



Coastal Fisheries Creel Report Card

2021

NUI

Introduction

This Coastal Fisheries Creel Report Card summarises the results of monitoring key indicators during creel surveys being carried out by Tuvalu Fisheries Department.

The Key indicators we use to show the health of the resources (and state of overfishing are):

Indicator 1: Percentage of fishes that are landed which are smaller than the size at which at least 50% of the fish can breed (called length at maturity, L_m). This value should decline and approach zero as management actions improve, followed by improvements in the fisheries resources.

This is an indicator of **overfishing**.

Indicator 2: Catch of fishes per unit of effort (CPUE). We use the weight (kg) of fishes being landed: (a) per fisher per hour spent fishing and (b) per fishing trip. The values for Indicator 2 should increase as things improve. That is, fishers should be able to catch more fish in less time.

This is an indicator of **abundance** of the fishery as well as the **efficiency** of the fishing method.

Results

Overall status of Nui's coastal resources is poor, with an average of 38% of the fishes caught being undersized. This is similar to the national average of 35%.

The ideal % of fishes being landed that are undersized is 0, so any actions that will reduce this to lower levels is a step in the right direction and is expected to lead to improvements in the resources.

IDEAL: % UNDERSIZED should DECLINE over time and approach 0%




Figure 1: Percentage of fishes being landed undersized by year +/-SE. The sample size (n) is reported in blue.

Green arrow = good trend

Red arrow = bad trend

Indicator 1 increased between 2016 and 2017. In 2018 this trend reversed, which is a good sign as the number of undersized fish being landed decreased. There are insufficient sample numbers in 2015 and 2019 to interpret the results further.

Every fish should have the chance to breed at least once to ensure the resources can be replenished.

For Indicator 2a, the total weight of fish being landed per fisher per hour spent fishing appears to have slowly decreased over the survey years for all fishing methods. The exception was handlining, which increased between 2017 and 2018 (Figure 2).




Figure 2: Indicator 2a. Weight (in kg) of fishes landed per fisher per hour spent fishing in Nui. Data is only available for 2016-2019.




Figure 3: Indicator 2b. Weight (in kg) of fishes landed per fisher per fishing trip fishing in Nui. Data is only available for 2016-2019.

Indicator 2b, the weight of fishes landed per fisher per entire fishing trip (i.e., not per hour) also showed a decline over the survey years for all fishing methods. (Figure 3). This shows that the returns per fishing trip have declined over that period.

Catch per unit of effort (CPUE) should INCREASE over time in a well-managed fishery.

Conclusions

Overall, there has been minimal improvement to the health of coastal fisheries since surveys begun. More data is needed to better understand the status of resources.

Management plans need to be developed and implemented more efficiently to improve the health of Tuvalu's coastal fisheries

Note: The catch reported do not include offshore fish species such as Atu (skipjack tuna). These pelagic species accounted for 15% of the total catch numbers recorded in the creel surveys (2016-2019). There is no data for 2020-2021.

Why are some figures different from the previous report card?

This is due to a number of reasons:

1. We have received more data from the years 2015 – 2019
2. We have more accurate information on size of maturity from recently published studies
3. We have now included the size of maturity data for 30 extra species
4. We have displayed CPUE by fishing method

Appendix I: Size of maturity (L_m) for top 25 species

Table 1 is part of indicator 1. It shows the breakdown of species that have 50% or more fishes landed that are undersized. A value of 100 means that all fishes landed are undersized. The ideal value for a well-managed fishery is 0. Blank cells indicate that no catch has been recorded for that species in that year. This table shows that many of the species being monitored are being caught undersized, and this varies by year.

The species are listed in order of their abundance in the catch landed (% of total catch).

Table 1: List of species for which size at maturity (L_m) is known, showing percentages landed which are undersized (2015-2019)

	Scientific Name	Local Name	% in catch	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
1	<i>Acanthurus triostegus</i>	Manini, Koinava	20.6%		18	60	18	
2	<i>Myripristis pralinia?</i>	Malau puku	5.2%			0	0	
3	<i>Epinephelus macrospilos</i>	Gatala (Ff), fÄpuku (Nm)	3.0%			100	85	
4	<i>Crenimugil crenilabis</i>	Kanase	2.8%	0		78	15	0
5	<i>Lutjanus fulvus</i>	Tagau, Takape	2.3%		29	42	10	
6	<i>Lethrinus obsoletus</i>	Tanutanu	2.3%		13	11	62	
7	<i>Liza vaigiensis</i>	Kafakafa	2.2%		100	72	80	
8	<i>Hipposcarus longiceps</i>	Ulafi	1.8%		33	55	47	
9	<i>Parupeneus barberinus</i>	Malili, Kaivete	1.8%			3		
10	<i>Caranx melampygus</i>	Aseu, Ulua, Fuaika	1.7%			62	60	
11	<i>Parupeneus cyclostomus</i>	Kaivete piniki	1.6%			50	19	
12	<i>Lutjanus monostigma</i>	Taiva	1.5%		14	100	43	
13	<i>Kyphosus cinerascens</i>	Nanue, Inonikai	1.0%			60	0	
14	<i>Caranx ignobilis</i>	Tino ulua (lge), Lupo (small), Aseu (med); Mea tal	1.0%			100	97	
15	<i>Lutjanus argentimaculatus</i>	Tagau	0.7%	100		100	100	
16	<i>Caranx sexfasciatus</i>	Teu	0.6%			100	59	
17	<i>Lutjanus gibbus</i>	Taea	0.5%		46		13	
18	<i>Kyphosus vaigiensis</i>	Nanue (Ff, Nm)	0.5%		0	100	82	
19	<i>Elagatis bipinnulata</i>	Kami, Kamai; Kamaa	0.4%		36	0	0	
20	<i>Sargocentron spiniferum</i>	Tamalau	0.3%		63	100		
21	<i>Monotaxis grandoculis</i>	Muu, Mufala	0.3%		0	86	100	
22	<i>Lutjanus kasmira</i>	Savane	0.2%			63	100	
23	<i>Neoniphon sammara</i>	Kami, Kamai	0.2%			0	0	
24	<i>Aphareus furca</i>	Palusega, Kotua, Taelepe, Takuoga	0.2%		100		100	
25	<i>Lethrinus erythracanthus</i>	Saputu	0.2%		0	75	0	