

MANAGEMENT OF MOORED FISH AGGREGATION DEVICES (FADs) IN THE CARIBBEAN

H. Sadusky^{1,2}, P. Chaibongsai², D.J. Die¹, J. Agar³ and M. Shivlani¹

SUMMARY

Humans have used fish aggregation devices (FADs) for centuries to attract fish. Technological advances in recent decades have made FADs more efficient and expanded their use globally. Management, however, has been slow to follow the fast developments in construction and deployment, and regional fisheries bodies have just begun to consider FADs as a tool requiring management and regulation. In the Caribbean, moored FADs are rapidly being deployed by a variety of stakeholders as guidelines are lacking, which has led to conflict among user groups and questions about biological sustainability. This study aims to guide the fishery manager, researcher, or community leader in developing a FAD management plan. The current situation of FADs in the Caribbean is presented, and global examples of FAD management are examined in order to determine the steps most necessary for successful use of this method of fishing. At the end, guidelines for possible management strategies for moored FADs in the Caribbean are presented.

RÉSUMÉ

L'humanité utilise les dispositifs de concentration de poissons (DCP) depuis des siècles pour attirer les poissons et les avancées technologiques de ces dernières décennies ont rendu les DCP plus efficaces et ont élargi leur utilisation dans le monde. La gestion, cependant, a été lente à suivre les développements rapides dans la fabrication et le déploiement, et les organes régionaux des pêcheries ont à peine commencé à envisager les DCP comme un outil qui nécessite une gestion et une réglementation. Dans les Caraïbes, les DCP ancrés sont rapidement déployés par divers intervenants étant donné que des lignes directrices font défaut, ce qui a conduit à des conflits entre les groupes d'utilisateurs et des questions ont surgi sur la durabilité biologique. Cette étude vise à orienter les gestionnaires et les chercheurs des pêcheries ou les chefs communautaires dans l'élaboration d'un plan de gestion des DCP. La situation actuelle des DCP dans les Caraïbes est présentée, et des exemples à l'échelle mondiale de gestion des DCP sont examinés afin de déterminer les étapes indispensables d'une bonne utilisation de cette méthode de pêche. À la fin, des lignes directrices sont présentées pour des stratégies de gestion possibles pour les DCP dans les Caraïbes.

RESUMEN

Desde hace siglos, la humanidad ha utilizado dispositivos de concentración de peces (DCP) para atraer a los peces, y los avances tecnológicos de las últimas décadas han hecho que los DCP sean más eficaces y que su utilización se haya expandido a nivel mundial. Sin embargo, la ordenación ha ido más despacio que los rápidos desarrollos que han tenido lugar en la construcción y plantado, y los organismos regionales pesqueros acaban de empezar a considerar que los DCP son una herramienta que tiene que ser regulada y gestionada. En el Caribe, los DCP fondeados están siendo plantados por una variedad de partes interesadas y, al no existir ningún tipo de directriz, han surgido conflictos entre los grupos de usuarios y se han planteado preguntas acerca de su sostenibilidad desde el punto de vista biológico. El objetivo de este estudio es servir de guía para los gestores, investigadores pesqueros o líderes de la comunidad a la hora de desarrollar un plan de ordenación de DCP. Se presenta la situación actual de los DCP en el Caribe, y se examinan ejemplos globales de ordenación de DCP con el fin de determinar los pasos más necesarios para conseguir una utilización adecuada de este método de pesca. Finalmente, se presentan directrices para posibles estrategias de ordenación para los DCP en el Caribe.

¹ University of Miami Rosenstiel School of Marine & Atmospheric Science; hsadusky@rsmas.miami.edu.

² The Billfish Foundation.

³ National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA.

KEYWORDS

Artisanal fishing, coastal fisheries, fishery development, fishing gear, floating structures, pelagic fisheries, sport fishing, fishery management, fishery policy

1. Introduction

Fish aggregating devices (FADs) have been used by humans for centuries, likely millennia, to attract fish to a floating object and make capture easier. Technological developments in the 20th century led to improved FAD design, use, and therefore efficiency. Today they are widely used by the commercial fishing industry, small-scale fishermen and sport fishers. Although much research has focused on ecological impacts of FADs, less has been done to understand the conflict arising when fishers of different user groups vie for a spot near a FAD. Such conflict is a reflection of the limited attempts to manage this activity. Regulatory fisheries bodies are only recently beginning to address the questions surrounding use of fish aggregating devices.

Through bio-economic modeling, Samples and Sproul (1985) showed that FAD fisheries under an open access regime fail to provide the benefits advertised, namely increasing fishermen's profits, employment opportunities and landings of fish. In fact, deployment of unregulated FADs may generate unintended results such as decreases in the above-mentioned benefits.

In the Caribbean, the rapid expansion of moored fishing is largely among artisanal fishers (CRFM, 2015), although recreational fishing on FADs has also been growing. In Guadeloupe, for example, 300 vessels are engaged in fishing the 400 moored FADs (also called anchored FADs) deployed around the island and their fishing effort represents almost 20% of the island fishing trips by commercial vessels (CRFM 2015). Despite the prevalence of the use of this fishing gear, little regulation exists regarding FAD use, development, and management in this region. Moored FADs are more prevalent than drifting FADs in the Caribbean and are used to catch pelagic species such as dolphin, wahoo, tunas, and billfish. FADs here are typically deployed in three manners: a private FAD placed by an individual, a private collective FAD placed by a group of fishers, or a public FAD placed by the government or an international agency. These moored FADs are always placed within each country's EEZ, so management responsibility resides with the coastal state or territory.

A recurring argument presented in support of developing moored FAD fisheries is to reduce pressure on the overfished coastal areas that have traditionally supported reef-fish fisheries, so as to provide additional or alternative economic benefits. However, it has not been proven that the introduction of FADs does in fact decrease pressure on coastal stocks: in Martinique and Guadeloupe, most fishers using FADs continued to fish the nearshore areas, while most in Dominica fished just the FADs (CRFM, 2015). This evidence suggests socioeconomic and regulatory context also heavily influence fishing pressure and behavior.

Conflict over FAD use has become common in the Caribbean. Artisanal fishers, individuals or co-ops, and recreational fishers all have an interest in easy capture of pelagic fish. This has led to clashes on the water as all users attempt to extract the greatest benefit from fishery resources aggregated around the FAD. Overcrowding on public FADs can lead to reduced catch and income. Vandalism and severing of lines of private FADs is also frequent. The source of a FAD's funding—government, NGO, communal, or private—can have an influence on how it will be treated and what kinds of conflict may come out of it. Those deployed by the government or grant funds are typically open access, neither providing fishers with a sense of responsibility nor offering secured funding for maintenance. Alternatively, if a FAD is built and deployed by a single fisher, that individual expects to reap the benefits of the investment and assumes some exclusivity. Conflict then erupts when others begin utilizing the FAD for their own benefit. Fishery regulations are largely absent in the Caribbean, and those few nations that do have legal guidelines typically lack enforcement with which to followup.

This paper intends to present the state of knowledge on FAD use and guidelines for developing FAD management plans in the Caribbean. It provides information on how to develop a FAD management plan and presents the elements necessary for its success, including several potential management strategies.

1.1 Methodology

This study conducted a thorough review of existing literature on FAD management as well as an examination of co-management research. The review was complemented with personal communications with a number of researchers and stakeholders that have knowledge of Caribbean FAD fisheries.

2. Global Management of moored FADs

The FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries recognizes the need for FAD management,

“States should, within the framework of coastal area management plans, establish management systems for artificial reefs and fish aggregation devices. Such management systems should require approval for the construction and deployment of such reefs and devices and should take into account the interests of fishers, including artisanal and subsistence fishers, (Article 8.11.3, 1995).”

However, regional fishery management organizations have only recently started operationalizing FAD management measures.

Management of fish aggregating devices has taken many forms across the world and it is recognized that sociocultural factors impact the success of any management strategy. The Caribbean region, and each island, has its own unique community that must be considered in development plans. Many of the following examples utilized such uniqueness in building their distinct FAD management plan.

Recreational fishing is a pastime in Australia, where sport fishers target pelagic species such as dolphinfish, wahoo, tuna, and billfish. The Perth Game Fishing Club located on the southwest coast of the country utilizes six moored FADs to attract tuna, kingfish, dolphinfish, marlin and more for its members. Membership dues help to continue the program by funding maintenance, although private companies may also sponsor FADs. A FAD Code of Conduct is part of the agreement as well. On the southeast side of Australia, the state of New South Wales (NSW) has a history of moored FAD use for recreational fishing as well. The initial success of five FADs in 2002 led to five more being deployed the following year, and the popular program now handles 29 FADs in total. Research has shown that the most common fish around these FADs is dolphinfish, which makes up 95% of the catch. The state government conducts monitoring and tagging research around their FADs and has also established a FAD Code of Conduct. At the national level, the Game Fishing Association Australia has a Code of Conduct for FAD fishing. With the help of management, public FADs are successfully evolving in Australia.

In Hawaii, moored FAD development and experimentation goes back to the 1970s. The Honolulu Laboratory of the National Marine Fisheries Services deployed several in 1977, which were successful in increasing commercial tuna catches as well as recreational catches. The state’s natural resources department soon proposed establishing a system of FADs, which resulted in the 1980 deployment of 26 FADs in waters around the main Hawaiian Islands. There are currently 55 surface FADs monitored and maintained throughout Hawaii, funded primarily by the Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Program, a national program authorized through a 1950 Act of the same name. Regulations include laws against mooring on, damaging or removing FADs.

Dolphinfish in the Mediterranean Sea have been caught using FADs for decades, if not centuries (Morales-Nin *et al.*, 2000). At the beginning of the season, typically August, artisanal boats from Italy and Spain deploy anywhere between 10 and 100 FADs each, depending on the location and surrounding benthic and fishery features. Generally, these FADs are moored, although some are drifting, and are small-scale, constructed of palm fronds and cork anchored with large stones. In Malta, fishermen must apply for a permit in May in order to gain access to particular fishing sites. Licenses are then distributed, fishermen place their own moored FADs in their allocated area, and dolphinfish fishing commences in August. In Tunisia, moored FADs are given unique markings to distinguish the owner (Morales-Nin *et al.*, 2000).

In lesser-developed countries, FADs are often promoted as an alternative form of fishing that provides access to previously hard to reach pelagic fish resources, as well as another source of income. FAD fishing can also be more cost effective and safer, as fishers do not use fuel to travel long distances searching for fish. Considering the congregating behavior of large fish, a greater catch per unit of effort (CPUE) is yielded from FAD fishing. The FAO/UNDP initiated a FAD development effort in Mauritius in the 1980s in response to drastic declines in inshore fisheries, including demersal and lagoon species (Beverly *et al.*, 2012). Seven pilot moored FADs were deployed, all considered to be common property, set by government institutions. “The anchored FADs were

deployed between 2.5 to 6.3 nm offshore which was where artisanal fishers normally operated. One anchored FAD was, however, later deployed 12 nm offshore,” (p.30, Beverly *et al.*, 2012). Boats spotted around the FADs included artisanal boats who mainly used handlines or trolled, sports (tourist) boats who trolled also, and part-time fishers who handlined.

Dolphinfish, yellowfin tuna, skipjack, wahoo, sharks, and billfish were commonly caught around the FADs, but tuna was most frequent, caught year-round and accounting “for 78 percent by weight of the artisanal catch,” (p.30, Beverly *et al.*, 2012). Interests of user groups did not become a problem here, as it just so happened that “the artisanal fishers preferred fishing at the nearshore anchored FADs while the sportfishing boats preferred visiting the more distant FADs. Big game fishers and sports fishers often caught baitfish at the FADs to be used to fish for marlin and tuna further from the anchored FADs.” (p.30, Beverly *et al.*, 2012). It was estimated that the cost of each anchored FAD deployed off Mauritius “represented only 4 percent of the net annual production value of the fish caught by artisanal, sport, and part-time fishers,” (p.30, Beverly *et al.*, 2012).

A study was done on moored FADs in the Comoros, La Reunion and Vanuatu in 2000. Increased productivity around FADs caused a 340 percent increase in pelagic fish catches in La Reunion over an eight-year period, however, the authors found that such fishing success was not sufficient for long-term success of the FADs. In fact, the level of involvement of the fishers and type of management method proved to be most important for the successful persistence of FADs in these two island nations.

Vanuatu saw a greater FAD development attempt in 2014 with the help of the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), an organization that also has a presence in the Caribbean. The initial program deployed 131 moored FADs in the 1980s, but a lack of awareness about the benefits of FADs was a challenge (Amos *et al.*, 2014). Management and technical regulations followed, including the establishment of a committee in each area for the purpose of implementing the community FAD guidelines. Only boats registered by the committee of an area were permitted to fish the community FAD, and those who are not must apply to the committee and pay a membership fee to register and be allowed access to their FAD. These fees are then spent on fuel to monitor and maintain the FAD. Regulations were also created for FAD conduct, such as trolling must be 20m away, dropline and deep-bottom fishing must be 300m away, no spearfishing or gillnetting allowed around the FAD, and also discouraging mooring to the FAD.

In each above scenario, community involvement in developing or implementing the regulations was a key component in successful FAD management, as it is for any fisheries management plan. Unfortunately, this level of institutional cooperation is less prevalent among Caribbean nations and communities.

3. FAD Management by Atlantic RFMOs

As the RFMO responsible for management of tunas and tuna-like species in the Atlantic, ICCAT has been discussing FAD management for a number of years, but it was only in 2014 that the first explicit recommendations on FADs were adopted. ICCAT created an ad-hoc working group on FADs [Rec 14-03] to report to the Commission in 2016. The group’s responsibilities were reinstated through [Rec 16-02] which requested “identifying management options and common standards for FAD management, including regulation”. The ensuing meetings for the FAD working group should therefore consider suggestions for furthering FAD management and plan building.

Recommendations [15-01], and [16-01] on management of tropical tunas contain several references on FAD fishing, but they are aimed mostly at drifting FADs, even though there is no wording to specifically distinguish drifting FADs from moored FADs. This recommendation calls for ICCAT contracting parties (CPCs) to submit management plans to ICCAT by January 31 each year. Further specifications are made for collecting information on FADs, which is recognized as lacking. The recommendation also calls for CPCs to have replaced FADs with non-entangling FADs and work to gradually replace existing FADs with fully biodegradable FADs. Annex 6 in [Rec 16-01] provides a useful outline of what must be included in FAD management plans for a member country’s purse seine and bait boat fleets.

In 2013, the Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism (CRFM) announced an initiative for member States to expand the use of FADs. Reasons cited include taking pressure off inshore reef fishes and developing economic benefits from an under-utilized resource (CARICOM, 2013). A collaborative effort has since begun in the region with a number of development projects and funding sources to advance FADs in the Caribbean. More recently, in 2015, the CRFM published a draft FAD management plan, however, the document fails to direct users to any concrete management schemes. The plan was never fully implemented due to the reluctance of several States to adopt any restrictive actions, and so it remains a draft with no authority.

4. Caribbean National FAD Management

Some Caribbean countries began to experiment with FADs in the 1980s, while others are just learning of the possible benefits and have been supported by various international development agencies. The Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) has tried to help development of FAD fisheries in the Caribbean, with mixed success. Their Caribbean Fisheries Co-Management (CARIFICO) project began with introducing FADs in several eastern Caribbean islands, then moved into education sessions to train fisherfolk on building and deploying FADs. Now that the program is several years in, management has become a concern and JICA is working to introduce some sort of rights-based plan, similar to the co-management found in Japan. However, the CARIFICO project is slated for just five years, and its deadline is approaching likely with no plans for renewal.

The French Research Institute for Exploitation of the Sea (IFREMER) has been working similarly in the Caribbean through a project called MAGDALESA: Moored Fish Aggregating Devices in the Lesser Antilles. They work in conjunction with the FAO and the Western Central Atlantic Fisheries Commission (WECAFC), and have thus far also focused on introducing FADs to fishing communities, sharing information on best FAD materials and design, and educating fishers about fish storage and quality. Finally, the Caribbean Billfish Project, funded by the World Bank and spearheaded by the FAO and WECAFC, is working to develop a regional management plan for billfish utilizing FAD fisheries. In some cases, these external partners have simply helped in the deployment of FADs; fewer, have worked to implement management.

Most Caribbean nations do not have regulation or legislation regarding FADs (**Table 1**). Of the 32 nations and territories in or surrounding the Caribbean, just nine have some form of FAD regulation. Further, those that do have regulations often have little to no enforcement of those regulations.

Management has often been an afterthought when it comes to FADs—agencies and governments are so concerned with introducing them as a new fishing tool and developing cost-effective designs that little attention is given to how the device will be used once people begin to fish around it. Further, upkeep is always dependent on consistent funding that is not always present. Lack of secure funding leads to mistrust and conflict often ensues as users individually try to extract the most benefit from a shared, public resource.

This was the case in Dominica, where “conflict arose among fishers upon realizing that heavy exploitation of the FADs was beginning to jeopardize the viability of the fishery. After the introduction of the limited entry of vessels and/or fishers, the fishers themselves were empowered through co-management arrangements to enforce and monitor each other’s compliance with established protocol.” (p.5, CRFM, 2013). In analyzing FAD fisheries of Dominica, Sidman *et al.* (2014) found working with the local fishers to be monumental. The researchers first talked to fishers in three communities to learn about primary concerns, then gathered data with the help of fishers, conducted an analysis, took the findings back to the local communities and together devised management strategies. Dominica has a history of private FADs, which caused conflict when the government deployed public FADs with an open access policy. These public FADs were not maintained well since no fisher believed it to be their responsibility; they were given no resting period and instead fishers would end up taking small fish, compromising the stock; and crowding resulted on these few FADs, reducing the fishers’ economic return. After stakeholder meetings, the following best management practices were identified: greater input from the government on deployment, maintenance, and information sharing like a newsletter; need for “code of ethics” to formalize cooperation among fishers; framework should be flexible to allow for both public and private FADs, but with spatial separation (p.9, Sidman *et al.*, 2014). Dominica as well as Saint Lucia have since initiated bottom-up efforts and developed a draft FAD fishery management plan with the help of CARIFICO. Conversely, attempts at this have failed in Haiti.

Such conflict was avoided from the start in Antigua and Barbuda. FAD fishery developments began here in 2013 with input from fisherfolk who worked to collaborate and enforce decisions, including establishing the fishery as limited-entry. The importance of instituting regulations from the beginning was noted at a regional FAD workshop (CRFM, 2013).

Strengthening collaboration with fisherfolk has been called for in Grenada, where a number of problems surround FADs. “Fisheries laws required vessels registration numbers to be written or placed on the vessel, however this was not enforced. Poor quality FADs, inappropriate site selection, lack of establishment of FAD ownership, lack of maintenance, lack of monitoring, and theft of FAD buoys reflected the need for the establishment of a FAD management system, which was currently considered as non-existent.” (p.6, CRFM, 2013). It was only recently that fishers became aware of FADs, after stumbling onto the one deployed by the MAGDELESA project, but it was found that they “strongly supported the principles of co-management, even to the point of self-imposing user fees,” (p.7, CRFM, 2013). The final management plan for Grenada’s FAD fishery remains to be seen.

FAD fishing has recently gained popularity among recreational anglers in Puerto Rico, where 11 moored FADs have been deployed within the past two years. Similar to the state-managed FADs in Hawaii, the initiative is funded by a U.S. Fish & Wildlife Sport Fish Restoration Program grant, and led by the non-profit Fundacion Legado Azul, which constructs and deploys the FADs. The goal, according to the project proposal, is to “provide recreational and economic benefits for Puerto Rican (and international) recreational anglers...and help perpetuate traditional fishing activities,” (Merten, 2017). An article by the San Juan International Billfish Tournament (2016) said the FADs are revitalizing the charter industry. Although no specific management plan has been outlined by Puerto Rico, user rules are listed on a website dedicated to the FAD system.

Tourism and sport fishing are popular in the Dominican Republic, where fishing is open access and conflict between user groups abounds. Both artisanal fishers and sportfishers aim to capture pelagic species on moored FADs. Since the resource is open access, there are no regulations or rights that must be respected. Agreements have been attempted between charter captains and fishing communities with mixed results (Arocha, 2017). This has so far proven successful in Punta Cana, where a captain at the Cap Cana marina will charge customers a fee to fish on a FAD, which ultimately pays fishers of the Macao village to maintain the device. A similar arrangement was attempted on the southern coast but failed: the Casa de Campo marina agreed to pay fishers of San Pedro de Macoris to service and maintain the FADs, but the middleman pocketed the money before it ever made it to the community. This has resulted in explosive conflicts on the water, as artisanal fishers chase sport fishing boats and try to pilfer their catch of marlin or sailfish. Arocha (2017) does not see a solution in these money transfer agreements, but instead calls for arrangements that can improve the fishing capabilities of artisanal fishers, such as cold storage facilities or enhancing the quality of fish being landed.

5. Guidelines for FAD Management

From this assessment of moored FAD management and existing tactics in the Caribbean, a set of guidelines to creating FAD management plans have been developed (Appendix I) with explanations of each of the steps and factors that must be considered in order to achieve success. Best practices will naturally vary based on a country or community’s current situation, and these guidelines are intended to account and allow for that diversity. They are also intended to be applicable for scenarios where FADs have already been deployed as well as instances where FADs are not yet in place. Following the guidelines are four suggested management strategies that have potential to be effective with FADs.

5.1 Limited Entry/License Regime

It is clear that FAD fisheries cannot be managed with unlimited open access. Studies have noted repeatedly that such unrestricted access and pressure on the fish stocks will lead to conflict and possibly unsustainable use of resources. The ensuing proposed solution is licensing, which would cap the number of fishermen allowed around a particular FAD by requiring they have a proper license to be there. This could be done at the community level, where fishers of one area obtain licenses for the nearby FADs, or at the national level, where a sustainable number of FAD fishing licenses are distributed to fishers all over the island. If the community level is pursued, a cooperative of fishers should be established, which then becomes the organization to grant licenses for the nearby FADs. Support would be needed from the national government in order to legitimize the co-op licenses. It is true this management technique is not without difficulties, namely that access is based on finances. Some may argue that not all have the means to purchase a license, however the fee is important in building a stable community organization—money would go towards maintaining the FAD, the source of all participants’ income, and extra funds could be used for facility improvements or marketing. Of course, enforcement and oversight would be a hurdle as well, but the rational thought is that the fishermen who pay to access the FAD resource would be more likely to police it and report or remove those without licenses, considering the financial stake they have in its good performance.

5.2 TURFs: location-based rights

Territorial use rights for fisheries (TURFs) have been successful with stationary resources, such as mollusks, by providing a community with exclusive access rights to a geographical area. Considering the location-based nature of TURF management, it’s possible that such a strategy could be applied to moored FADs. In this scenario, a fishing community is given access rights (by the government) to a nearby area, perhaps 10 miles offshore or a two- mile radius surrounding a FAD. This zone of access should include the area where FADs have been or will be deployed. If this strategy is used it must be uniform: each community should have their own exclusive access area, and each is responsible for managing the resources therein. In this way, the

community of fishers decides how, when, and who can fish the FAD resources to which they have been granted exclusive access. This also lends a sense of ownership, giving fishers a reason to exclude others and guard their resource that provides a livelihood. A communal approach is required to make such decisions, and if such a cooperative group does not exist it will have to be created for this management scheme.

5.3 Temporal closures

Time and area closures around FAD fishing have the ability to protect the stocks while also limiting effort. Local fishers often know when particular species of interest frequent their area, and science has explained many migration routes of highly migratory fish. The fishing co-op would use this information to determine where and when closures around FADs should take place. When the closures open, fishers must pay to play, a source of funding that is responsible for maintenance of the FAD. This strategy also makes monitoring easier if no one is allowed at certain times.

5.4 Regulation by gear types

Based on experience with conflict, entanglement, and successful catch, fishers often know best which types of fishing gear should be allowed around FADs, and which should not. Entangling materials should be avoided to minimize effects of FADs on the ecosystem. Again, community organization is required to define this management strategy. The gear types excluded from FAD fishing can be designated to another area, also identified by the fishermen. Further, gear type may imply sector, whereby artisanal fishers may fish around particular FADs and recreational anglers may fish around others. Government cooperation would be necessary in legitimizing these gear zones, while the fishers' rational behavior (self-interest) would help enforce the rules in this instance.

It should be noted that all of these proposed solutions essentially eliminate the option for private FADs, and instead assume a system of communal FAD management for those deployed by the fisher cooperative, the government, or NGOs. Although such a transition will require on the ground effort with trainings and team building, fishing co-ops should be viewed in positive light as they have the ability to strengthen social cohesion and organization. Working together to best manage a shared resource can help eliminate the rampant mistrust among fishers in the Caribbean. Each of the above suggested management plans require input from the fishing community, who should be the ones directing the decision with support from external agencies.

Fujitani *et al.* (2017) show that participatory management improves ecological literacy and can build environmental capacity that leads to sustainability. Jentoft *et al.* (1989) noted nearly three decades ago that "if fishermen find the regulatory scheme legitimate, there is more reason to believe they will follow the rules," (p.139). They identified four components to indeed make regulations legitimate: relevance (coincide with the problems fishers identify), equity of regulations, involvement in making of regulations, and involvement with implementation of regulations. By addressing these last two, the first two concerns will consequently be improved.

Further, all of the proposed solutions also require some form of monitoring and enforcement. This has been a challenge to fisheries in the Caribbean, and while giving a sense of ownership to the fishers will incite their rational behavior to protect their resource, their efforts can only go so far. To reinforce this, government law enforcement will be needed. However, it is not expected that law enforcement constantly patrols each community's management system. Instead, part of the fisher cooperation and organization should include discussion and trainings to note the importance of and how to gather evidence of rule breakers. This can mean photographing an infringing vessel on one's camera phone or recording the vessel ID numbers and passing the information along to the authorities. Due to the involvement of the fishers, the government enforcement's workload will be lighter, and they will be responsible for responding to reports rather than monitoring.

The recreational fishing sector cannot be ignored in FAD management. A simple way to control access is a "pay to play" strategy. There are successful examples of this in the Dominican Republic and Australia, where recreational anglers pay a marina or national fishing club and agree to a Code of Conduct in exchange for access to FADs and the big fish surrounding them. Additionally, the charter captains and marinas may be the ones responsible for paying a government or community for access to FADs, and simply pass those costs on to the customer.

Alternatively, the recreational sector may be included in the above management strategies and planning stages, where relevant. If FAD licenses are decided upon, marinas and charters may be considered an entity for purchasing licenses. In this way, individual tourist anglers are not responsible for obtaining licenses. If a TURF strategy is chosen, again the recreational sector may be given their own region, specifically for anglers from a marina or charter in the area. The same format could be followed for a gear-based management plan, in which recreational-only areas may be designated.

Some locations and nations have little conflict between sectors over FADs and the associated fish. In these cases, a fee may not be necessary for recreational FAD fishing, however, a Code of Conduct for users to abide by should be developed and well publicized.

6. Conclusion

Open access to moored FADs can be disruptive, socially, economically, and biologically. However, the matter of identifying an effective management scheme considering each of these factors-which vary by island in the Caribbean-has been elusive. In Grenada and Dominican Republic open access to FADs has created problems such as inter-user conflict and in Guadeloupe poor FAD management is undermining revenues. We therefore conclude that a limit on fisher participation as well as a limit on FADs deployed are necessary components of management.

Regardless of the final FAD management tool used, it is clear that co-management provides the most promise for success and local fishers must be included in developing and implementing whatever mechanism they see fit. As with any resource, users are more likely to be stewards if they have a stake in its good management. This was confirmed in Grenada where fishers were willing to impose fees upon themselves for proper management (CRFM, 2013). It is also necessary to have coordination among all levels of institutions, including researchers and governments, who should be in tune with these local management plans. Researchers can provide the biological, economic, and environmental factors that must be considered, and ideally, the national government could require the creation of a consortium or cooperative of fishermen-essential for all four suggested strategies-before accepting the community's draft management plans. A final, well-informed plan would then be presented to the government to be adopted, providing the force of law.

Histories, cultures, and economies of each nation in the Caribbean are different; therefore, solutions to managing FAD fisheries will not be a one size fits all approach-numerous methods will have to be employed, depending on the socio-cultural factors present in each nation. A strategy that has worked in Japan may not work in Grenada, just as a method in Australia may not produce the same results in the Dominican Republic. However, it is important that governments, NGOs, universities and researchers work to solve these puzzles and initiate management attempts.

This study is intended to serve as a foundation-subsequent research should address how successful the above-suggested plans are in managing FAD fisheries in the Caribbean. The final product of this research is a set of guidelines that can be applied across the board while still allowing for different management outcomes. Considering the fast-paced growth, nations and management bodies should act promptly to develop informed FAD plans and guidelines. Doing so can allow for the benefits of FAD deployment whilst avoiding and mitigating negative biological, economic, and social consequences.

The use of FADs is increasing across the world, as is the uncertainty surrounding them. Thousands are being deployed annually, with largely unknown biological and ecological consequences. The challenge of finding a management strategy can no longer be pushed to the side.

References

- Albert JA, Beare D, Schwarz A-M, Albert S, Warren R, Teri J, *et al.* 2014. *The Contribution of Nearshore Fish Aggregating Devices (FADs) to Food Security and Livelihoods in Solomon Islands*. PLoS ONE 9(12): e115386. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0115386>
- Allison, E.H. and Ellis, F. 2001. *The livelihoods approach and management of small-scale fisheries*. Marine Policy 25: 377-388.
- Amos, G., Nimoho, G., Fujii, M., Seko, A. Inuma, M., Nishiyama, K., Takayama, T., and Pakoa, K. 2014. *New FAD development approach strengthens community-based fisheries management in Vanuatu*. SPC Fisheries Newsletter #144: 40-47.
- Arocha, F. 2017. Personal communication.
- Bach, P., Dagorn, L., Josse, E., Bard, F.-X, Abbes, R., Bertrand, A. and Misselis, C. 1998. *Experimental research and fish aggregating devices (FADs) in French Polynesia*. SPC Fish Aggregating Device Information Bulletin #3: 3-18.
- Beverly, S., Griffiths D. & Lee, R. 2012. *Anchored fish aggregating devices for artisanal fisheries in South and Southeast Asia: benefits and risks*. FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, Thailand, RAP Publication 2012/20,65p.
- CARICOM. *CRFM states to expand use of Fish Aggregating Devices in 2014*. 2013. Retrieved from <http://caricom.org/communications/view/crfm-states-to-expand-use-of-fish-aggregating-devices-in-2014>
- CRFM. 2015. *2015 Draft Sub-Regional Management Plan for FAD Fisheries in the Eastern Caribbean (Stakeholder Working Document)*. CRFM Technical & Advisory Document. 94p.
- CRFM. 2013. *Report of the CRFM - JICA CARIFICO / WECAFC - IFREMER MAGDELESA Workshop on FAD Fishery Management*. CRFM Technical & Advisory Document, No. 2013/9. 42p.
- Dempster, T., and Taquet, M. 2004. *Fish aggregation device (FAD) research: Gaps in current knowledge and future directions for ecological studies*. Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries 14(1): 21-42.
- FAO. 2016. *Caribbean fisheries legal and institutional study: findings of the comparative assessment and country reports*, by Cristina Leria. FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Circular No. 1124.
- FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries. 1995. *Artificial reefs and fish aggregation devices*. Article 8, section 11.
- Fisheries Division. 2004. *Barbados fisheries management plan 2004-2006*. Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development.
- Fujitani, M., McFall, A., Randler, C., and Arlinghaus, R. 2017. *Participatory adaptive management leads to environmental learning outcomes extending beyond the sphere of science*. Science Advances 3(6).
- Gershman, D., Nickson, A., and O'Toole, M. 2015. *Estimating the use of FADs around the world*. A report by The Pew Charitable Trusts.
- HIMB. 2017. *History of the Hawaii State FADs Program*. State of Hawaii's Fish Aggregation Device Program, Hawaii Institute of Marine Biology.
- ICCAT. 2017. *1st joint t-RFMO FAD working group meeting*. ICCAT Circular #1153.
- ICCAT. 2016. *Recommendation by ICCAT on a multi-annual conservation and management programme for tropical tunas*. Rec 16-01.
- ICCAT. 2016. *Recommendation by ICCAT to establish an ad hoc working group on fish aggregating devices (FADs)*. Rec 16-02.
- ICCAT. 2015. *Overview FAD measures in RFMOs*. 1st meeting of ICCAT WG on FADs, European Commission.
- Jentoft, S. 1989. *Fisheries co-management: delegating government responsibility to fishermen's organizations*. Marine Policy: 137-154.
- Merten, Wessley. 2017. Personal communication.

- Montes, N., Sidman, C., Lorenzen, K., Honda, M., Tamura, M., and Ishida, M. 2017. *Co-management of FAD fisheries: a socio-economic analysis of offshore fishers residing on CARIFICO member islands*. Florida Sea Grant, Japan International Cooperation Agency.
- Morales-Nin, B., Cannizzaro, L., Massuti, E., Potoschi, A., and Andaloro, F. 2000. *An overview of the FADs fishery in the Mediterranean Sea*. Regional syntheses, Session 1: 184-207.
- NSW Government. *Use of FADs in NSW*. Department of Primary Industries. Retrieved from <http://www.dpi.nsw.gov.au/fishing/recreational/resources/fish-aggregating-devices/use-of-fads-in-nsw>
- Pereira, M. 2017. *Against the tide: a FAD fit for Timor-Leste's artisanal fishers*. WorldFish. Retrieved from: <http://blog.worldfishcenter.org/2017/06/against-the-tide-a-fad-fit-for-timor-lestes-artisanal-fishers/>
- Perth Game Fishing Club. 2016. *FADs*. Retrieved from <http://www.pgfc.com.au/fads/>
- Puerto Rico Fish Aggregating Device System. Retrieved from <https://prfadsystem.com/>
- Samples, Karl C. and Sproul, John T. 1985. *Fish Aggregating Devices and open-access commercial fisheries: a theoretical inquiry*. Bulletin of Marine Science 37(1): 305-317.
- San Juan International Billfish Tournament. 2017. *Puerto Rico FADs luring billfish and marine life*. Retrieved from <http://sanjuaninternational.com/V3/puerto-rico-fads-luring-billfish-and-marine-life/>
- Scott, G.P., and Lopez, J. 2014. *The use of FADs in tuna fisheries*. Directorate General for Internal Policies, European Parliament. Retrieved from <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/studies>
- Sidman, Charles. 2017. Personal communication.
- Sidman, C., Lorenzen, K., Sebsten, R., Magloire, A., Cruickshank-Howard, J., Hazell, J., and Masters, J. 2014. *Toward a sustainable Caribbean FAD fishery (an analysis of use, profitability and shared governance)*. Florida Sea Grant, TP-206.
- Spagnolo, M. and Onlus, I. 2012. *What kind of management for Mediterranean fisheries?* Directorate General for Internal Policies, European Parliament. Retrieved from: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/studies>
- Statute Law of The Bahamas. 2006. *Fisheries resources (jurisdiction and conservation)*. Chapter 244: 1- 27.
- The World Bank. 2014. *Ocean partnerships for sustainable fisheries and biodiversity conservation – models for innovation and reform*. World Region, Report No. PAD962
- WECAFC. 2015. *Coordination and collaboration in fisheries research in the region*. Seventh Session of the Scientific Advisory Group. FAO Fisheries & Aquaculture - WECAFC
- Yusfiandayani, R. 2013. *Fish aggregating devices in Indonesia: Past and present status on sustainable capture fisheries*. Galaxea Journal of Coral Reef Studies (Special Issue): 260-268.

Table 1. FAD legislation in all Caribbean nations according to CRFM, 2013; CRFM, 2015; FAO, 2016.

<i>Country</i>	<i>Moored FAD Fishery?</i>	<i>Description of FAD Management</i>
Anguilla	No	FAD deployment requires permission of Minister
Antigua and Barbuda	Yes (supported by CARIFICO)	FAD fishery is limited entry, requires license. FAD fishers placed in zones, allowed to fish any FAD around country but each zone responsible for monitoring their own FAD. Descriptions for placing, marking, protection and designation of FADs, as well as disposal of unlawful FADs.
Aruba (Dutch Caribbean)	Some (Recreational)	None; FADs placed in 1990s and onward, benefit charter boats
Bahamas	Some (Recreational)	None
Barbados	No	None
Belize	No	None; There are no FADs in Belize
British Virgin Islands	Some (Recreational)	None
Cayman Islands	No	None
Colombia	No	FADs prohibited as of 2004, but 2014 Resolution calls for collection of data on FADs to develop management plan for future FAD use
Costa Rica	Some (Recreational)	None
Cuba	No	None
Curacao (Dutch Caribbean)	Yes	None; FADs placed in 1990s and onward, benefit charter boats
Dominica	Yes (supported by CARIFICO and MAGDELESA)	Limited entry introduced after conflict, fishers then monitored each other's compliance
Dominican Republic	Yes	None
Grenada	Yes (supported by CARIFICO and MAGDELESA)	None; need has been recognized, meetings being held
Guadeloupe	Yes	Only commercial fishermen can deploy; location must be registered; no mooring; owner has exclusive rights when present
Guatemala	No	None
Haiti	Yes	None; problems rampant
Honduras	No	None
Jamaica	No	None
Martinique	Yes	FAD laws describe deployment, licensing, marking, contact with FAD and fishing techniques. Licensing: permit required before construction of boat to which license is then assigned
Mexico	No	None
Montserrat	No	FAD defined, Governor in Council provides for licensing and rights to fish around FADs
Nicaragua	No	None
Panama	No	None
Puerto Rico	Some	No nets allowed around FADs; local recreational rules including no anchoring, mooring, damaging or altering FADs
St. Kitts and Nevis	Yes (supported by CARIFICO)	Details on use, marking, and disposal of FADs. FAD license implemented, designed with input of fishers
St. Lucia	Yes (supported by CARIFICO)	Consult with Fisheries Dpt. before deploying; coordinates given to Air & Sea Authority; mark with radar, reflector, flag; no mooring to FAD; owner does not have exclusive rights; regulations in making

St. Vincent and the Grenadines	Yes (supported by CARIFICO and MAGDELESA)	Defines FADs and provides guidelines: requires permission from Chief Fisheries Officer, permission does not confer exclusive rights to fish in the area, person placing FAD must notify CFO within 24 hrs. Further legislation touches on designated FADs, how to mark FADs, and disposal
Trinidad and Tobago	Yes (Tobago)	None; need recognized
Turks & Caicos Islands	No	None
Venezuela	No	None



Figure 1. Simplified steps to building a FAD management plan (*See Appendix I for full guidelines*)

Guidelines to Developing a FAD Management Plan

a. Begin with community meeting

- Includes researcher/fishery manager/NGO and fishermen
- First off: are FADs in your area?
- No: Where will your FADs come from? (Community, government, NGO, other grant)
- Yes: What kind? (private, public, shared)
- Identify existing issues: what concerns, conflicts do fishers have regarding FADs, fish they catch on FADs, use of FADs?
- What are wants/needs of fishing community? For example: more fish, exclusive use of public FAD, improved monitoring

b. Establish a fishing community coop

- Applies for all management strategies and types of stakeholders involved
- May consist of artisanal fishing community; mix of artisanal and recreational voices; between islands -- whoever is utilizing the FAD and associated fishery resource
- Fees apply: no matter the final management strategy, fishers must pay to be part of coop and have access to FAD fishery; this money will be used in maintenance of FAD to ensure fishery

c. Draft a FAD management plan

- What does the coop want out of the management plan?
- Researcher/fishery manager/NGO should help guide and inform the decision of which management strategy is best for this community to employ
- Code of Conduct needs to be included (for all strategies); how does the coop want to interact with the FAD, and each other?
- If government is not directly involved, this draft plan should be sent to appropriate fishery manager; institutional cooperation is necessary for plan to be effective
- Specifically lay out plan for use of funds--coop leader/director will be tasked with managing funds and held accountable by law

d. Secure funding

- Source may influence management (FADs deployed by government and NGOs are typically public, while communal private FADs are presumed exclusive)
- Identify original funding/deployment source and any associated terms of use; is this funding sustainable for long-term management?
- Community coop will need to manage funds

e. Implementation

- Community coop is involved in execution of the management plan
- Any bumps should be addressed in meetings (hold weekly meeting for first few months of implementation?)
- Bonus if reporting system can be developed

f. Monitoring and enforcement

- Partnership effort: community can be watchdog (capture evidence), government will have to be the teeth (enforcing the law and associated punishments)