



**AgEcon** SEARCH  
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

*The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library*

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

*No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.*

**PAGRI/IAP**

*Politica Agricola Internazionale*

Volume **4/2014**

**Paolo De Castro**

*Chairman of the Scientific Committee  
Presidente del Comitato Scientifico*

**Francesco Marangon**

*Editor-in-Chief  
Direttore Scientifico*

**INTERNATIONAL**

[www.politicaagricolainternazionale.it](http://www.politicaagricolainternazionale.it)

*agricultural*

**POLICY**



EDIZIONI  
L'INFORMATORE  
AGRARIO

# THE FISHERMAN FUTURE AND THE OPINION OF THE STAKEHOLDER

JEL classification: ??????

**R. Rigillo<sup>1</sup>, A. Peli<sup>2</sup>, A. Antinelli**

## Introduction

In the next programming period, to maximize the effectiveness of European Structural and Investment funds, (the ESI funds, including the financial instruments for cohesion policy, rural development and fisheries), the Commission has proposed the common provisions regulation (COM (2011) 615). This regulation sets out a common set of basic rules for all ESI funds. This includes provisions concerning conditionality, performance review, arrangements for monitoring, reporting, evaluation and eligibility rules.

The EMFF provisions for the management and control systems and for financial management are aligned with those of the cohesion policy financial tools (the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund).

It is believed that the institutional intervention, national and Community, is crucial to the economic and social competitiveness of the fisheries sector and aquaculture; while representing the legislative intervention characterizing a constraint for the same competitiveness (for known reasons in support of environmental sustainability of fish production), there is no doubt that without government intervention the fishing industry as a whole would be exposed to the dynamics of filthiness international markets, and the low profitability / efficiency / organization that makes less and less profitable activity of industry insiders.

Without this conviction, to make speculations on the possible future of the fishing industry as a whole, and its employees, it was considered useful to resort to the views of some stakeholders of the fisheries and aquaculture sector in some Italian regions (Campania, Puglia, Lazio, Emilia Romagna and Veneto). The goal was to understand how “the sector” perceive and feel improved public intervention (based on the past programming period, 2007-2013), and what the needs not captured by the current programming.

Before considering the merits of the answers, it seems useful to also fix some points on the current competitive situation of fisheries and aquaculture in Italy, by resorting to socio-economic indicators.

The indicators are particularly useful to provide an accurate picture of the fisheries sector from a biological point of view, economic and social. In addition, an evaluation of the state of a system over time can be obtained by comparing the indicators with appropriate reference points. As reported by Caddy and Mahon (1995), these reference values should be associated with a critical condition or with an optimal condition; in the first case is identified a limit that you need to avoid, limit reference points (LRP), while in the second a target to be reached for the system,

<sup>1</sup> Direttore Generale, ex Direzione generale della pesca marittima e dell’acquacoltura, Mipaaf

<sup>2</sup> Univeristà di Bologna Alma Mater

target reference points (TRP). Despite this, LRP and TRP are not easily identifiable for many indicators and / or, in many cases, the necessary data for their estimation are not available.

An attempt to define a general list of indicators and reference points has been pursued by the FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries (FAO, 1999).

## **The role of indicators to build new policy**

Between the reference points pro- places, only in a minority of cases it was possible to define the TRP, in agreement with the general concepts in the literature on sustainability in the fisheries sector, as the Maximum Sustainable Yield and Maximum Economic Yield; while in most cases, have been defined with reference to historical levels of the same indicators. However, the use of historical levels of the indicator does not necessarily represent a choice of second order, as these are particularly suited to highlight the presence of trends and to assess the status of the system with reference to the period analyzed.

The results obtained by the analysis of indicators and reference points can be represented in a clear and easily understood by the so-called method of traffic light. This method was introduced by Caddy (1998) to establish a management system based on the precautionary approach to those fisheries are characterized by a lack of available data. This method is able to provide an instant snapshot of the state of the sector, assigning a color to each value of the indicator along its series.

The use of indicators to analyze and evaluate the state of fisheries are being used by more and many examples can be found in the literature. Over the past thirty years the development of a standardized and continuous monitoring of the sector put at the disposal of scientific research for a greater amount of data. This has encouraged an increasing use and methodologically more appropriate indicators. From a socio-economic, an estimate of annual indicators on the fisheries is produced by Italian Irepa continuously since 2001 and published in "Economic Observatory on Productive structures of" Sea Fishing in Italy.

The indicators have always been used in the fisheries sector as in other sectors, as they represent one of the basic tools for the analysis of a phenomenon. However, a more adherent to the definition given in the FAO on the economic aspects of fisheries in Italy, must be traced back to the early nineties with the publication by dell'Irepa Observatory on Economic Structures of the Productive Fishing Marittima in Italy. In fact, right from the outputs of such publication, have been reported indicators of physical productivity, as daily catches and average catch per boat, and indicators of economic productivity, such as revenue and average revenue per day per vessel. These indicators, while not being compared with appropriate reference values, however, were allowed to represent and identify a trend in the sector from a production point of view and economically. Moreover, the very structure of the Observatory Irepa has allowed an analysis of these indicators, and a comparison of both regionally and fleet segment.

Since 2001 productivity indicators published dall'Irepa were integrated with a set of new indicators intended to permit an evaluation of the state of the industry in terms of sustainability. To give a measure of sustainability according to the traditional three pillars of the multidisciplinary approach of the research in the fisheries sector - ecological, economic and social - were used, respectively, the daily catch per unit of gross tonnage used, the gross salable daily per unit of gross tonnage and labour costs per employee in the industry. Even for the sustainability indicators, the analysis is conducted for each coastal region and fleet segment so that it fully covers the marine

fisheries in Italy. Additionally, each indicator is compared with a reference point generally calculated as the average of the indicator in the last five years.

The progress made in the field of data collection following the introduction of specific programs by the European Commission, such as the Data Collection Regulation from 2002 to 2008 and the Data Collection Framework from 2009 onwards, helped to improve the data base available for the production of indicators and to improve the quality of information. It was then possible to develop and use socio-economic indicators in a more comprehensive and detailed analysis of specific case studies.

Both in the work of Accadia and Spanish in 2006 on demersal fisheries in the Upper and Middle Adriatic (FAO Geographical Sub Area 17 - GSA 17) and in that of Ceriola et al. 2008 on demersal fisheries in the Southern Adriatic (GSA 18) was used the same methodology to identify, measure and assess the socio-economic indicators. In the FAO-GFCM, the same methodological approach was also extended to the pelagic fisheries in GSA 17 and 18 with the aim to compare the results for different areas and types of fishing.

The methodology used in the case studies introduced is based on using a set of 24 socio-economic indicators. These are divided into two types: indicators to assess the state of the industry and indicators to measure the level of economic and social sustainability. For the first group of indicators, were used historical levels as reference values, while for the second group it was possible to identify specific LRP. The results were reported by the typical representation of the method of the traffic light.

As for the assessment of economic performance, we used the traditional indicators based on return on investment and some indicators to measure the share of revenues direct to inputs (Value Added / Revenues, EBITDA / Revenue, ROS (Return on Sale), ROI (Return on Investment) (%), Revenues / Invested Capital (%), Net income per boat (€ 000)). Also for the evaluation of productivity, has been used a multiplicity of indicators. These can be divided into two groups: indicators of physical productivity, expressed in terms of quantity produced (catch per vessel (ton), catches for TSL (ton), Daily catches (tons), CPUE (kg)), and productivity indicators economic, expressed in terms of revenues (revenues per boat (€ 000), Revenue by TSL (€ 000), daily revenues (€ 000), RPUE (€)). The last four economic indicators (average price landed (€ / kg), fuel costs for boat (€ 000), costs of fuel daily (€ 000), maintenance costs for boat (€ 000)), relating to the main variables market, are intended to measure the evolution of prices and cost items most relevant, maintenance costs and fuel costs.

From a social point of view, the studies cited have provided for the analysis of the four indicators, two on labor productivity (catch per employee (ton), revenue per employee (€)), one on the number of people employed in the sector (number busy) and one on the average wage per employee (Average salary (€ 000)).

Regarding the assessment of the levels of sustainability of the sector, have been defined an economic indicator and one social. The definition of these indicators was obtained considering a sustainable industry in which it is guaranteed in the long term availability of all resources used. Specifically of fishing, this means to safeguard not only the availability of fish stocks, but also those economic and human.

From an economic point of view, the traditional indicator used to measure the profitability of an economic sector, namely the rate of return on investment (ROI), was compared with the average rate of the multi-year treasury bonds (BTP). The indicator of economic sustainability (ISE) is the result then the difference between the two rates of return. When the value of the ROI is less than or close to the rate of BTP (the value of ISE is negative or close to zero), the investment in

treasury bills becomes better than investing in the fishery and the state of the industry does not can no longer be considered as economically sustainable.

From a social point of view, the approach is very different. In this context, the role of trade unions and legislation on safety at work take on a special significance. In particular, the minimum wage, defined by union agreements category was considered the minimum level at which an economic sector can be considered socially sustainable. So, the difference between the average wage per employee and the minimum wage defined by Italian law (the National Collective Labour - National Labour Contract), is considered as an indicator of social sustainability (ISS). Then, a value close to zero for the ISS will highlight a situation of unsustainable from a social perspective.

Among the indicators mentioned above, some have also been used in the Management Plans drawn up by the Italian authorities in implementing Article 19 of the Regulation of the Mediterranean. In this case, the socio-economic indicators were selected based on their relevance to the specific objectives of the plans. The gross profit for the boat and the value added per employee have been considered the most appropriate to "indicate" a possible improvement in the profitability of fishing activities; while the number of employed and the average cost per employee have been considered the most appropriate to "indicate" any development of job opportunities in the sector.

In order to effectively interpret the information obtained by the indicators, these are generally compared with appropriate reference values. Accadia and Spanish (2006) analyzed the time series of indicators by the method of traffic light, which assigns a color to each value. When you adopt the standard approach of this method based on the use of three colors - where the green, yellow and red, are associated respectively with the conditions "positive", "intermediate" and "negative" - it is necessary to define two reference values.

Of the two values, one is associated with a situation of difficulty and the other to an optimal situation (or sub-optimal). In the first case, it is an LRP, while in the second case it is a TRP. For sustainability indicators described above, ISE and ISS, the LRP were associated respectively to the average rate of the multi-year treasury bonds and the minimum wage provisions of the National Collective Bargaining Agreement for the fishing industry. Since ISE and ISS are calculated by subtracting the LRP from the value of the relative indicators, the resulting reference values, used to separate the red area within the representation by the yellow traffic light, are set equal to zero. The second reference value, used to define the boundary between the areas of yellow and green, was computed as the average of the time series of the indicator.

A different approach has been used in the definition of the reference values associated with the economic and social indicators, first introduced. In this case, LRP and TRP are not easily identifiable because their estimates require the use of special tools and / or data that are not always available. Of the reference points of simple construction and immediately understandable can still be obtained by means of historical levels of indicators. In the articles mentioned above, the reference values for these indicators have been associated with the percentiles of the respective time series according to the following schedule:

> 66th percentile, for indicators of productivity and economic performance - "positive", green color; for indicators of cost, "negative", red color.

66° - 33° percentile, intermediate, yellow.

<33 th percentile, for indicators of productivity and economic performance - "negative", red; for indicators of cost, "positive", the color green.

For detailed methodological results, interesting in the method and to upgrade to time level, please refer to the study cited; enough to anticipate that the situation of the indicators has increas-

ingly worse since the late 90', both in terms of socio-economic and environmental sustainability.

More specifically, if one focuses on economic sustainability, the indicators most commonly used are the ratio between the gross salable production and effort (PLV / effort) aimed at analyzing the time course of aggregates and economic phenomena; the index of production (catches, prices and revenues) aimed at analyzing the fluctuations of economic phenomena through the use of the respective time series; the relationship between revenues and current point balance of revenues (revenues / BER) aimed to analyze the economic situation in the short term.

The three indicators chosen prove suitable to represent the national reality, as they are measurable and are scientifically sound.

Measurability comes from systematic data collection conducted in Italy. The monitoring was conducted with statistical regularity and makes available historical data suitable to assess the viability of the national fishing fleet.

Scientific robustness is characterized by the existence of the cause-effect relationship between the indicators. These reports have been demonstrated in scientific contexts international and ease of interpretation of the indicators has widely distributed.

Subsequent processing based on methodologies drilling down the national database, offer the opportunity to deepen the analysis at the technical level and geographic. In this context, the analysis of economic systems for fisheries and for regions is the tool to complete the assessment of the economic state of the Italian fishing.

For the first indicator, Plv / effort, in the period 2004-2010 there was a general stability of the economic productivity unitary. In the presence of the accentuated reduction of effort, the value of the indicator is obviously influenced by a simultaneous decline in catches. In this context, the stability of the economic productivity of recent years depends on the returns unit which benefited primarily from the positive trend in the prices of products. In the medium term, therefore, the economic sustainability of the national fishing fleet was favoured by the price. However, it is considered that the mechanism of price formation is external to the production process and operators have few tools to influence the prices of fish products. This is of relevance as, a possible slowdown in prices, which could undermine the future economic viability of the sector.

The index of production of the fisheries sector (built with base year 2004), for comparing the fluctuations of economic phenomena and is a useful tool to assess the prospects of development of the sector. In 2012, the index of the catch has reached a level of 75, compared to an index of revenue that has stopped to share 79.

The performance of the two indices confirm that the trend in the prices of fish products has helped to ensure economic sustainability in the medium term. In the period under analysis, the fluctuation in the price index has settled on a value of 103. The listing in 2012 represents the minimum value of the period, showing a downward trend. This situation is caused by a decline in consumption and demand orientation towards products less valuable statement. According with Ismea (2014), the price trend for each product category indicates a significant setback in the prices of shellfish and fish products more valuable. Concurrently, there was a substantial stability for species from the lower unit value.

Ultimately, the current economic momentum is characterized by a strong recession. The time series of the average returns of the indicators of catches and revenues are, in fact, a negative trend. In this context, the inability to control the prices of first sale reflects negatively on short-term profitability of the sector: the cash flow tends progressively to shrink due to the contraction of current income and the simultaneous increase in variable costs, including them being the increase in oil prices.

The trend of the previous two indicators showed the risk of a progressive loss of economic efficiency of the fleet. In this context it is appropriate to assess its effects on the economic sustainability of the short term. In this regard the use of the third indicator allows the analysis of the short term, which provides important information on the ability of the business in the fisheries sector to cover operating costs with revenues.

Specifically, this ability can be evaluated according to a liquidity indicator, the ratio of current revenues and revenues of Break Even Revenue, representing the level of revenues that total revenues are equal to the total costs ( $RT = CT$ ).

In the short term some production segments of the Italian fleet operating in a regime of low profitability. The value close to break-even point, equal to 1, indicates a situation of borderline. The economic sustainability of the fisheries sector is affected by rising production costs and declines in physical productivity. In 2010 the fishing equipment that has an indicator next to the unit are the train, the steering wheel and the seine.

Such production segments, therefore, operate at the limits of viability, as the short-term cash flow may be insufficient to cover fixed costs. Ultimately, the current situation of overall weakness of the fisheries sector is also confirmed in the analysis of the short term and it is the result of a dynamic production decreasing associated with a substantial stability in the level of producer prices. In this context, in the presence of concomitant increase in variable costs, profits continue to decline and operators find it increasingly difficult to ensure the economic sustainability of the fishery.

This is the objective situation of the sector; a sector as a whole in trouble, in need of public support in order to survive, but also in need of radical changes, cultural and organizational.

## **The stakeholders opinion**

What is according to the stakeholders of the fisheries and aquaculture sector in Italy the impact and value of the PCP? The interviewees, almost unanimously express a decidedly negative judgment on the relevance of the program, not only in terms of ability to meet the needs of business but also in relation to its effectiveness for the sustainable development of the entire national fisheries sector. The views are much softer than its usefulness in enhancing aquaculture. According to representatives of the category of Emilia Romagna, the PO EFF, to date, has not been able to meet the needs of the sector, particularly in regions which have been allocated a small amount of resources. Nevertheless, in Emilia Romagna, but not only, thanks to the ongoing dialogue between the Administration and the social partners in the stages preceding enactment of the calls, the few available funds have been used to the fullest. On the other hand, the associations give the program a very important role in fostering investment. The Italian fishing industry consists largely of small businesses that typically have great difficulty in accessing credit and therefore could not make investments in the absence of such financial support.

The same are convinced that the measures of the OP EFF not produce any benefit to the fisheries sector and do nothing but distribute contributions to parties that have nothing to do with the production sector. Furthermore, they believe that the fishing companies have Italian demands that the EFF does not share, as demonstrated by the incentives for the permanent and the lack of real support to fishing companies, which are not at all favoured virtuous organizations and the fisheries sector in Italy is destined to die.

Even the representatives of the category of the Campania region believe that the results of the



program did not meet the expectations and the great opportunities that the EFF has offered have not been fully exploited. They also claim that the Calabrian fishing was even damaged by the Program on leaked from the field of a large number of fishermen and that it had no major benefits for employees in the sector, despite the huge commitment that associations category have put in this direction. A note expressed in his favour, is related to the fact that in the Campania PO EFF has nonetheless contributed to the creation of new job.

Another problem identified by all respondents, is the lack of proper planning of investments, which were often made irrationally, sometimes only in order to take advantage of available resources. They also believe that, as in most cases the contributions were disbursed in favour of third parties, members of the supply chain but not closely related to the production, the producers do not have benefited. Furthermore, it was verified that important investments, such as the construction of mariculture, were interrupted during construction and this resulted in huge waste of resources.

For the region, stressing however that there are certain cases where the actions taken have fully embraced the principles of the EFF. For example, the Fund has financed the start-up of cooperatives, with a strong youth component, having invested absolutely innovative in the panorama of the fishing bell, as the construction of facilities for the processing of hand craftsmanship by the manufacturer.

No less severe was the judgment of Puglia, that the program, and thus its results were tainted by an underlying problem, which is to have attached importance to the downsizing of the fleet exceeds that given to other objectives OP EFF and have therefore assigned to Measure 1.1 a disproportionate share of resources. It is believed that the restructuring of the fleet is extremely important in Puglia, but that should be done in a critical way, that is, eliminating the fleet boats less efficient. In other words, the PO FEP was "bad set" from the beginning and, therefore, is not able to improve the condition of the field, nor in terms of employment or income.

Three other issues are identified for Apulia, as due to the limited effectiveness of the program. First, its goals are contradictory: on the one hand there are measures in favour of less pressure on stocks (incentives for the permanent or temporary, incentives for diversification of activities, etc.), On the other hand, measures that may even result in increased damage to fish stocks (e.g. incentives for modernization). Also, the rules of the program have not been defined and presented clearly. In some cases (e.g. For measure 1.3) they have even been changed after the submission of applications for funding from the operators. Finally, the decision-makers do not have the full knowledge of the problems of the sector, so sometimes make decisions that are not in line with the goals you have set. This problem is compounded by the lack of communication between the organizations and the core assessment.

Still, it is agreed that the PO EFF has been up to now little relevant in meeting the needs of the fisheries sector, but that this was caused mainly by delays in the calls and the length of procedures for the investigation and assessment of applications, critical that have dramatically reduced the attractiveness of the measures. In addition, the delays in terms of disbursement of resources have reduced the importance of the funding or investment decisions.

For the Lazio region, is deemed the PO EFF can only partially meet the needs of the industry and highlight two main weaknesses: the lack of experience of the Region in the management procedures and the slow implementation of the measures, due to the continuous changes of staff suffered from 'Fishing Regional Office. Moreover, it is believed that the OP EFF has not been relevant in investment decisions of firms that have often opted for alternative sources of funding.

Campania is in line with that of other respondents that the PO EFF has been, to date, very

incisive in offering answers to companies of fishing and aquaculture Italian. Associations bells, however, attribute much of the failure to the deep economic crisis faced by the industry and regulatory uncertainties relating to procedures for carrying out the sampling. Resizing the tuna sector (n. 49 boats of 2009 was passed to n. 12 boats authorized in 2011), the lack of exemptions for fishing for whitebait and lipstick, the tightening of controls (penalty points), dear diesel, etc. certainly not encouraged investments. In Veneto, the overall impact of the EFF OP Fisheries is strongly negative. The feeling, in this case, is that the measures of the program have not been built on the basis of the real needs of the world's fisheries and the implementation procedures of the few measures that could have a positive impact on the industry have been made so complex as to make such measures almost unworkable. In particular, the three measures of which the fishermen could benefit, namely the 1.1, the 1.2 and 1.3, the first two were not able to respond effectively to the needs of the sector, the third was blocked. The associations also point out that the Measure 1.3 had used a large number of fishing companies that were exposed economically convinced that they would then receive the contribution.

Consequently, the blocking of payments has created hardships really huge. In contrast, with regard to the specific needs of aquaculture enterprises, the EFF has detected a positive tool, since it has allowed the construction of new facilities and the renovation of existing ones.

## **Stakeholders suggestion**

Stakeholders heard have provided numerous indications to improve the effectiveness of measures implemented under the OP EFF. Some of these seem particularly relevant: ensure greater integration of the measures in favor of the fisheries sector with those provided under other Community programs, greater involvement of stakeholders in the creation and implementation of programs, review the entire architecture of the procedural PO EFF.

In Puglia, the relevance of the interventions of the OP EFF would increase if there was a greater integration between the measures for the fisheries and aquaculture and those provided under other Community programs (ERDF, ESF, EAFRD). Is, in fact, highlighted the lack of Puglia in all initiatives in favor of such integration.

Moreover, it is believed that the problems that have caused delays in the measures of the OP EFF in Italy, have not been completely overcome, and that is therefore essential in a greater organizational effort on the part of all the institutional, economic and social representative national fishing industry. Still, it is believed that the adoption of a procedural architecture which includes the involvement of the intermediate bodies has further complicated the situation. The regions are not yet fully equipped on the cultural and structural to effectively manage the implementation procedures of the OP EFF.

Last tip, is to keep the calls are always open until exhaustion of the resources planned for the whole period 2007-2013 in order to simplify and speed up the procedures.

All believe that, in order to improve the effectiveness of interventions, it would be extremely important to achieve greater involvement of stakeholders and to gear measures to the specific local situations.

There is broad consensus on the opportunity to increase the amount of resources available and the percentage of contribution and make it easy access to the measures. This is especially true in the case of aid for structural investments that are very relevant to the vitality and the future of businesses but typically are made only if the entrepreneur receives a contribution.

For the region, it is recalled that the simplified procedure provided for in the convergence regions under the FIFG had allowed to obtain good results in terms of the operation of the procedures for implementation of the calls. Instead, with the current structure of programming, which includes the involvement of multi-level institutional, procedural problems are detected, related to the management of cash flow and the respect of the Stability Pact of the different institutional levels, which slow down the concrete implementation interventions. Further problems have arisen as a result of the choice of the regions Mipaaf provide stringent guidelines on the implementation procedures of the interventions (schemes call, selection criteria, eligibility criteria, expenditure ceilings). In this situation, the Intermediate Body is found to have a limited capacity to take decisions in the management of the interventions.

In addition, this programming structure, the risk is related to automatic release of economic resources EFF available for our country. To overcome these problems, it would be appropriate to implement the program fully centralized or fully regionalize the management, through the implementation of various regional operational programs.

In Lazio, it is believed that the EFF should be directed to qualifying businesses fishery, supporting more innovation also in order to allow operators to adapt to the new rules of the Common Fisheries Policy (especially Reg. 1224 / 2009 and Reg. 404/2011 on Community control system for ensuring compliance with the rules of the Common Fisheries Policy). In other words, the fishing industry should take a leap of quality, enhancing and strengthening the role of companies within the industry, in order to improve their profitability. Therefore, the EFF should include measures that promote a greater culture of enterprise among business operators.

In Veneto, it is considered that it would be appropriate to allocate resources differently under the program. In particular, the funds should be allocated primarily to measures most significant (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1.1, 2.3, 3.1, 3.3). Moreover, it should be eliminated the distinction between areas in convergence and non convergence as companies fishing have exactly the same problems and the same economic difficulties both south and north of the country.

Unanimously, it would be preferable, regardless of the specific measure of the program, replace the capital contribution, with other financing solutions that will produce the best results, it is the easy access to credit. A second proposal, much more ambitious, is to create a specific program for countries operating in the Mediterranean and arising from an in-depth knowledge of the real problems of the sector.

Despite many associations interviewed consider that the management of the entire program by the Intermediate Bodies would improve its efficiency, the issue is quite controversial.

Another point on which there is consensus, is that it would be preferable that all measures of the program were implemented at the regional level but managed centrally (this should be reflected for example in the uniqueness of the calls), because it would thus ensured the simplification of procedures. The implementation at the regional level would be preferable because associations communicate more easily with the region and with the Central Administration.

For the Veneto, it is believed that both the D.G. fishing Intermediate Bodies do your best to manage the PO EFF. Unfortunately, however, the involvement of too many contemporary organisms generates major complications. Nevertheless, in a “federalist” and decentralization, no one can see alternatives.

It is believed, however, that one cannot generalize, since administrative efficiency varies greatly from region to region. In the experience of Veneto, the regional body is confronted with the social partners and therefore knows the needs of the territory, which cannot however be known to the Central Administration.

In other words, if the region is able to manage resources efficiently, regionalization is undoubtedly the best solution. It is suggested, therefore, the total regionalization and coordination by the Ministry, also in view of the fact that the existence of a “connection” between the different regions in the current management model has also delayed the implementation of the program by of intermediate bodies more efficient. Another idea would be to introduce a policy of rewards in the allocation of funds, based on the speed and efficiency showed by Regional administrations. Finally, the associations consider that it would be very important to raise the level of expertise at the regional level.

According to the Lazio, the management at the regional level is the more functional but should definitely be improved if we are to overcome the problems that have emerged so far.

Not identify, however, critical specifications for the aquaculture sector, nor on access to finance EFF, either as regards the effectiveness of the measures it intended.

On the contrary, in the opinion of Campania, Sicily aquaculture production businesses are going through a very difficult time which affected the effectiveness of the measures of the OP EFF intended for them.

For the construction of a new plant for mariculture, is, in fact, must have a specific grant and funding procedure Funds EFF provides that the maricoltura is already in possession of such authorization when submitting the application for funding. After the submission of the request for assistance by many companies, the law relating to the concessions has been changed (fees paid by businesses have increased), so the documentation submitted by these companies was no longer in good standing. This has caused the suspension of numerous practices and the failure of the actions taken. In Sicily, however, the aquaculture farms are disappearing, are very few plants that can survive. This is mainly due to fate that local products are not valued, for which the sector is strongly affected by the competition of products from other countries, such as Greece and Turkey.

For Lazio, aquaculture production businesses have great difficulties in accessing finance due to the extreme complexity of procedures. Additional critical issues affecting the timing of investigation and evaluation for admission to the financing.

More specifically with respect to the employment impact of public intervention, all, except in Puglia, consider the measures of the OP EFF completely unable to compensate for the loss of jobs caused by Measure 1.1.

According to Puglia, the measures of the OP EFF have so far had a very limited impact the appearance of employment. Even measures of economic diversification, aimed at creating alternative opportunities for income and employment, have had very limited effectiveness.

Moreover, has been pointed out that economic diversification in the fishing industry is viable only in the territorial areas that have a specific vocation environmental and cultural.

Very critical has been also the opinion of Campania, which considers the program guilty of the loss of many jobs. Some positive results have been obtained only in the industrial sector. They consider that the measures of the program have not been designed to allow for the diversification of activities. For example, the Measure 1.5, which provided just compensation for those leaving the activity (among other very small for the possible start of a new business) was not able to create credible alternative employment. Another example is fishing tourism: its success is necessarily conditioned by the specific nature of the area in which it is practiced, so it can not be considered a viable alternative to fishing. Measures that could really help enterprises are the 1.3, which allows the reduction of business costs, and 2.3. With specific regard to the marketing of products, and consider that you could work a lot in this regard, especially involving women.

To curb unemployment and encouraging diversification would have to focus on Axis IV. The field would have to develop in a manner consistent with the preservation of resources and in an integrated manner than other sectors, such as tourism and had to be created synergies advantageous to reduce the expulsion of workers from the sector. Negative also the judgment of Campania, where interventions appear to be unable to solve the employment problems that characterize the sector. In this regard, it highlights the fact that have been underestimated the potential of the Measure 1.5. The sum that operators receive to exit the sector (40,000 euro) is definitely not enough to support the operator in the creation of an alternative activity. It would be appropriate to increase the value of that prize, promoting parallel suitable control interventions and monitoring during the design phase, to avoid speculative actions by the beneficiaries of the measure.

Even in Lazio and consider that the EFF has so far had a minimal impact in terms of employment. The inability of the EFF to compensate for the loss of jobs resulting from the Measure 1.1 also depends on the fact that the workforce coming out of the industry can not find alternative employment in other companies in the supply chain but is forced to find employment in various fields of work. In Veneto, the associations are certain that the PO EFF has had an impact on increasing employment zero. No measure allows for projects that have this specific purpose. During the previous program, it was possible to carry out projects under the measure “collective action”.

In contrast, in the current schedule, the similar measure appears aimed almost exclusively to the realization of training projects which, although useful for maintaining employment, do not allow certain to increase it.

For Emilia, shows how the design implicit in the Community rules that govern the system is to demolish the system professional fishing, especially the great fishing. As a result, they believe that the initiatives funded by the EFF programs are not able to work on the reduction of jobs caused by the actions of zero activity in the sector.

## **Retraining opportunities**

In the last twenty years of the last century and the first decade of this century the reduction in the number of fishermen has been a further sharp acceleration, especially as a result of Community policies aimed at reducing fishing effort, pursued, the latter, by the ‘providing grants and incentives for the demolition of the vessels. It is in this sense, assisted, in just three decades, to a further halving (or most) of the number of fishermen.

If from the point of view it is not strictly quantitative, therefore, of a category from the considerable absolute weight in terms of the number of employees, its actual value, however, must be held still strategic; This, according to the specific sector which have gained more and more importance in the context of environmental policies for the protection of the sea, as well as a strong social and cultural role. It’s no mystery what is the role played by fishing communities in many coastal resorts such as, not least, do not underestimate the contribution of the same quality and the needs of the food supply.

With regard to the origin of the operators and the requirements needed to do their jobs, until about fifty years ago, the job of the fisherman and the skills necessary for its implementation is inherited almost exclusively in the context of a tradition in family transmission: be fisherman meant to belong to a community, often closed and isolated, from which they were transmitted, and thus gained from the earliest age, the knowledge and the tools needed.

Today, even though in many cases persists inheritance of this activity, in the sense that those who decide to be a fisherman, often, is still part of a family of fishermen, to carry out this job you have to be real entrepreneurs, in the sense Modern term.

Therefore, modern entrepreneur must be able to acquire and master a range of skills, both traditional and innovative.

Even fishermen who belong to the small-scale fisheries (artisanal fisheries), which surely is the sector in which the techniques and tools have undergone the transformation minor, can not operate without being informed and keep up to date.

And 'necessary, for example, to know how to use the instruments for navigation more and more advanced, as well as learn about the opportunities and limitations provided by the regulations both Community and national or the findings and evidence emerged and focused by countless research applied about environmental issues and the abundance or scarcity of resources.

Of course, while it is undeniable that technological innovations have improved the conditions of life and work of fishermen, with a growing decrease in physical fatigue, reduction in work time and navigation, greater profitability and improved safety at work, by 'other have increased both the cost of investment and production, that the knowledge necessary to do their jobs in a profitable way.

A major impact has also had activity for drawing, with obvious effects on the conservation of resources and thus the need for regulation of the activity.

This process of modernization and transformation, in which of course still some reservations and resistances, in a category that traditionally was acting alone and often in the belief of not having to answer to anyone for their actions nor take into account any conditions, has initiated and is steadily, although today many have invokes the strengthening of training processes, precisely in order to accompany and support the process of development of the sector.

In this regard it should be noted that, for the most part, the evolution of the category in this direction is due and made possible by the ability to organize themselves into companies, cooperatives and, joined by the creation and strengthening of associations and representative bodies.

In particular, the emergence and development of cooperatives and their organizations representing local, or national, in fact, make it easier to carry out many operations bureaucratic or access to credits, incentives and subsidies, which in the recent phase have supported and accompanied many evolutionary processes experienced by the sector. The organization cooperatively also favors the possibility of jointly addressing the many challenges have arisen in recent years, as well as the opportunity to be informed on the evolution of legislation and in particular the provisions relating directly to the manner of performing the activity of levy, the tools and systems permitted or prohibited in different areas or seasons.

To meet the challenges of the current economic cycle, requires an increase in terms of cultural and entrepreneurial skills of the employees, who need to acquire more and more the ability to innovate through a process of diversification of its activities. Think of the fishing companies as potential stars of new forms of catering, as well as experienced in agriculture and in the direct sale of local products, or even initiate activities of teaching, in connection with the environmental tourism and its operators or even more directly, becoming protagonists of new forms of tourism blue, as part of activities disclosures already required by law, such as fishing tourism and related tourism. These aspects, which we will see in greater detail later.

In essence, it is hoped a cultural evolution and professional and a simultaneous recognition of the social role played by the fishermen themselves, in view of the distinctive value of their business

not only in terms of production and merely quantitative, but also because of their contribution to employment, food, the environment, green tourism, culture and therefore to society as a whole.

## **Concluding remarks**

Public intervention, and therefore bodies at various levels responsible for the planning and provision of financial resources for the fishing industry as a whole, are, and will be called more strongly to take account of evolving new demands of the sector and its operators. We must, therefore, show themselves able to understand and interpret the needs of the class, in order to combine the instances that promote the achievement, or at least the pursuit of a full sustainability in terms of not only environmental, but also social and economic.

Section 3.2 of the National Programme three years of fisheries and aquaculture, approved by the DM August 3, 2007, on page 40 provides explicitly a section dedicated to support employment in the fisheries sector, namely, "Development of employment opportunities".

Quote, "The effects of the reduction of the fleet, in implementation of Community legislation, are found in the progressive reduction in employment with considerable social repercussions. On the other hand, in most of the country and for certain categories of fishermen, the income produced by the fishing activity were lower than other business activities. Unlike other production categories, the income of the industry, are characterized by a downward trend in real terms. The extension of models of co-management and consortium grouping small fisheries, concentration and rationalization of landing sites, development aid and cooperation producer organizations (public works) to promote models of management and enhancement of the product even in the areas of marketing before, a reduction in the number of steps in the chain to guarantee the income of fishermen and a developed system of labeling in which each transfer Outgoing accept responsibility than to protect the incoming quality, medium-term objectives are to be pursued and that this program is intended for its part comply.

In addition there are aspects such as multifunctionality and the introduction of measures to encourage the integration of basic income, such as fishing tourism and related tourism, already accepted even within the EU regulations, which are to be decisively strengthened especially as concerns so far inadequate financial resources, the examples bureaucratic and administrative support to the promotion of such environmentally friendly activities.

It arises, therefore, the need to identify the criteria of innovative intervention can provide a direct and concrete support to the total employees in the sector. Furthermore, in order to encourage the development of new jobs and the creation of additional employment opportunities and to facilitate the generation change, will be given specific powers in favour of the recognized organizations for the establishment of appropriate support tools and service in favour of employment sector, their members.

Without forgetting the need to support employees in the sector that, at present, are not members and employees. For these reasons and for the development of innovations in this program, we need to focus on a method of horizontal subsidiarity aimed at increasing opportunities and tools intervention aimed for trade unions and employers".

It is evident that this so generic forecast, is inadequate to provide concrete answers to the problem of conversion and / or retraining of workers escaping from the current fish production system in Italy.

At the time of drafting the Plan, it was already clear the employment trend recessive; and was

also a clear need to address this trend, to focus on aspects still present, such as aid to cooperation and diversification of activities (e.g. tourism).

But what is left on the card as widely discussed above, is the willingness to give substance to these alternatives, the failure overview of the activities expected / desirable and the funds allocated for the EFF (have preferred measures that have little helped the employment dynamics), the lack of a clear definition of expenditure commitments and actions to be taken.

Professional retraining geared to fisheries and aquaculture are taking an increasing share important in the interest of a gradual process of restructuring and rationalization of the industry. However, despite recording one hand a decreasing employment trend due to both the reduction in fishing effort that the tendency of the younger generations to retrain in other specialties, there is the phenomenon of a chronic labour shortage. Therefore require actions stimulus for young people and for businesses in order to bring the same to the world of fishing, to be associated with measures aimed at improving the quality of life on board and the hygiene and environmental sanitation, to help overcome obstacles also cultural in nature. In this, the next Triennial Program should be in charge of supporting vocational training courses to prepare unemployed young people to occupy professionals, today lacking in the area, as well as retraining courses aimed to fishermen to acquire higher professional (engineers, captains, etc.).

All this information, alone, strongly introduce the theme of the redevelopment is it cultural, whether of identifiable features in new professionals.

How not to think about the need for professionals capable of interfacing with the markets and that they are able to organize the supply of the industry, avoiding in this way also to the small economic size of businesses. How not to think about professional profiles capable of interacting with the credit market, which represents a decisive opportunity in times of economic restructuring and conversion of enterprises. How not to think of figures capable of governing the opportunities guaranteed by the commitment to EU and national policy measures.

There is a question not too latent for additional services related more or less directly with the fishing activity: it is not difficult to imagine that, especially for women, there is a need for retraining to respond to this “new” question (fishing tourism, catering, etc.).

In this sense, although at national level are established for some time, these activities have not yet taken adequate importance. Therefore we must encourage the integration of interventions aimed both income of fishing companies is to lighten the fishing effort, in a few months a year, distracting operators from fishing to tourism activity. The adaptation of fishing effort and the conversion of labour and capital is the best guarantee for the local economy.

## REFERENCES

- Andersen P. e Sutinen J.G., 1984, “Stochastic Bioeconomics: A Review of Basic Methods and Results”, *Marine Resource Economics* 1 (2): 117-136.
- Baranzi-Yeroulanos L. (2010) - Aquaculture - A Marketing and promotion. Studies and Reviews, 88. General fisheries commission for the Mediterranean. FAO, Roma: 198 pp.
- Barten A. P. e Bettendorf, L.J., 1989, “Price Formation of Fish – An Application of an Inverse Demand System”, *European Economic Review* 33: 1509-25.
- Bjørndal T. e Conrad J.M., 1987, “The Dynamics of an Open Access Fishery”, *The Canadian Journal of Economics* 20 (1): 74-85.
- Bondand-Reantaso M.G., Arthur J.R., Subasinghe R.P.(eds) (2008) - Understanding and applying risk analysis in aquaculture. FAO, Fisheries and Aquaculture Technical Paper, 519, Roma: 304 pp.



- COM (2002) 535 definitivo del 9/10/2002, Comunicazione della Commissione al Consiglio e al Parlamento Europeo “relativa ad un piano d’azione comunitario per la conservazione e lo sfruttamento sostenibile delle risorse della pesca nel Mar Mediterraneo nell’ambito della politica comune della pesca”.COM (2009) 163 definitivo del 22/4/2009, Libro Verde sulla Riforma della politica comune della Pesca.
- Commissione europea (2010) 428 definitivo - Sintesi della consultazione sulla riforma della politica comune delle pesca. Documento di lavoro dei Servizi della Commissione.
- COM (2009) 163 definitivo del 22/4/2009, Libro Verde sulla Riforma della politica comune della Pesca.
- Commissione europea (2011) 1416 definitivo - Valutazione d’impatto sulla proposta di regolamento riguardante il nuovo strumento finanziario per la politica marittima e la pesca. Documento di lavoro dei Servizi della Commissione.
- COM (2009) 163 definitivo del 22/4/2009, Libro Verde sulla Riforma della politica comune della Pesca.
- Corte Dei Conti Europea (2011) - Le misure dell’UE hanno contribuito ad adeguare la capacità delle flotte pescherecce alle possibilità di pesca? - Relazione speciale n. 12/2011: 60 pp.
- Comunicazione della Commissione al Consiglio e al Parlamento Europeo, Una politica marittima integrata per una migliore governance nel Mediterraneo, Bruxelles, 11.9.2009, COM(2009) 466 definitivo.
- Edwards, M. (2000). The administration of fisheries managed by property rights. In Use of property rights in fisheries management. FAO Fisheries Technical Paper No. 404/1. Roma, Italia: FAO.
- European Commission (2009) - Green paper. Reform of the Common fishery policy. Bruxelles, 22.4.2009. COM(2009)163 final: 29 pp.
- FAO (1997) - Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries, n. 5, Roma: 82 pp.
- FAO (1999) - Use of Property Rights in Fisheries Management. Fisheries Technical Paper, 505/1-2, Roma.
- FAO (1999) - Indicators for sustainable development of marine capture fisheries. Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries, 8, Roma: 68 pp.
- FAO (2001) - Managing fishing capacity. A review of policy and technical issues. Fisheries Technical Paper, 509, Roma: 25 pp.
- FAO (2004) - The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture. FAO, Roma: 153 pp.
- FAO (2010) - The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture. FAO, Roma: 197 pp.
- Fukami, T. & Morin, P. 2003 Productivity-biodiversity relationships depend on the history of the community assembly. *Nature* 424, 423-426.
- Haraldsson G.Ó. e Árnason R., 2005, “Bio-economic models: a survey (2): *Bioeconomic*.”
- Hoggart D.D. et al., 2006, “Stock assessment for fishery management”. FAO Fisheries Technical Paper No. 487. Roma, Italia: FAO.
- Josupeit H. (2008) - World Octopus market. Globefish Research Programme (FAO), 1014-9546, v. 94: 65 pp.
- Ismea (2004) - Dalla conflittualità al partenariato: il ruolo della pesca nel Bacino del Mediterraneo, Osservatorio permanente sul sistema agroalimentare dei Paesi del Mediterraneo. Roma: 235 pp.
- Ismea-IAMB (2007) - Sistemi di qualità, rapporti commerciali e cooperazione euromediterranea. Possibili scenari per le imprese agroalimentari del Mediterraneo. Osservatorio permanente sul sistema agroalimentare dei Paesi del Mediterraneo: 280 pp.
- LEI (2006) - Economic Performance of selected European fishing fleet - Italy in Economic Assessment of European fisheries, EC Contract FISH/2005/12, Annual Report: 306 pp.
- Lem A. (2003) - The WTO Doha Round and Fisheries, What’s At Stake. FAO Fact Sheet for WTO Ministerial Conference in Cancun, Mexico, Fisheries Trade Issues in WTO.
- Lem A. (2006). WTO and fisheries: an update in IIFET 2006 Proceedings, Portsmouth, IIFET, Oregon State University.
- Libro verde “Riforma della Politica comune della pesca”, Bruxelles, 22.4.2009 COM(2009)163 definitivo.

- Piano di azione comunitario per la conservazione e lo sfruttamento sostenibile delle risorse della pesca nel Mar mediterraneo nell'ambito della politica comune della pesca. (COM 2002/535).
- Lovatelli A., Holthus P.F. (eds) (2008), Capture-based aquaculture. Global overview. FAO, Fisheries Technical Paper, 508, Roma: 298 pp.
- Malvarosa L., De Young C. (2010) - Fish trade among Mediterranean countries: intraregional trade and import-export with the European Union. Studies and Reviews. General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean. No. 86. FAO, Roma: 93 pp.
- Management Models for the North-Atlantic: An Overview". Final Report of the project: Bio-economic modelling of Mediterranean Fisheries BEMMFISH (Q5RS-2001-01533).
- Mipaaf, 2012, "Lo stato della pesca e dell'acquacoltura nei mari italiani", a cura di S. Cautadella e M. Spagnolo.
- Myers R.A. & Worn B. 2002 Rapid worldwide depletion of predatory fish communities. *Nature* 423, 280-283.
- OECD (1996) - The management of multispecies, multigear fisheries: the Italian approach, in "Study on the economic aspects of the management of living marine resources", Parigi: 174 pp.
- Palmer W. (2000). Legal planning for management of fisheries using property rights. In Use of property rights in fisheries management. FAO Fisheries Technical Paper No. 404/1. Roma, Italia: FAO.
- Parlamento Europeo, Dipartimento tematico delle Politiche strutturali e di coesione, 2007, "Gestione della pesca basata sui diritti", Seminario, Bruxelles, settembre 2007.
- Pearce D.W. e Turner R.K., 1991, "Economia delle Risorse Naturali e dell'Ambiente", Bologna, Italia: il Mulino.
- Regolamento (CE) n.302/2009 del Consiglio del 6 aprile 2009.
- Relazione annuale sull'attuazione del Fondo Sociale Europeo per la Pesca (2007), Bruxelles, 16.1.2009 COM(2009) 6 definitivo.
- Soto D., Aguilar-Manjarrez J., Hishamunda N. (eds) (2008) - Building an ecosystem approach to aquaculture. FAO/Universitat de les Illes Balears Expert Workshop. 7-11 May 2007, Palma de Mallorca, Spain. FAO, Fisheries and Aquaculture Proceedings, n. 14, Roma: 221 pp.
- Spagnolo M. (2009). I piani di gestione nel quadro della nuova politica della pesca europea. In Trevisan G. (a cura di) La nuova PCP per il Mediterraneo. Franco Angeli s.r.l., Milano, Italia.
- Spagnolo M. and Placenti V. (1998). I sistemi di informazione statistica della pesca in Italia. Franco Angeli s.r.l., Milano, Italia.
- Trevisan, 2012, "L'intervento pubblico nel settore ittico", Franco Angeli Ed..