

Dear EXCO,

**Herewith an overview of FOSAF-related matters in the Western Cape:**

NEM:BA and CapeNature (CN) alien fish management policy

Since I've been elected as chair of the CPS I've been distracted from FOSAF mainstream objectives, especially those related to the NEM:BA debate. However, the CPS did respond to the CapeNature (CN) alien fish management programme, which I believe was not well received by CN.

In brief, CN's legal team disagrees with the advice that the CPS obtained from Ilan Lax and Ian Cox (please see attached documentation) and CN's representatives requested politely that the CPS separates itself from FOSAF's stance and recommendations regarding alien species and alien invasive species. We are still waiting for a formal reply from CN.

The South African Flyfishing and Fly-Tying Festival

The CPS (in conjunction with Boland Fly Fishing and Western Province Fly Fishing) will be hosting a Flyfishing and Fly-Tying Festival on 30 July 2016 at Lourensford Estate (see attached draft document). The event will raise money that will be shared between Trout SA, Boland Fly Fishing and WP Fly Fishing. I therefore request FOSAF and Trout SA's involvement in terms of banners and perhaps raffle prizes and pamphlets etc. Please discuss this at the EXCO and provide feedback asap.

FOSAF Administration

It has come to my attention that a great deal of money is spent on FOSAF administration costs, of which the expense I believe is unnecessarily high. In order to cut on costs, it is suggested that most of the administration (such as membership renewal prompts and other notices and information, circulation of The Tippet, website updates etc.) should be transferred to an electronic communications system. The CPS makes use of Torque for this purpose:

GARRETH  
managing

VAN

RENSBURG  
director

garreth@torque.pro

+27

83

608

3021

[www.torque.pro](http://www.torque.pro)

torque

get geared to accelerate your business

## Recreational Fisheries Economic Impact Assessment

*(In response from a scientific angle)*

The questionnaire appears poorly constructed as there are numerous grammatical errors in the various question headings. The excel questionnaire gave the impression that it was constructed by someone with a basic knowledge of fishing, likely someone with no background in fishing (i.e., an undergraduate student who is not a fisherman taking up a project to perform a survey on fisherman), someone that did not spend much time on research methodology regarding an economic impact study, etc. etc.; which should not be the case for well-constructed scientific survey questionnaires, regardless of the participants/target group.

If the recommendations by Southwick and Associates are compared to the questions in the excel sheet, it immediately raises the question and concern about the difference between an economic impact study and social/psychological study. The focus should be on the economic impact and it should not include anything about the emotions associated to the hobby/sport/business that is fishing.

The limitation and lack of specification in angling types and fish species in the questionnaire is easily identified by an angler and also very concerning in case of a scientific study. Moreover, the questionnaire addresses only 'the angler' and not clubs/organizations/businesses that are dependent on fishing and that also make out a fundamental part of the fishing industry in the RSA. Even though anglers are the likely consumers of fishing businesses and likely belong to clubs/organisations, there are other costs that angling bodies (i.e., fishing organisations/clubs/businesses) cover that are not directly related to the consumer - has this been taken into account? Both sides (the consumer and retailer/provider) should be taken into account in this survey (as rightly pointed out by Ian Cox in saying trout farmers were left out of the equation, for instance). The most concerning part of such a survey is the sample population - I doubt that this survey, spread electronically, would reach even 50% of South Africa's fishing population?

Ian Cox's response would be perceived as obstreperous by those who are conducting the survey, but there is a big difference between being difficult and being someone with high standards; Ian Cox has high standards and he is trying to help rather than end this survey - he is mostly right in his detailed response and I support his views. In my opinion this survey is fundamentally flawed and the project is extremely poorly planned and constructed, which is very surprising considering the list of academic people involved and their qualifications. This is bad science and not at the level of a masters or PhD degree, it is more like a high school project.

This survey will without a doubt be published in a local journal with a poor impact factor and it almost seems like it was constructed for that purpose - "Let's just do a quick survey and publish something locally". No! You do something 100% and not 80%, 60% or 30% as in this case, and you aim for the highest journal with a good impact factor and media that receives international recognition. I hate to say this, but this will produce 'another 3rd world publication' that will receive little attention and credit internationally. It is not good for our country's 'face' at this point in time.

So, my recommendation is that it is entirely reconstructed and sent out to all key stakeholders and that it caters for all types of entities in the fishing industry, and not just individual anglers. Otherwise, this project should not go ahead at all. All research projects come with an initial 'research proposal'; that is the most critical part of a study (it includes a motivative introduction, reason(s) for conducting the study, hypothesis, objectives and aims etc.) and FOSAF and Trout SA should inquire to see the research proposal of this project - in fact, the research proposal should be circulated as part of the survey documents to all stakeholders.

#### FOSAF Policies and Objectives

Heck! What a document...I believe that it could be presented simpler and shorter – my biggest recommendation re this doc. Otherwise, I agree with most of the minor and obvious changes indicated as track changes in the document. Good luck addressing and discussing the more complicated phrases and definitions in the document – I really believe that it's too long and dragged out; the text should be more concise.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Leonard Flemming  
(FOSAF WC Chapter representative)