

Ron Johnson

Presentation to the Ministerial Advisory Panel (MAP) on the Last In, First Out (LIFO) Policy in the Northern Shrimp Fishery

May 31, 2016

Introduction

2

- Born and raised in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, Labrador
- Employed in fishery management positions for 27 years
- Employed with Torngat Fish Producers Co-operative for 24 years
- Continuous struggle to protect and advance North Coast Fishery

MAP Requested Views

3

1. Should LIFO be continued, modified, or Abolished?

LIFO must be Continued

- All Parties Understood & Agreed to the later named LIFO policy
- LIFO policy and Threshold has been major component of all Management Plans since 1997
- Removal of the Offshore from SFA 6 will result in a 36% decline of revenues, which is 100% used to subsidize onshore North Coast processing operations

History of LIFO 1996-Present

4

YEAR	TAC (t)	Management Plan	News Release
1996	37,600	<u>(1994-1996)</u> Only 17 Offshore Shrimp Licences	N/A
1997	59,050	<u>(1997-1999)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Temporary New Entrants - Priority to individual fishers in adjacent areas - All inshore permits expire end of 1999 - Protection of Offshore 1996 is Threshold 	Expanded fishery governed 4 principals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Viability of Existing Enterprise not be jeopardized - No Permanent increase in harvesting capacity, new entrants temporary - Adjacency respected - Priority to Aboriginal people
1998	84,420	<u>Existing 1997-1999 Plan</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increases Temporary: 90-10% split for adjacent - Same 4 Principals – Conservation, Viability offshore, not permanent & adjacent have priority
1999	102,052	<u>Existing 1997-1999 Plan</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SFA 6 Increase 90% to adjacent temporary inshore - Same 4 Principals – Conservation, Viability offshore, not permanent & adjacent have priority
2000	110,052	<u>2000-2002</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inshore Temporary Fleet - Access to increased quota Temporary - <u>Need to adjust Quota in future will be based on the “LAST IN, FIRST OUT” Principal, as is the case in all fisheries</u> 	Principals of 1997 access to increased quotas are on a temporary basis, no permanent increase in harvesting capacity <u>.. the removal of access privileges will be based on the “last in, first out” principal, as in all fisheries.</u> Since 1997, all new access has be provided on a temporary basis

YEAR	TAC (t)	Management Plan	News Release
2001	110,052	<u>Existing 2000-2002 Plan</u>	“In accordance with principals developed in consultation with industry, all allocations since 1997 have been provided on a temporary basis, based on the “last in, first out” principle. In other words, should there be a decline in the abundance of the resource in the future, temporary participants will be removed from the fishery in reverse order of gaining access.
2002	115,742	<u>Existing 2000-2002 Plan</u>	Maintain existing quotas no new entrants
2003	152,102	<u>Effective 2003</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Since 1997 increased are new, temporary entrants - If quotas decline to 1996 thresholds, the sharing will end and the new, temporary entrants will leave the fishery - Decline in abundance of resource then new temporary participants will be removed from the fishery in reverse order of gaining access – last in, first out(LIFO) - Temporary licences & temporary or special allocations will only continue as long as the overall threshold level or individual SFA threshold levels are maintained when quotas are set - Sharing principals same as previous plans - New Access Framework to guide all new or additional Atlantic commercial fisheries 	

YEAR	TAC (t)	Management Plan	News Release
2004	156,352	<u>Existing 2003 Plan</u>	Inshore temporary fleet
2005	156,352	<u>Existing 2003 Plan</u>	TAC to remain the same as 2004
2006	164,244	<u>Existing 2003 Plan</u>	DFO to work with all interests to map out how to respond to future changes in abundance
2007	164,244	<u>Effective 2007</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Temporary new entrants ... mainly inshore component - 1996 threshold stands - In SFA 6, 363 temporary inshore shrimp licences have been issued - Use of Last In First Out principle as the primary policy guiding allocations when dealing with TAC declines, subject only to Land Claims obligations 	Nil

MAP Requested Views

7

2. *What key considerations should inform any decision to continue, modify, or abolish LIFO?*

Apply the long term DFO sharing Principals

- Conservation
- Economic Viability
- Threshold of 37,600 tons remain
- Adjacency be respected
- Priority given to increase Participation of Aboriginals
- Employment maximized in both harvesting and processing

MAP Requested Views

8

3. *If support changing or abolishing LIFO, what would be the elements of new access & allocation regime?*

I Do not Support

This exists in the last Management Plan of 2007

- Conservation
- Recognition of Aboriginal Treaty Rights
- Equity
 - Fair and consistent manner
 - Does not create or exacerbate excessive disparities

TOR – What Constitutes an appropriate access & allocation regime

9

Correction of Past Errors

Actually follow the established

- TAC Sharing Principals
- New Access Framework
 - Conservation
 - Aboriginal and Treaty Rights
 - Equity
- The Criteria
 - Adjacency
 - Historic Dependence
 - Economic Viability

History Snapshot of Unfair Treatment

10

- Cod Collapse prior to 1989
- No NCARP/TAGS programs – Requests Rejected
- Snow Crab north of 54'40
- Unfair access to Northern Shrimp
- Combining of Turbot zones – Benefit Island Fishers
- Province against North Coast Shrimp Plant

History Snapshot of Unfair Treatment

11

- 2003 adjacent SFA 5 increase provided to affected cod closure & crab reduction participants (NOT North Coast)
- 2003 Special allocations in SFA 5 to be landed to processing facilities (NOT North Coast)
- 2007 temporary licences converted to regular licences from whom geared up in 1997 or 1998
- No great amount of Labrador fishers received licences
- No North Coast fishers are temporary or regular licence holders

History Snapshot of Unfair Treatment

12

- SFA 4 Inshore allocation is a patronage and never attempted to be harvested inshore since 1988
- The long awaited NG land claim has been turned into a stop gap measure and used as a maximum
- All parties of Northern Labrador only holds 2% inshore and 8% offshore of the TAC for SFA 4, 5 & 6 which is 74.5% of the overall TAC for all zones
- NG holds less % of adjacent zones than the non land claim participants

History Snapshot of Unfair Treatment

13

- No Interest from the All Party Committee to understand the importance of shrimp to the North Coast
- FFAW, Island participants, Province, etc. all tout adjacency at this opportune time
- FFAW and Province requesting those special allocations to be made permanent which is in SFA 5
- No consideration for TFPC loss of revenue and implications to processing facilities

Possible Future

14

- Abolish LIFO, pro-rated decline for SFA 6
- Remove all special allocations
- Convert SFA 4 inshore from patronage to NG actually harvested inshore
- SFA 4 Increase for NG to a Minimum 11%
- SFA 5 Northern Peninsula Cod/Crab Affected provided to adjacent fishers of NG
- SFA 5 Cod/Crab affected to be split properly to NG and South Coast
- Treat North Coast parties with respect and dignity

Thank-you