....	56
5.1 Introduction	56
5.2 Theoretical foundations of the model.....	56
5.3 Key assumptions.....	58
5.4 The economic model	62
5.5 The biological model.....	63
5.6 Analytical solution of the model	65
5.7 Conclusions	71
6. THE NUMERICAL MODEL	73
6.1 Introduction	73
6.2 The study region	73
6.2.1 Growth within the study region.....	76
6.2.2 Sexual maturity within the study region.....	77
6.2.3 Life cycle within the study region.....	78
6.3 Formulation of estimates for the objective function.....	80
6.3.1 Estimation of prices received for harvested eels	80
6.3.2 Formulation of a cost function for the eel fishery	81
6.3.3 Estimation of the cost parameter	82
6.3.4 Calculation of the initial discount rate.....	84
6.4 The measurement of stock levels	85
6.5 Estimation of the instantaneous survival rate for juveniles.....	85

6.6	Estimation of the instantaneous density-dependent growth rate for adults	86
6.6.1	Calculation of the instantaneous growth rate as a function of fishing mortality	88
6.6.2	Calculation of the adult biomass as a function of fishing mortality.....	91
6.7	Estimation of a Beverton-Holt stock-recruitment relationship	95
6.7.1	Background.....	95
6.7.2	Analytical derivation of parameters for the Beverton-Holt spawner-recruitment function	96
6.7.3	Estimation of parameters for the Beverton-Holt spawner-recruitment function.....	100
6.8	Specification of the numerical model.....	102
6.9	Solution procedure.....	106
6.10	The analysis of alternative management strategies	108
6.10.1	Policy scenarios reflecting the current state of the fishery.....	108
6.10.2	Alternative management policies	108
7.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	111
7.1	Introduction	111
7.2	Models providing insight into existing longfin eel fishery conditions.....	111
7.2.1	Implications of the base model.....	111
7.2.2	Implications of the open-access model.....	114
7.2.3	Implications of maintaining current exploitation	114
7.3	Optimal management of the longfin fishery.....	115
7.3.1	Importance of a higher minimum weight restriction.....	116
7.3.2	Importance of user cost in determining the optimal harvest profile.....	117
7.3.3	Importance of no maximum weight restriction	120
7.3.4	Importance of moderate exploitation rates	125
7.3.5	The optimal recovery of longfin populations	127
7.3.6	Key factors underpinning efficient management of the longfin fishery.....	130
7.4	Sensitivity analysis	131
7.4.1	Sensitivity of model output to the strength of the stock-related cost externality.....	131
7.4.2	Sensitivity of model output to the discount rate.....	132
7.4.3	Sensitivity of model output to the density-dependent growth parameter....	133
7.4.4	Sensitivity of model output to density-independent growth.....	134

7.4.5 The incorporation of stochastic recruitment.....	135
7.4.6 Summary.....	136
7.5 Efficient management of the longfin fishery.....	136
7.6 Construction of a suitable management strategy.....	138
7.7 Area closures	140
7.8 Managing open areas to maximise efficiency	143
7.8.1 Suitability of recommended weight restrictions.....	143
7.8.2 Management of exploitation in open areas.....	144
8. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	147
8.1 Background.....	147
8.2 Key results	148
8.3 Policy implications for the management of the longfin fishery	150
8.4 Limitations.....	152
8.5 Recommendations for further research	154
8.6 Conclusions	155
APPENDICES.....	157
REFERENCES	197

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1. The mean length and weight of individuals in each year class.....	158
Appendix 2. The survey sent to commercial harvesters.....	159
Appendix 3. Summary and analysis of survey results.....	168
Appendix 4. Concise specification of the GAMS programme.....	184
Appendix 5. Detailed description of the GAMS programme.....	187
Appendix 6. Net Present Values accruing to alternative management policies.....	193
Appendix 7. Levels of harvest accruing to alternative management policies.....	194
Appendix 8. Levels of spawning biomass accruing to analysed policies.....	195
Appendix 9. Levels of stock accruing to alternative management policies.....	196

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1. The body shape of a typical longfin eel (Paul 2000).	7
Figure 2.2. National distribution of the longfin eel (McDowall 1990).	8
Figure 2.3. The reproductive cycle of the longfin eel.	11
Figure 3.1. New Zealand eel harvest for 1965-99 (Annala et al. 2001).	17
Figure 3.2. Catch-Per-Unit-Effort (kg/net/night) for the New Zealand freshwater eel fishery for 1990-99 (Ministry of Fisheries data).	19
Figure 3.3. A small fyke net being emptied of its harvest (McDowall 1990).	22
Figure 3.4. The mean price for individual eels within generalised weight brackets.	24
Figure 3.5. The effect of commercial harvest on a longfin eel population (Jellyman et al. 2000).	25
Figure 6.1. Location of the study area.	74
Figure 6.2. Generalised life cycle of the lower Waikato River eel stock.	79
Figure 6.3. The Beverton-Holt spawner-recruitment function.	102
Figure 7.1. Optimal harvest levels for the base run of the model.	112
Figure 7.2. Equilibrium stock and harvest for each of the most valuable year classes and the spawning cohort for the base model.	112
Figure 7.3. Optimal stock levels for the base run of the model.	113
Figure 7.4. Optimal harvest levels for the model depicting open-access conditions. ...	114
Figure 7.5. Levels of discounted profit for varying minimum weight restrictions across all analysed maximum weight limits for a TAC of 5 percent.	116
Figure 7.6. Equilibrium stock and harvest levels for each of the most valuable year classes and the spawning cohort for a minimum weight limit of 1.5kg, no maximum weight restriction, and no TAC.	118
Figure 7.7. The optimal age structure of equilibrium harvest when the value of a harvested tonne of eels from each year class is the same (\$4922.50).	119
Figure 7.8. Levels of discounted profit for varying maximum weight restrictions and levels of permitted harvest for a minimum weight limit of 1kg.	121
Figure 7.9. Levels of spawning biomass across varying maximum weight restrictions for unconstrained harvest and a minimum weight limit of 1.5kg.	122

Figure 7.10. Equilibrium stock and harvest levels for the fourteen eldest year classes for a minimum weight limit of .5kg, a maximum weight restriction of 2kg, and no TAC.	123
Figure 7.11. NPV across varying rates of exploitation for a minimum weight limit of 1.5kg and no maximum weight restriction.	125
Figure 7.12. Stock and spawning biomass across varying rates of exploitation for a minimum weight limit of 1.5kg and no maximum weight restriction.	127
Figure 7.13. The recovery of stock levels across all TAC levels for a minimum weight limit of 1.5kg and no maximum weight restriction.	128
Figure 7.14. The time path of harvest for a minimum weight limit of 1.5kg, no maximum weight restriction, and no TAC.	128
Figure 7.15. The inverse relationship between the profitability of the fishery and levels of spawning biomass.	130
Figure 7.16. Stock and harvest profiles when growth is density-independent.	135
Figure 7.17. The divergence between policies designed to maintain robust longfin populations and those that maximise economic efficiency.	139
Figure A3.1. Levels of commercial eel fishing experience among harvesters.	168
Figure A3.2. The percentage of total annual harvest that fishers take from the Waikato River.	169
Figure A3.3. The proportion of harvesters that take a certain percentage of longfins each year.	170
Figure A3.4. The opinions of harvesters regarding changes in longfin eel populations in recent years.	171
Figure A3.5. The opinions of harvesters regarding the primary cause of decline in longfin eel populations.	171
Figure A3.6. The opinions of harvesters regarding changes in both shortfin and longfin populations in recent years.	172
Figure A3.7. The opinions of harvesters regarding the primary cause of the decline in freshwater eel populations.	173
Figure A3.8. Average hours spent eel harvesting within the fishing season.	174
Figure A3.9. Degree of support for the use of minimum size restrictions.	178
Figure A3.10. Degree of support for the use of maximum size limits.	179
Figure A3.11. Degree of support for the use of effort restrictions.	179
Figure A3.12. Degree of support for the use of area closures.	180

Figure A3.13. Degree of support for the use of ITQs. 180

Figure A3.14. The percentage of respondents within each age bracket. 181

Figure A3.15. The educational attainment of respondents. 181

Figure A3.16. Income earned by respondents from eel fishing over the last year. 182

Figure A3.17. The mean percentage of annual household income earned from eel
fishing by respondents. 183

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1. Principal nations importing New Zealand eel products (by weight), 1998-1999.	21
Table 6.1. The instantaneous rate of male migration (μ) for each affected age class. ...	78
Table 6.2. The mean scalar price per tonne (P_k) for each bracket of harvestable year classes.	81
Table 6.3. Regression results for the estimation of the growth factor.	93
Table 6.4. Cohort references and subscripts used in the numerical model.	103
Table 6.5. Description of exogenous parameters used within this analysis.	103
Table 6.6. The year classes available to the fishery for each set of analysed weight restrictions.	109
Table 7.1. Changes in equilibrium population, spawning biomass, exploitation rate, and Net Present Value for alternative values of the stock-related cost externality, relative to the base model ($i=1$).	132
Table 7.2. Changes in the levels of equilibrium stock, harvest, and Net Present Value for alternative discount rates, relative to the base model ($\delta=5$ percent).	133
Table 7.3. Changes in the level of equilibrium population, harvest, spawning biomass, exploitation rate, and Net Present Value for alternative values of the density-dependent growth parameter (ϕ), relative to the base model ($\phi=.0004$).	134
Table A1.1. The estimated mean length and weight statistics of each age group involved within the study.	158
Table A3.1. The calculation of the opportunity cost of harvester time.	177
Table A5.1. Ord(k) commands for each minimum weight restriction.	190
Table A5.2. Ord(k) commands for each maximum weight restriction.	191
Table A6.1. The Net Present Values accruing to the analysed strategies.	193
Table A7.1. Optimal equilibrium harvest levels for the analysed strategies.	194
Table A8.1. Optimal equilibrium spawning biomass levels for each of the analysed strategies.	195
Table A9.1. Levels of equilibrium stock for each of the analysed strategies.	196