

GENERAL FISHERIES COMMISSION FOR THE MEDITERRANEAN COMMISSION GÉNÉRALE DES PÊCHES POUR LA MÉDITERRANÉE Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy. Tel: + 39 0657055730. www.gfcm.org



Scientific Advisory Committee Economic and Social Sciences (SCESS) Sub-Committee on Stock Assessment (SCSA) Sub-Committee on Marine Environment and Ecosystems (SCMEE) Transversal workshop on the monitoring recreational fisheries in the GFCM area

Palma de Majorca, Spain, 20-22 October 2010

EVALUATION OF THE PHENOMENON OF RECREATIONAL FISHERIES IN ITALY: DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF AN INTEGRATED MONITORING SYSTEM

S. Colella, F. Donato, N. Cingolani, A. Santojanni



CNR- Institute of Marine Science, U.O. S. of Ancona - ITALY

AIMS OF PROJECT

The main objectives of the proposed project are:

✤To acquire sufficient knowledge about the state and dynamics of "sport fisheries" over the time by proposing an efficient and feasible system of data collection.

✤To contribute towards the amelioration of conflicts between recreational and professional fishermen by proposing the monitoring of sources of conflicts between the two segments of fisheries.

To facilitate towards the improvement of fisheries management by developing the quality of scientific advice for a sector such as recreational fisheries, that has been greatly neglected in the CFP.

✤To provide the necessary information over time for expanding our knowledge about 1) the fishing fleet capacity and the rate of exploitation of fisheries resources, 2) the quality of marine environment 3) the socio-economics aspects in the fisheries sector.

METHODOLOGY

Because the very high number of the recreational fishermen (1,500,000 of recreational fishermen were estimated in Italy from the previous EU project **no. 96/018**) only a sampling system could be applied for data collection.

On the basis of geographical distribution of the recreational fishermen, a number of ports (*indicated as Primary Sampling Unit, PSU*) were extracted; in these ports the interviews to recreational fishermen were carried out.

Because in Italy doesn't exist any licence system for the recreational fishermen and doesn't exist any kind of registration, it is very difficult to rebuilt their geographical distribution.

To overcome this difficult, the distribution of the mooring place by ports, has been assumed like a reliable index of the geographical distribution of the active recreational fishermen: so on the basis of EU proposal were **selected 6 regions**.

A successive selection of **10-15 recreational fishermen** will be carried out in each selected PSU. **Each selected fisherman constitutes the Secondary Sampling Unit (SSU)** to be interviewed using the questionnaires.



| Sampled Regions | No of yearly interviews (Database A) <u>Face to face</u> <u>interviews , during</u> 13 meeting | No of monthly <u>Telephone</u> <u>interviews</u> (Database B) | Ports covered |
|--------------------|---|--|---------------|
| Liguria | 6 | 30 | 1 |
| Toscana | 4 | 10 | 1 |
| Lazio | 13 | 65 | 2 |
| Sicila | 23 | 115 | 3 |
| Marche | 29 | 138 | 3 |
| Veneto | 9 | 44 | 1 |
| TOTAL | 84 | 402 | 11 |

Summary of interviews made

Both the recreational fishermen and their associations judged the project very interesting and they gave a good degree of collaboration.

After these meetings, the sample of recreational fishermen amounted to 84.

DATA COLLECTION SYSTEM

Two **questionnaire** were planned in order to collect informations by recreational fishermen .

Related to these questionnaires, have been developed and tested two databases to manage the data collection :

•Database a,- STARFISH RF1 in order to collect data on annual basis to target a general picture of phenomenon, and to collect "*una tantum*" information such as social status of fisherman ,characteristics of vessels

•Database b, - SARFISH RF2 contains the routine informations to collect on monthly basis concerning catches, number of fishing trips, gears used and so on

•For the management of data has been developed <u>a coding system for all fields</u> <u>covered by the two databases.</u>

•Data collected by questionnaires were processed using the **software package STARFISH – RF** to test all different phases of data processing (data input, data checking, data printing, etc).

| code | scientific name | english | italian |
|------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 0100 | SURFACE PELAGIC FISH | SURFACE PELAGIC FISH | PESCI PELAGICI DI SUPERFICIE |
| 0101 | Belone belone | Needlefish, Garfish | Aguglia |
| 0102 | Scomberesox saurus | Atlantic Saury, Skipper | Costardella |
| 0200 | MIGRATORY PELAGIC FISH | MIGRATORY PELAGIC FISH | PESCI PELAGICI GRANDI MIGRATORI |
| 0201 | Thunnus alalunga | Albacore | Alalunga |
| 0202 | Euthynnus quadripunctatus | Atlantic little tuna | Alletterato |
| 0203 | Sarda sarda | Atlantic bonito | Palamita |
| 0204 | Xiphias gladius | Broadbill swordfish | Pesce spada |
| 0205 | Seriola dumerili | Amberjack | Ricciola |
| 0206 | Thunnus thynnus | Bluefin tuna | Tonno rosso |
| 0207 | Thunnus spp. | Tunas (other) | Tonnidi (altri) |
| 0300 | SMALL PELAGIC FISH | SMALL PELAGIC FISH | PESCI PICCOLI PELAGICI GREGARI |
| 0301 | Engraulis encrasicholus | European anchoviy | Alice |
| 0302 | Engraulis encrasicholus juv. + | Whitebait, Engraulis | Bianchetto, Minnata |
| | Sardina philchardus juv. | enrasicholus juv. + sardina | |
| | | philchardus juv. | |
| 0303 | Auxis rochei | Bullet tuna | Biso |
| 0304 | Scomber japonicus | Chub mackerel | Lanzardo |
| 0305 | Atherina boyeri | Sand smelt | Latterino |
| 0306 | Aphia minuta | Transparent goby | Rossetto |
| 0307 | Scomber scombrus | Atlantic mackerel | Sgombro |
| 0308 | Sardina pilchardus | European pilchard | Sarda |
| 0309 | Sprattus sprattus | Sprat | Spratto |

Example of coding system for species fished

QUESTIONNAIRES FORM Database a & b

| EU project 00000 "Sport faharies in Eastern and Queteul Mudiamanean. Dasign, implementation and economic evaluation of un integrated monitoring system" | EU project 00000 "Sport Interior in Eastern and General Mudiamanean: Design, implementation and economic evaluation of an integrated monitoring weak |
|--|---|
| STARFISH - RF Recreational Fisheries | STARFISH - RF Recreational Fisheries |
| GENERAL QUESTIONNAIRE (on yearly basis, database a) | RECREATIONAL FISHERMEN INTERVIEWS (on monthly basis, database b) |
| mod. STARFISH - RF1, p. 10 | md \$116519H, BF2 p 10 |
| a- HEADING SECTION | b- HEADING SECTION |
| s-a. Country: | b-a. Country |
| a-b. Enumerator code: | b-b. Enumerator code: |
| a-c. Filling date (ddmmyy): Y | b-c. Filling date (ddmmyy): Y |
| a-d. Number of interview: | b-d. Number of interview: Y |
| | • |
| a-1. RF SECTION | b-1. RF - INTERVIEWED |
| a-1.1 Code of RF: Y a-1.8 Telephone (number): N | b-1.1 Code of RF:Y |
| a-1.2 Family name: N =-1.0 Sox (M/F): N | NUT'S code IIP code |
| a-1.3 Firstname: | b-2. RF - MONTHLY FISHING TRIPS SECTION |
| e-1.1 Marrar Sciole | b-2.1 No. of fishing trips during the month: N b-2.5 Employment in Full Time |
| a-1.4 Permanent N address. | b-2.2 Mean duration of fehing trip (hour): |
| a-1.5 Postcode: N a-1.14 No. of RF license: G | b-23 Mean number of people on board during Skilling trip: b-2.7 Other operational costs (crew) |
| a-1.6 City where RF N a-1.15 Expiration of | b-2.4 Mean time dedicated to fishing operation N efficiency of fish, etc.): |
| ad 16 Cost of Irease | |
| s-1.7 Telephone (prelix): | b-3 RE-MONTHLY FISHING GEAR (CATCHES SECTION |
| | |
| a-2. RF CLUB SECTION | b-3.1.1 Gearmainty used (code): b-3.2.4 Monthly catches for goar 2 (kg): N |
| a-2.1 Member of Recreational Club (Y/N):Y a-2.5 City ofN | b-3.1.2 Gearmaniy Geo (no. ormaniagrays); N b-3.2.5 Previaing apoces (cool); gear 2; N b-3.1.3 Gearmaniy Geo (no. ormaniagrays); N b-3.2.6 Previaing apoces (cool); gear 2; N |
| B-2.2 Code of Club who has a second s | b 3.14 Monthly catches for oner 1 (so): b 3.13 rd oner used (code): |
| e-2.3 Name of N =-2.7 Participation to RF game (YIN): | b-3.1.5 Prevailing species (code), gear 1: Y b-3.3.2 3rd gear used (no. of fahing days): N |
| | b-3.1.6 Prevaling species (%), goar 1:Y b-3.3.3 3rd gear used (fishing area):N |
| Recreational | b-3.2.1 2nd gear used (code): N b-3.3.4 Monthly catches for gear 3 (kg): N |
| | b-3.3.5 Prevailing species (code), geer 3: |
| | b-3.2.3 2nd gear used (fishing area): N b-3.3.6 Provaling species (%), gear 3 |
| Remark 2: Y = mandatory fields; N = no mandatory fields; G = field used only by Graece; I = field used only by Italy. | Remark 1: Euro is the currency to be used. |
| | Remark 2: Y = mandatory fields; N = no mandatory fields; G = field used only by Greece; I = field used only by Italy. |
| | |

The *database a (on annual basis)* and the *database b (on monthly basis*), gave a picture of the pre-selected sample of recreational fishermen covering the following seven sections:

status of recreational fisherman; association of the recreational fishermen; fishing vessels characteristics; fishing trips; fishing gear/catches; conflicts with professional fishermen; discards at sea.

RESULTS

Database a

In every field of the datase was calculated the percentage of response obtained during interviews.

In the **"RF Section"** referred to **social aspects**, all recreational fishermen have provided an answer.

In the section "**Vessel Section**" we obtained a high response rate on the characteristics of the boats, but not for the questions of an economic nature such as capital investment to buy the vessel.

| Field | Field name | Sample | No. of | % |
|-------|---|--------|---------|-----|
| code | | size | answers | |
| a-4.1 | No. of annual fishing trips | 84 | 83 | 99 |
| a-4.2 | Mean duration of fishing trip (hour) | 84 | 74 | 88 |
| a-4.3 | Mean number of people on board during fishing trip | 84 | 75 | 89 |
| a-4.4 | Mean time dedicated to fishing operation in each trip (h) | 84 | 74 | 88 |
| a-4.5 | Employment in Full Time Equivalent (on a yearly basis) | 84 | 3 | - 4 |
| a-4.6 | Yearly cost of fuel (Euro) | 84 | 52 | 62 |
| a-4.7 | Other operational costs (crew wages, ice, boxes, | 84 | 0 | 0 |
| | treatment of fish, etc.) | | | |

Fishing Trips Section

| Field | Field name | Sample | No. of | % | No. of |
|-----------|--|--------|---------|-----|------------------------------------|
| code | | size | answers | | RF using |
| | | | | | 2 nd or 3 rd |
| | | | | | gear |
| a-5.1.1 | Main gear used (gear 1) | 84 | 84 | 100 | |
| a-5.1.2 | Secondary gear used (gear 2) | 84 | 84 | 100 | 52 |
| a-5.1.3 | Third gear used (gear 3) | 52 | 52 | 100 | 18 |
| a-5.2.1 | Annual fishing days estimated for gear 1 | 84 | 82 | 98 | |
| a-5.2.2 | Annual fishing days estimated for gear 2 | 52 | 51 | 98 | |
| a-5.2.3 | Annual fishing days estimated for gear 3 | 18 | 17 | 94 | |
| a-5.3.1.1 | Annual catch estimated for gear 1 (kg) | 84 | 0 | 0 | |
| a-5.3.1.2 | Prevailing species (code) for gear 1 | 84 | 64 | 76 | |
| a-5.3.1.3 | Prevailing species (%) for gear 1 | 64 | 8 | 13 | |
| a-5.3.2.1 | Annual catch estimated for gear 2 (kg) | 52 | 0 | 0 | |
| a-5.3.2.2 | Prevailing species (code) for gear 2 | 52 | 43 | 83 | |
| a-5.3.2.3 | Prevailing species (%) for gear 2 | 43 | 2 | 5 | |
| a-5.3.3.1 | Annual catch estimated for gear 3 (kg) | 18 | 0 | 0 | |
| a-5.3.3.2 | Prevailing species (code) for gear 3 | 18 | 15 | 83 | |
| a-5.3.3.3 | Prevailing species (%) for gear 3 | 15 | 10 | 67 | |
| a-5.4.1 | Cost of gear used (gear 1) | 84 | 38 | 45 | |
| a-5.4.2 | Cost of gear used (gear 2) | 52 | 4 | 8 | |
| a-5.4.3 | Cost of gear used (gear 3) | 18 | 0 | 0 | |
| a-5.5.1 | Repair and maintenance of gear used (gear 1) | 84 | 45 | 54 | |
| a-5.5.2 | Repair and maintenance of gear used (gear 2) | 52 | 4 | 8 | |
| a-5.5.3 | Repair and maintenance of gear used (gear 3) | 18 | 0 | 0 | |

Fishing Gear/Catches Section

The table shows that, in addition to the main gear, 52 (equal to 62%) of recreational fishermen of the selected sample made use of secondary gear, and 18 (equal to 21%) of them practised fishing using also a third type of gear.

| Field code | Field name | Sample size | No. of answers | % | No. of RF answering Y | |
|------------|---|----------------|-------------------|----|--------------------------|-------|
| a-6.1 | Any conflict with professional fishermen during last year ?(Y/N) | 84 | 83 | 99 | 46 | (55%) |
| a-6.2 | No. of annual conflicts with professional fishermen (estimated) | 46 | 1 | 2 | | |
| a-6.3 | Competition for space | 46 | 11 | 24 | | |
| a-6.4 | Competition for fishing gear and fishing effort | 46 | 33 | 72 | | |
| | | 40 | 0 | 0 | | |

Conflicts section

In case of Italy, <u>the conflicts highlighted by the respondents never referred to direct</u> (<u>personal</u>) <u>quarrels</u>. Rather, they tended to describe the reasons for frequent and sometimes persistent misunderstandings between the two categories of fishermen, although they were never directly involved.

| | Field code | Field name | Sample size | No. of answers | % | No. of RF answering Y | Catches/Discards section |
|-----|---------------|--|----------------|-------------------|-----|-----------------------------|---|
| t | a-7.1.1 | Annual catches (estimation, kg) | 84 | 65 | 77 | | in this section, the response to the |
| 1 | a-7.2.1.1 | Species 1 caught (code) | 84 | 25 | 30 | | questions about "kill no fish" and |
| 1 | a-7.2.1.2 | Species 1 caught (%) | 25 | 13 | 52 | | "discarding". |
| [| a-7.2.2.1 | Species 2 caught (code) | 25 | 21 | 84 | | tended to overlap, since |
| [| a-7.2.2.2 | Species 2 caught (%) | 21 | 12 | 57 | | regreational fishermon generally |
| - [| a-7.2.3.1 | Species 3 caught (code) | 21 | 16 | 76 | | recreational insterment generally |
| - [| a-7.2.3.2 | Species 3 caught (%) | 16 | 10 | 63 | | define as "discarding" the release |
| - [| a-7.3 | % of catches for self-consumption | 84 | 84 | 100 | | of fish only if it is still alive, in other |
| - [| a-7.4 | Kill no fish: % on total catches | 84 | 7 | 8.3 | | words what is meant by "kill no |
| - [| a-7.5.1 | Do you usually discard catches at sea? (Y/N) | 84 | 73 | 87 | 64 (76%) | fich" |
| | a-7.5.2 | Percentage of total catches during a fishing trip accounting for discards at sea | 64 | 2 | 3.1 | | lian |
| | a-7.6.1 | Which is the discarded species at sea? (1st species) | 64 | 27 | 42 | | |
| | a-7.6.2 | Which is the discarded species at sea? (2nd species) | 27 | 5 | 19 | | |
| | a-7.6.3 | Which is the discarded species at sea? (3rd species) | 5 | 2 | 40 | | |

Frequency distribution of most discarded species by RF

| Species code | Species (English name) | Species (Scientific name) | no. of specimen among catches | % |
|--------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----|
| 0401 | Bogue | Boops boops | 27 | 20 |
| 0101 | Garfish | Belone belone | 20 | 15 |
| 1006 | Saddled bream | Oblada melanura | 13 | 10 |
| 0307 | Atlantic mackerel | Scomber scombrus | 8 | 6 |
| 0901 | Triglidae | Triglidae | 8 | 6 |
| 0903 | Gobidae (other) | Gobidae | 8 | 6 |
| 1018 | Blennies | Blennius spp. | 6 | 5 |
| 0402 | Flathead grey mullet | Mugil cephalus | 3 | 2 |
| 1002 | European conger | Conger conger | 3 | 2 |
| 1007 | Gilthead sea bream | Sparus auratus | 3 | 2 |
| 1009 | Pagellus spp. (other) | Pagellus spp. | 3 | 2 |

As shown in the table, the most discarded species in quantitative terms was bogue (*Boops boops*), followed by garfish (*Belone belone*), saddled bream (*Oblada melanura*) and so on.

The same evaluation was made for database b, on monthly basis: in this case we obtained a higher percentage of responses with regard to the monthly quantities of fish and species caught, because it was easier for the fisherman to remember better in a more limited period of time.

CONCLUSION

The present study, forms the initial basis for the application of an integrated data collection system for recreational fisheries in Eastern and Central Mediterranean, *in order to be easily comparable to the data collection related professional fisheries (The Council Regulations no. 1543/2000)* and the *Commission Regulation no.1639/2001*, were the two main sources for considering and finally determining the recreational fisheries data in order to be comparable with professional fisheries).

♦ Special effort was exerted in determining the kind of parameters – biological, economic, social and demographic – that portray the state and dynamics of sport fisheries in Italy.

The biological parameters chosen are:

Organization of recreational fishermen (nautical club, association of recreational fishermen, etc.); Fishing vessel characteristics (GRT, engine power, etc.); Fishing trips (no. of annual or monthly fishing trips, people on board during fishing trips, etc); Fishing gear characteristics (type of fishing gear used, catches by fishing gear, etc.); Conflicts with professional fishermen (causes of conflicts, no. of conflicts, etc.). Conflicts could be also considered as social variables. Their presence here is related to the competition among the recreational and professional fishermen in the same fishing area and the same species; Catches (by species, by fishing trips, etc.); Discarded catches (percentage of discards, species discarded, etc.). Economic parameters (for example consumption of fuel) to make easier to evaluate fishing effort. *To give an exact picture of recreational fisheries, a yearly data collection ("minimum program") has been

decided for the general picture of the pre-selected sample of recreational fishermen, while a monthly data collection ("extended program") has been decided as the best time frequency that can compromise between the following:

the memory of the recreational fishermen; the need to process data on monthly/seasonal basis;

the discontinuity of the recreational fishery.

By concluding the theoretical determination of our proposed data collection system the following step was to test it in practice. Thus, the proposed data collection system was tested in practice by face-to-face interviews to a sample of recreational fishermen using the data forms A and B produced.

Fishermen's positive response to the data forms and generally towards a future system for data collection was mainly based on personal communication and mutual trust.



Thank you for your attention !!!