

# A Survey on the Changes in Fisheries Management Based on Ecosystem

Harshavardhan Ghosh\*

Department of Animal Science, Animal & Fisheries Sciences University, India

## Abstract

A frequently referred to hindrance to the operationalization of environment based fisheries the executives is the absence of an administration structure that unequivocally gives the power and system to carrying out this all-encompassing way to deal with fisheries the board. However, the idea of optimum yield appears to be an explicit mandate and framework that can and should be utilized to operationalize ecosystem-based fisheries management in the United States and other parts of the world. Due largely to chance, this optimum yield policy has been hidden from view for close to 40 years due to other factors that have obscured the concept's original intent. This paper explains how ecosystem-based fisheries management and optimum yield are similar, how it has been overlooked in the past, and how the idea can be used to make ecosystem-based fisheries management real.

**Keywords:** Fisheries management; Ecosystem; Sustainable yield; EBFM

## Introduction

Even though the idea of Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management (EBFM) was first adopted by several nations as a more holistic approach to fisheries management over 20 years ago, the ability to operationalize the concept remains a challenging process. The existence of a governance structure capable of effectively implementing EBFM is one of several obstacles to its implementation. Governance, in the eyes of EBFM, entails the legal authority as well as the regulatory framework for how fisheries could be managed (Table 1) [1].

The debate regarding governance is far from over, despite the fact that a number of authors have described how many of the previous governance obstacles to EBFM are no longer an issue. This is particularly evident in the US, where numerous researchers' directors still routinely state they need administration designs to carry out EBFM in light of the fact that there are no express commands or structures to operationalize the idea [2].

This paper explains why the United States, and probably other nations, does have a strong framework and clear mandate for EBFM implementation. The Magnuson-Steven Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), which almost 40 years ago mandated the use of Optimum Yield (OY), were responsible for the development of this governance structure in the United States. The paper goes over the similarities between OY and EBFM, the reasons why OY might have been overlooked during the early stages of EBFM's implementation, and how to use OY to implement EBFM [3].

## Methods

The idea of OY was formalized as a core value in fisheries the board in the U.S. also, Canada in 1976. Although the United States and Canada define OY in different ways, both countries generally agree that OY is a quantity of fish that is derived from the maximum sustainable yield and strikes a balance between the nations ecological, economic, and

social objectives. This framework could be used to implement EBFM in other nations [4]. For instance, nations like Australia, Joined Realm, New Zealand, and South Africa use or are investigating OY ideas and could profit from this methodology. Since 1976, the term "OY" in the United States has essentially been defined as follows:

the quantity of fish that will provide the nation with the greatest overall benefit, especially in terms of food production and recreational opportunities, as well as the preservation of marine ecosystems; is set as such based on the fishery's maximum sustainable yield, reduced by any relevant economic, social, or environmental factor; what's more, on account of an overfished fishery, accommodates modifying to a level steady with delivering the most extreme supportable yield in such fishery (Table 2) [5].

In contrast to the fairly uniform North American definitions of OY, the scientific literature defines several EBFM derivatives. They have mostly come together to mean the same thing in substance, just with different subtle emphasis points [6]. The Food and Agriculture Organization, an intergovernmental organization with representatives from 194 nations, developed one of the most well-known definitions of EBFM1 as an approach to fisheries management that:

Strives to strike a balance between a variety of societal goals

Table 2: Fish population monitoring.

Fish species	Initial population	Current population
Tuna	10,000	8,000
Mackerel	8000	6500
Cod	5000	4000
Shrimp	20000	18000
Lobster	15000	12500
Salmon	12000	10000

Table 1: Types of fishing gear.

Type of gear	Precautions
Gillnet	Banned
Bottom trawl	Regulated
Longline	Regulated
Purse seine	Allowed

\*Corresponding author: Harshavardhan Ghosh, Department of Animal Science, Animal & Fisheries Sciences University, India, E-mail: ghosh.h@gmail.com

Received: 20-Apr-2023, Manuscript No: JFLP-23-98726, Editor assigned: 22-Apr-2023, PreQC No: JFLP-23-98726(PQ), Reviewed: 06-May-2023, QC No: JFLP-23-98726, Revised: 11-May-2023, Manuscript No: JFLP-23-98726(R), Published: 18-May-2023, DOI: 10.4172/2332-2608.1000418

Citation: Ghosh H (2023) A Survey on the Changes in Fisheries Management Based on Ecosystem. J Fisheries Livest Prod 11: 418.

Copyright: © 2023 Ghosh H. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

by utilizing an integrated approach to fisheries within ecologically meaningful boundaries and taking into account the knowledge and uncertainties surrounding the interactions between the biotic, abiotic, and human components of ecosystems [7].

To look at the similitudes between the OY and EBFM ideas, a lattice of the vital expressions from every one of the definitions was developed. Based on the expert opinion of the authors, the degree of overlap was rated as high, moderate, or low. The goal of maximizing the benefits to the nation or society is shared by both ideas. However, the types of objectives that must be taken into account when determining the OY are outlined in detail in the OY definition; In contrast, the EBFM definition explicitly acknowledges the ecosystem's various components and the variables' uncertainty [8, 9]. The ecological factors align with several of the keywords used in the EBFM definition, and the EBFM key phrase "strives to balance diverse societal objectives" aligns with several of the key phrases used in the OY definition.

However, there are a few key terms that do not exactly match the OY or EBFM definitions. The FAO guidelines for EBFM, MSA, or National Standard 1 Guidelines discuss these cases' similarities elsewhere. For instance, "an amount of fish" taken from the fishery is not mentioned in the EBFM definition. However, the FAO's EBFM guidelines acknowledge that quotas for target and bycatch species are necessary to safeguard more perilous species and the marine ecosystem as a whole. Another illustration of this is the fact that "use ecologically meaningful boundaries" is not mentioned in the OY definition [10, 11]. The MSA, which established eight Regional Fishery Management Councils to oversee fisheries within their respective marine ecosystems, has been largely responsible for resolving boundary issues within the United States. The point is that the supporting context of each framework frequently complements the other's main tenets.

While this key expression examination is useful, all-encompassing inquiries remain. OY is typically defined at the stock or stock complex level in the United States, whereas EBFM is carried out at the fishery or ecosystem level. The MSA defines a fishery as one or more stocks that can be treated as a unit for the purposes of conservation and management and makes the actual observation that OY should be specified for the fishery.

## Discussion

NOAA Fisheries has generally recommended that OY be specified at the stock or stock complex level so that this concept can be put into practice for traditional single-species approaches to fisheries management; in any case, far reaching OY can likewise be determined for blended stock fisheries. A fishery-wide OY is currently only specified for the ground fish fisheries in the Gulf of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands of the Bering Sea. The idea of determining OY at the bigger fishery or environment level to forestall biological system level overfishing is likewise empowered in the logical writing, and by existing direction for creating Fishery Biological system Plans. At the moment, four of the eight Regional Fishery Management Councils in the United States have Fishery Ecosystem Plans for at least some of the regions they are responsible for (Table 3) [12].

One more overall issue connected with OY and EBFM is that OY

**Table 3:** Fishery management plan.

Ecosystem-based management plan	Adopted
Monitoring and surveillance plan	Implemented
Enforcement and compliance plan	Implemented
Stakeholder engagement plan	Implemented

is many times considered a reference point or determined measure of catch, instead of an incorporated methodology. However, an integrated method for evaluating and defining OY is explicitly laid out in the NS1 guidelines. Based on trade-offs that are of ecological, economic, or social significance to the fishery and the nation, OY ought to be reduced from MSY [13]. The cycle is likewise versatile, where OY is supposed to change consistently because of changing conditions in the fishery. The demographics of the fishing fleet and fishing communities may change over time, ocean productivity may alter the production potential of fish stocks, technological advancements in gear may reduce bycatch and increase OY, and profit margins on particular species may change as a result of increases in harvesting costs.

Generally speaking, the correlation shows that OY and EBFM are basically indistinguishable in idea: (1) They all point to an integrated process by which the ecological, economic, and social goals of fisheries can be balanced in order to (2) bring the nation or society the most benefit. The definitions of the two concepts are the only thing that distinguishes them from one another. While EBFM emphasizes the various ecosystem components, OY emphasizes the kind of objectives that should be taken into consideration. Where there were definitional differences, the supporting FAO and US guidelines revealed even more similarities [14].

There are some clues in the history of U.S. fisheries management as to why OY was not seen as an explicit framework for EBFM implementation. Since 1976, the definition of OY has essentially remained unchanged in the United States; nonetheless, how it has been deciphered has changed emphatically throughout recent years. As the MSA and NOAA Fisheries' NS1 OY guidelines were updated, the OY concept developed over time. The end result was an OY that was in line with the current concept of fisheries management [15].

## Results

Prior to 1976, the dominant fishery management concept was MSY, which aimed to maximize fisheries' yields without taking into account any other management goals. Healey takes note of that "by 1975 it had become unmistakably clear that, much of the time, stock elements were neither alright perceived nor adequately deterministic to deliver MSY an attainable objective, that information on stock elements alone was not adequate for viable administration, and that MSY was most likely not a suitable cultural objective at any rate." Likewise, Larkin and others additionally noticed that MSY was presently not a suitable objective during the 1970s in light of the fact that it expanded the gamble of enrolment disappointment, was impossible in blended stock fisheries because of stuff selectivity and trophic communications, and that according to a financial matters point of view fishing at MSY didn't necessarily make the most beneficial or economical fishery [16-18]. All of these experts agreed that the obvious way out of this problem was to set MSY as a limit for fishing effort, target a lower level of harvest to reduce risk, and think about much more sophisticated methods to maximize yield in fisheries.

Under the Fishery Conservation Management Act, which was later renamed the MSA, the United States introduced OY in 1976. OY is a level of catch that provides the greatest overall benefit to the Nation and is prescribed based on MSY, as modified by any relevant economic, social, or ecological factor. Practically speaking, in any case, the OY arrangement was not utilized by Gatherings to represent the logical vulnerability in the gauge of MSY, or other social and monetary variables that were normally referred to as endless. Since the MSA only permitted foreign fishing in the Exclusive Economic Zone if the

capacity of the domestic fishing fleet was unable to achieve OY, it was generally accepted that OY was used by the Councils to prevent foreign fishing [19, 20]. Consequently, OY was typically defined as the level of catch landed in accordance with the management measures of the fishery management plan or the average amount of catch landed by the domestic fishery in the past. The utilization of OY generally as an unfamiliar fishing obstruction progressed forward through the 1980s.

## Conclusion

The arguments against implementing EBFM are becoming less and less valid in light of the mandate to achieve OY and the framework that was discussed earlier. The conspicuous connection among OY and EBFM goals ought to reduce worries in the U.S. with respect to absence of administration structures for EBFM, and could be applied somewhere else in the existence where comparable OY arrangements exists. Moreover, the reasonable reason for OY obviously incorporates biological system contemplations. Although OY was initially overlooked as a governance mechanism for EBFM implementation, this was not a deliberate rejection of EBFM but rather a reflection of other issues facing society as a whole and the applied science and management field at specific points in time.

The requirement for EBFM remains serious areas of strength for ever, now is the ideal opportunity to start carrying out it. The proposed approach utilizes the current OY strategy structure, adjusts it to a framework point of view, and gives a way to practically consider co-found fisheries as the between associated framework that they really are. There are no technical reasons not to implement EBFM using the OY framework, and the benefits of doing so are significantly greater than those of maintaining the status quo.

At the very least, it is hoped that this approach will reveal something that was never really hidden. Besides, the proposition gives yet further affirmation that carrying out EBFM is well inside our span and fills in as a manner forward to keep on coming to both OY and EBFM targets.

## Acknowledgement

None

## Conflict of Interest

No conflict of interest declared.

## References

- Barrett CB (2020) Actions now can curb food systems fallout from COVID-19. *Nature Food* 1: 319–320.
- Mertens E, Sagastume D, Sorić T, Brodić I, Dolanc I, et al. (2022) Food Choice Motives and COVID-19 in Belgium. *Foods* 11: 842.
- Islam SB, Habib MM (2013) Supply chain management in fishing industry: A case study. *Int J Sup Chain Manag* 2: 40-50.
- Jeyanthi P, Chandrasekar V (2017) Value chain management in fisheries. ICAR-Central Institute of Fisheries Technology.
- Suresh A (2021) Global fisheries value chain: Issues and opportunities. ICAR-Central Institute of Fisheries Technology.
- Surtida AP (2000) Middlemen: the most maligned players in the fish distribution channel.
- Rajeev M, Nagendran P (2019) Should They Avoid the Middlemen? an Analysis of Fish Processing Firms in India. Institute for Social and Economic Change.
- Bjorndal T, Fernandez-Polanco J, Lappo A, Lem A (2014) Consumer trends and preferences in the demand for food. SNF Working Paper 17/14.
- Petetin L (2020) The COVID-19 crisis: an opportunity to integrate food democracy into post-pandemic food systems. *Euro J Risk Reg* 11: 326-336.
- Hamilton ND (2011) Moving toward food democracy: Better food, new farmers, and the myth of feeding the world. *Drake J Agric L* 16: 117.
- Aday S, Aday MS (2020) Impact of COVID-19 on the food supply chain. *Food Quality and Safety* 4: 167-180.
- BBC (2020) Coronavirus: How can society thrive post-pandemic?
- DeBroff S (2020) How COVID-19 Has Impacted Consumer Food Habits. Retrieved July 10: 2020.
- Galanakis CM (2020) The food systems in the era of the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic crisis. *Foods* 9: 523.
- Rodriguez- Perez C, Molina-Montes E, Verardo V, Artacho R, García-Villanova B, et al. (2020) Changes in dietary behaviours during the COVID-19 outbreak confinement in the Spanish COVIDiet study. *Nutrients* 12: 1730.
- Fleetwood J (2020) Social justice, food loss, and the sustainable development goals in the era of COVID-19. *Sustainability* 12: 5027.
- Mazzucato M (2021) Mission economy: A moonshot guide to changing capitalism. Penguin UK.
- Bassett HR, Sharan S, Suri SK, Advani S, Giordano C (2022) A comparative study of small-scale fishery supply chains' vulnerability and resilience to COVID-19. *Marit Stud* 21: 173-192.
- Arthur RI, Skeritt DJ, Schuhbauer A, Naazia E, Friend RM, et al. (2022) Small-scale fisheries and local food systems: Transformations, threats and opportunities. *Fish and Fisheries* 23: 109-124.
- Bennett NJ, Finkbeiner EM, Ban NC, Belhabib D, Jupiter SD, et al. (2020) The COVID-19 pandemic, small-scale fisheries and coastal fishing communities. *Coastal management* 48: 336-347.