



## Results based management in fisheries: Delegating responsibility to resource users



Kåre Nolde Nielsen\*, Petter Holm, Michaela Aschan

Norwegian College of Fishery Science, Faculty of Biosciences Fisheries and Economics, University of Tromsø, Brevikva, 9037 Tromsø, Norway

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 17 December 2013

Received in revised form

8 October 2014

Accepted 10 October 2014

Available online 31 October 2014

#### Keywords:

Results based management

Co-management

Common fisheries policy

Cost recovery

Shifting the burden of proof

Governance

### ABSTRACT

While the notion of results based management has been devoted recent attention in the context of reforming European fisheries management, it remains unclear what it entails. A conceptual model of results based management in fisheries is proposed as a way for public authorities to delegate specific management and documentation responsibilities to resource users. The model comprises three defining features: (1) That authorities define measurable objectives for the utilization of fisheries resources; (2) that resource users are made responsible for achieving these objectives and for (3) providing documentation that allows for an audit of the extent to which they are met. Selected cases are used to illustrate these features. Rationales and prospects of introducing results based management as an alternative in a European fisheries management context are discussed, giving consideration to how it may be pursued under the reformed common fisheries policy.

© 2014 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>).

### 1. Introduction

Preparing for the third reform of the common fisheries policy (CFP), the European Commission published a Green Paper [1] reviewing the problems of the existing CFP. The Green Paper identified five main structural failings: fleet overcapacity, imprecise policy objectives, short-term focus, insufficient industry responsibility, and poor industry compliance. In its analysis, the Commission emphasized the vicious cycle set off by overcapacity and overexploited resources, which generate pressure on authorities to make derogations and exemptions from particular regulations, and leads to a demand for more regulations. The outcome is what the Commission terms “micromanagement”, a myopic management system that is becoming increasingly complex, ineffective, difficult to understand and costly to maintain [1,2].

The Commission suggested “results based management” (RBM) as a way to overcome micromanagement: “The industry can be given more responsibility through self-management. Results based management could be a move in this direction: instead of establishing rules about how to fish, the rules focus on the outcome and the more detailed implementation decisions would be left to the industry. Public authorities would set the limits within which the industry must operate, such as a maximum catch or maximum by-

catch of young fish, and then give industry the authority to develop the best solutions economically and technically” [1].

According to the Commission, a basic problem is that public authorities have become too closely involved in the details of fisheries management. The solution, presented under the label of “results based management” involves a principled shift in the division of responsibility between public authorities and industry partners in management issues. While public authorities should decide overall objectives, decisions on the practical means to achieve them should be left to the industry. Instead of the passive and unwilling receivers of management decisions resulting from the current system, the industry partners must be actively engaged in, and take on real responsibilities for, management issues.

While the general direction of the reform ideas included under the heading of RBM seems clear, it leaves a number of questions unanswered. The notion of RBM is relatively recent within fisheries governance and does not come with a ready-made definition explaining what it is and how it can be implemented in practice. What are the basic features of a RBM model? How are roles defined and responsibility distributed between authorities and resource users in an RBM system? How to ensure that the overall objectives set by the authorities are pursued and achieved when the implementation of measures is left to resource users?

The purpose of this paper is to address such issues by proposing a conceptual model of Results Based Management. Concepts and practices of RBM in intergovernmental organizations and public administrations are reviewed. Subsequently, a conceptual

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +47 7764480.

E-mail address: [kare.nolde.nielsen@uit.no](mailto:kare.nolde.nielsen@uit.no) (K. Nolde Nielsen).

model of RBM in fisheries will be proposed and discussed as an approach by which a fisheries management authority may delegate specific management and documentation responsibilities to fisheries resource users. Features of the model are illustrated through selected cases, giving particular consideration to lessons made with RBM different contexts that seem important when moving in this direction in fisheries. Finally, the normative underpinning of RBM is discussed as well as prospects of implementing it within the reformed CFP.

## 2. Conceptual background: Results based management in public organizations

Results based management (RBM) is focused on achieving specified results, and on documenting that they are achieved. This means that “managers and/or organisations are given flexibility in order to improve performance and are then held accountable for results” [3]: 128. This is in contrast to what the Green Paper referred to as micromanagement, which is focused on input control and on specifying detailed requirements of a management process. RBM typically deploys incentive logic, such that achievements of results elicit benefits for those to whom responsibility has been delegated.

In the context of public administration, RBM can be placed within “New Public Management”, a loosely defined reform trend that, in particular in OECD countries, has been going on since the 1980s. This management style had taken inspiration from result oriented management in the private sector. Characteristic elements of New Public Management include emphasis on accountability, decentralization, “value for money” and delivery of measurable results—in contrast to regulating and overseeing a particular process [4–6]. RBM is closely associated with an “evaluation culture”, which aims at developing robust governance systems through orientation towards the achievement of identified objectives in a transparent process. It is also strongly related to what Michael Power has identified as ‘the Audit Society’ [7].

RBM – also often known as ‘Objective Based Management’ and ‘performance management’ – has been extensively used as an instrument to reform administration processes in major intergovernmental organizations such as the UN, the OECD and the World Bank. In addition RBM related strategies have been deployed to reform a range of national administrations and regional governments [3,8–10]. RBM has also been applied within regional forestry management [11,12] and national aid programs.

“broad management strategy aimed at achieving important changes in the way government agencies operate, with improving performance (achieving better results) as the central orientation” [5].

Seen in isolation, this definition, like the similar definition endorsed by the OECD,<sup>a</sup> neither captures what RBM is, nor what sets it apart from other management strategies. For instance, one may ask if not all management strategies are orientated towards improving performance and achieving better results in some sense.

To get a better grip on what RBM is in the context of the UN and the OECD, one must go beyond their definitions and turn to their conceptual frameworks and practical guidelines for implementing RBM [13,14]. In 2004, the UN’s Joint Inspection Unit reviewed experiences from the process of reforming UN agencies based on RBM. This review offered a list of “key RBM techniques”, indicating what RBM is, and how it may be practised [15]<sup>b</sup>:

- Formulating objectives (results).
- Selecting indicators to measure progress towards each objective.
- Setting explicit targets for each indicator to judge performance.
- Regularly collecting data on results to monitor performance.
- Reviewing, analysing and reporting actual results vis-à-vis the targets.
- Integrating evaluations to provide complementary performance information.
- Using performance information for purposes of accountability, learning and decision-making.

As this suggests, RBM is a goal-oriented management strategy that systematically uses evaluations to improve performance in a learning process. The standard against which RBM takes on meaning is the command-and-control chain, as portrayed in Weber’s model of the perfect bureaucracy [16]. In such a system, the organizational apex in principle should know and be responsible for everything that goes on at subordinate levels. The RBM model departs explicitly from that and is built on the principle of coordinating activities in relatively autonomous sub-units, dispensing with detailed central direction and control. Under this principle, the activities of individual sub-units are instead orchestrated towards the common goals through information management and incentive systems.

As the above suggests, RBM should be understood as a reform instrument: While its definition is typically kept open, it will in practice take on much of its identity from the system that it originates in and is set up to reform. This article addresses how this may play out in the context of fisheries management.

## 3. Results based management in fisheries: A conceptual model

The European Commission’s suggestion of RBM implies making resource users responsible for implementing appropriate management means, as long as their operations remain within limits set by public authorities [1]: 11–12; see also [17–19]. This envisages a change in the relationship between public authorities and resource users. Within the command-and-control logic of management, in particular in its perverted form known as “micromanagement”, the role of resource users is reduced to that of passive (or disobedient) clients. An important first step in moving towards RBM is hence to redefine the role of the resource user, establishing them as responsible partners in a common management framework. In this way, RBM comes with a strong commitment to a governance form in which the role of the central authority is no longer to regulate action in detail, but to advise, facilitate, and oversee self-management of industry partners. Importantly, the Commission links RBM to a shift in the “burden of proof” from management authorities to resource users [17,20,21]: “It would be up to the industry to demonstrate that it operates responsibly in return for access to fishing. This would contribute to better management by making the policy considerably simpler and removing the current incentives for providing false or incomplete information” [1]: 12.

With a starting point in the Commission’s suggestions, this article conceptualizes RBM in terms of a contract situation between public authorities and resource users. Here, the authority defines the specific requirements to be met, and leaves it to resource users to achieve them and to document that they are achieved.

RBM accordingly includes three defining features: (1) that public authorities specify measurable requirements for the resource users; (2) that resource users have considerable autonomy and flexibility of choosing appropriate management means; provided that they (3) document that they satisfy the requirements set by authorities. In addition, RBM requires that

<sup>a</sup> The OECD defines RBM as “A management strategy focusing on performance and achievement of outputs, outcomes and impacts” [13].

<sup>b</sup> See [5]: 10 for a similar list.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/7490952>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/7490952>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)