

# Development of an Environmental Standard for Recreational Fishing Tournaments

BEN K. DIGGLES\*

*DigsFish Services Pty Ltd.*

*32 Bowsprit Cres, Banksia Beach, Queensland 4507, Australia*

WILLIAM SAWYNOK

*Infofish Services Pty Ltd.*

*Post Office Box 9793 Frenchville, Queensland 4701, Australia*

LEONARD J. H. OLYOTT

*Recfish Australia*

*Post Office Box 187, Grange, Queensland 4051, Australia*

*Abstract.*—Fishing tournaments are high profile events that are important to the recreational fishing industry. Tournaments are also under increasing scrutiny by governments, environmental groups, and the broader community. Much of this attention focuses on potential impacts on fish stocks, fish welfare in catch-and-release tournaments, and other issues such as potentially negative social impacts on local communities. The recreational fishing industry in Australia identified a need to be proactive in demonstrating sound environmental management of these events. The result was NEATFish, otherwise known as the Standard for National Environmental Assessment of Tournament Fishing. The NEATFish Standard is a novel concept that is based on a 1–5 star-rating system designed to provide tournament organizers with an objective assessment of how well their tournament meets certain environmental, social, and economic criteria. NEATFish was developed utilizing ISO 17050 with a pathway to allow 5-star events to migrate to a more robust certification under ISO 14001 if desired. The NEATFish Standard was developed with funding from the Fisheries Research and Development Corporation after a comprehensive consultation process with key stakeholders in the recreational fishing industry, sponsors, insurance agencies, fisheries management agencies, environmental groups, and certification bodies. Benefits to participating tournaments include reduced insurance premiums, recognition by sponsors, and greater acceptance within the broader community. The standard is currently being considered for use by several organizations, including marine parks authorities. Development of the concept is continuing through establishment of an interactive Web site, [www.neatfish.com](http://www.neatfish.com), where tournament organizers can undertake the certification process and gain accreditation online, greatly increasing the utility and uptake of the standard.

## Introduction

Recreational fishing competitions are high profile events that are becoming increasingly popular with a significant number of recreational fishers, not only in Australia (Sawynok et al. 2008), but also in the United States (Schramm et al. 1991a) and several other parts of the world.

In these locations, large prize money-oriented fishing tournaments have become important to the recreational fishing industry as they tend to function as publicity, advertising, and marketing tools. In line with their increasing popularity, both the number of tournaments held and the prize money offered at those tournaments have tended to increase in recent years (Oh and Ditton 2004). The expanding popularity of fish-

---

\* Corresponding author: [ben@digsfish.com](mailto:ben@digsfish.com)

ing tournaments has resulted in these activities coming under scrutiny from environmental groups, governments, scientists, and the wider community.

Much of the scientific attention directed towards fishing tournaments in recent years has focused around determining the extent of their impacts on fish stocks, fish survival, and welfare issues in catch-and-release tournaments (Kwak and Henry 1995; Cooke et al. 2002; Wilde et al. 2002, Broadhurst et al. 2005; Suski et al. 2005, Cooke and Sneddon 2006; Arlinghaus et al. 2007; Hanson et al. 2007) and the need to measure their social and economic impacts on the local communities in which the events are held (Schramm et al. 1991b). From a management perspective, fishing tournaments have historically been overlooked by fisheries managers in Australia. Usually, there has been no additional regulation of tournament activities besides the need for participants to observe relevant fisheries legislation (e.g., size and bag limits), a situation that is also reflected in many parts of the United States (Oh and Ditton 2004).

Recfish Australia, in collaboration with other Australian recreational fishing industry groups, determined that there was a need for the recreational fishing industry to take the initiative on fishing competitions and become proactive in promoting their sustainability through sound environmental management of these events. The same trend also appears to be occurring in the United States, where recent studies have indicated that tournament anglers are increasingly concerned about sustainability of fish stocks and the potential for conflicts between tournament and nontournament users (Oh et al. 2007). However, it is also important to highlight the human dimensions associated with fishing tournaments by balancing their potential environmental and social impacts with their socioeconomic benefits. Indeed, we considered development of a tool that measures not only the environmental performance, but also the economic and social performance of fishing tournaments, in a manner similar in some respects to the triple bottom-line approach to evaluating business performance (Henriques and Richardson 2004).

The tool that we developed was NEATFish, otherwise known as the Standard for National Environmental Assessment of Tournament

Fishing. This novel concept was developed with funding from the Fisheries Research and Development Corporation and is based on a 1–5 star-rating system designed to provide tournament organizers with an objective assessment of how well their tournament meets selected environmental, social, and economic criteria. The 1–5 star model is similar to that used in the accommodation industry, with 1 star denoting tournaments with high environmental impacts and low social and economic benefits up to 5-star tournaments, which have negligible environmental impacts (or even positive environmental benefits, as well as high socioeconomic benefits).

### Objectives of the Standard

The NEATFish Standard was developed after a comprehensive consultation process with key stakeholders in Australia's recreational fishing industry, including organizers of several high profile fishing tournaments, industry representative bodies, tackle manufacturers, sponsors, insurance agencies, fisheries management agencies, environmental groups, and certification bodies. The standard was designed to encourage organizers to develop tournament formats that

- minimize detrimental impacts on fish stocks,
- are environmentally sustainable,
- encourage support from local communities,
- provide safe fishing experiences for competitors and spectators, and
- provide significant positive social and economic benefits to those communities in which they are held.

These objectives of the NEATFish Standard were mainly based on outcomes derived from the National Code of Practice for Recreational and Sport Fishing ([www.ansa.com.au/Recfish%20Australia%20NCOP%20brochure.pdf](http://www.ansa.com.au/Recfish%20Australia%20NCOP%20brochure.pdf)) and the National Strategy for the Survival of Released Line Caught Fish ([www.recfishinresearch.org/released\\_fish\\_survival.asp](http://www.recfishinresearch.org/released_fish_survival.asp)).

### Compatibility with Other Standards

The NEATFish Standard was designed to be self administered so that the process of partici-

pating in NEATFish was as simple as possible in order to increase acceptance and engagement by the industry with the accreditation process. However, tournament organizers are required to maintain supporting documentation to substantiate their declaration of conformity with the standard, and Recfish Australia reserves the right to conduct random audits of any participating tournament to ensure consistency against the standard, with penalty points and potential exclusion applying if infringements are detected. The requirements for supporting documentation were based on ISO (International Organisation for Standardization) standards 17050-1:2004 (*Conformity Assessment—Supplier's Declaration of Conformity—Part 1, General Requirements*), and 17050-2:2004 (*Conformity Assessment—Supplier's Declaration of Conformity—Part 2, Supporting Documentation*).

Other environmental standards that were considered potentially applicable to fishing tournaments included the ISO 14000 series of environmental management standards. These allow organizations to demonstrate that they have taken steps to minimize harmful effects on the environment caused by their activities and are striving to achieve continual improvement of their environmental performance. However, at a national workshop held in September 2006, the industry agreed that a more appropriate standard for fishing competitions could be developed under ISO 17050. Development under ISO 17050 was considered less complicated than development under ISO 14001, as well as significantly less costly. Adaptation of the methodology outlined in ISO 17050 would therefore make the NEATFish Standard more attractive to fishing competition organizers by reducing the time, effort, and costs required to undertake an assessment. Furthermore, unlike the NEATFish Standard, the ISO 14000 standards are not necessarily designed to measure social and economic performance. However, in the development of the NEATFish Standard under ISO 17050, a pathway to certification under ISO 14001 was included for any event that reached a 5-star NEATFish rating and subsequently sought a higher level of environmental accreditation such as ISO 14001, which requires regular audits of tournament activities from independent accreditation bodies.

## The NEATFish Scoring System and Determination of NEATFish Ratings

The scoring system used to determine a tournament's NEATFish rating is based on a questionnaire, with scores being allocated to each question up to a nominal score out of 100 points. However provision is made for tournaments to score more than 100 points through allocation of bonus points for some questions if organizers present innovative new concepts to improve their environmental and socioeconomic performances. The questionnaires can be supplied either in hard copy form (with scoring performed manually), in electronic format (standard in PDF format, with scoring calculated using an Excel spreadsheet), or via an interactive Web site at [www.neatfish.com](http://www.neatfish.com).

Sections 1 and 2 of the NEATFish Standard cover the introduction and how to use the standard, while sections 3–7 contain the questionnaire used to determine the NEATFish rating. Table 1 shows the weighting of scores for each section. The scoring system was designed to reflect the relative importance of various tournament activities as determined from consultation with tournament organizers and industry representatives at the national workshop.

The scoring system was designed so that the environmental performance of a tournament would be prioritized over its socioeconomic performance. This was done to ensure that large tournaments with significant economic and/or social footprints could not score highly without undertaking significant steps to improve their environmental performance. Conversely, tournaments that are environmentally friendly are encouraged by the scoring system to improve their social and economic performances but cannot compromise on their environmental record if they want to achieve a high rating.

### Section 3. Environmental Assessment

The environmental section of the standard includes questions related to impacts on fish stocks, with the required outcome being that a high-ranking tournament should not adversely impact the sustainability of fish stocks. Impacts on the environment and contributions to fisheries research and management are also assessed

Table 1.—Weighting of each section in the NEATFish scoring system.

Section number	3	4	5	6	7
Section name	Environmental Assessment	Social Assessment	Economic Assessment	Risk Assessment	Record Keeping
Points available	50	20	20	10	0 to -10
% of total points	50%	20%	20%	10%	0 to -10%
Star rating allocated	2.5	1	1	0.5	0 to -0.5

for all tournament types. Then, the questionnaire splits into specific sections related to four different tournament formats, namely catch and release, catch and retain (also known as catch and kill), mixed catch and release/catch and retain, and spearfishing tournaments. Each section evaluates education and gear regulations. The catch-and-release section allocates 15 points to best practice formats that utilize release at site of capture and penalizes tournaments that use live wells by requiring them to answer questions about their fish handling, transport, and weigh-in regulations in order to gain back the 15-point deficit. The other the tournament formats, which include weigh-in of dead fish, have sections on reducing their impacts on fish stocks and disposal of fish and/or offal. The types of environmental issues raised in section 3 of the standard and their rewards and penalties are summarized in Table 2.

#### Section 4. Social Assessment

The social section of the standard includes questions that assess how tournament organizers have attempted to maximize the social benefits their tournament brings to the communities in the area the tournament is held while minimizing the potential for detrimental impacts on local infrastructure and adverse affects on local residents and nonparticipating fishers. This section also emphasizes the need to have an effective method of recording, management, and resolution of any complaints that may arise during the course of the tournament. Emphasis is placed on maximizing family involvement, including local communities in both the planning of the event as well as tournament activities, and encouraging education of local communities on recreational fishing-related issues. The types of issues raised in the questionnaire for section 4 of the standard and the points awarded for these are summarized in Table 3.

#### Section 5. Economic Assessment

The economic section of the standard includes questions that encourage tournament organizers to first determine the economic impact their tournament has on the economy of the area in which the tournament is held and then to let local councils, tourism bodies, sponsors, and the local community know the tournament's economic contribution to the local community. This section emphasizes the need to conduct expenditure surveys to determine how much money flows from tournament activities into the local community and to examine how to maximize the retention of any economic benefits within the local community. The types of issues raised in the questionnaire for section 5 of the standard and the points awarded for these are summarized in Table 4.

#### Section 6. Risk Management

The risk management section of the standard was designed to encourage tournament organizers to promote safe practices for tournament participants, spectators, and members of the community within the tournament area. Some of the questions in this section were developed to assist insurance underwriters to determine the level of risk associated with each particular tournament format with a view to rewarding well-managed tournaments with lower insurance premiums. The types of issues raised in the questionnaire for section 6 of the standard and the points awarded for these are summarized in Table 5.

#### Section 7. Record Keeping

The record-keeping section of the standard reminds tournament organizers who seek official recognition under the NEATFish system that they should ensure that they maintain accurate

Table 2.—Issues raised and scores allocated in the Environmental Assessment (Section 3, 50 points). Tournaments that include catch-and-release and catch-and-retain formats are required to answer questions from both sections 3.4 and 3.5.

<b>Points awarded</b>		
Section/heading	Issue	Points added
3.1 Impacts on fish stocks	Restrictions on number of participants	1
	More stringent regulations/limitations on number of fish weighed in	3
	Promotion of catch and release	1
	Avoidance of prespawning and spawning aggregations, and threatened species	2
	Targeting of stocked species	2
3.2 Impacts on the environment	Development and implementation of an environmental plan	3
	Prohibition of entry to sanctuary areas	1
	Removal of rubbish from campsites, protection of riparian habitat and shorelines	2
	Targeting of noxious fish when they are present and avoidance of their translocation	2
3.3 Contribution to fisheries research/management	All relevant permits obtained, maintain/publish records of number of anglers, numbers of fish taken and/or released	6
	Participation in tagging programs	1
	Donation of funds to fisheries research and development, fish stocking	1
3.4 Catch-and-release tournaments	Angler education is undertaken	3
	Gear regulations require use of fish-friendly gear (circle hooks, barbless hooks, knotless nets)	7
	Fish released immediately at site of capture after photograph/length measurement OR	15
	Compulsory use of appropriate live-well designs, and weigh-in procedures that improve fish welfare	15
3.5 Catch-and-retain tournaments	Angler education is undertaken	4
	Gear regulations require use of fish-friendly gear (circle hooks, barbless hooks, knotless nets)	6
	Impacts on fish stocks reduced by tighter bag limits, increased minimum sizes, eliminate high grading	3
	Provision to dispose offal, weigh fish gilled and gutted, donate samples to scientists, target noxious fish	6
	Alternative methods of winning prizes, such as random draws, secret weights, and best presented team	4
3.6 Spearfishing tournaments	Angler education is undertaken	2
	Gear regulations—use of snorkel, not scuba	2
	Impacts on fish stocks reduced by tighter bag limits, increased minimum sizes, targeting of specific species, eliminating high grading, and eliminating use of burley	9
	Provision to dispose offal, weigh fish gilled and gutted, donate samples to scientists, target noxious fish	6
	Alternative methods of winning prizes, such as random draws, secret weights, and best presented team	4

Table 2.—Continued.

<b>Points deducted</b>		
Section/heading	Issue	Points subtracted
3.1 Impacts on fish stocks	Taking of fish during spawning aggregations	Up to -8 points
3.4 Catch-and-release tournaments	Use of live wells and live weigh-ins instead of immediate release at site of capture	-15 points
3.5 Catch-and-retain tournaments	Awarding prizes for the heaviest specimens and/or heaviest bag of fish	Up to -4 points
	Tournament organizers procure ownership of fish and sell/auction the fish for various purposes	Up to -8 points
3.6 Spearfishing tournaments	Awarding prizes for the heaviest specimens and/or heaviest bag of fish	Up to -4 points
	Tournament organizers procure ownership of fish and sell/auction	Up to -8 points

records to fulfill all of the evidence requirements they need in order to comply with their declaration of conformity with the standard. Failure to maintain adequate records makes it difficult to determine whether a tournament fulfills the requirements of the standard and can jeopardize

the credibility of the tournament and the standard. To encourage maintenance and regular update of all required records, penalties of up to 10 NEATFish points apply, and exclusion from recognition under the standard can be applied if noncompliance is detected by random

Table 3.—Issues raised and scores allocated in the Social Assessment (Section 4, 20 points).

<b>Points awarded</b>		
Section/heading	Issue	Points added
4.1 Social amenity of the tournament	Strategies in place to ensure infrastructure is adequate for competitor influx	1
	Local councils, tourism bodies, media, and businesses contacted to obtain support, generate publicity, and prevent clashes with other events	5
	Tournament organizers contribute financially to maintenance/upgrade of facilities used by tournament	1
	Maintain records of positive and negative media, have complaint resolution procedures in place, and survey local communities about their satisfaction with the event	3
4.2 Social interaction	Maximizing involvement of families, women, people with special needs, and the wider community during the tournament itself through appropriate planning, social events, and educational activities	8
	Notify and involve local fish stocking groups, especially if stocked fish are being targeted	1
	Promoting the health benefits of fishing and outdoors activities	1

Table 4.—Issues raised and scores allocated in the Economic Assessment (Section 5, 20 points).

<b>Points awarded</b>		
Section/heading	Issue	Points added
5.1 Economic amenity of the tournament	Collecting and maintaining detailed records of expenditure by tournament organizers and participants through expenditure surveys and so forth	4
	Regular updating of expenditure figures to ensure they are relevant and provide historic data	5
	Putting an actual dollar figure on the economic activity associated with the tournament	4
	Verification of economic data by independent sources	1
	Production of statements, media releases, and so forth to promote the economic benefit of the tournament to relevant local councils, sponsors, business development bodies, and so forth	2
	Supporting local businesses wherever possible	2
	Donation of some of the tournament proceedings to local charities, fish stocking groups, and so forth	2

compliance audits, tournament competitors, or members of the public.

### Sections 8 and 9. Scoring, Determination, and Official Recognition of NEATFish Ratings

Upon completion of the questionnaires in sections 3–7 of the standard, the overall NEATFish score for the tournament is determined by addition of the scores for each section either manually (if a hard copy of the standard was used) or by using an Excel spreadsheet supplied with

electronic copies of the standard. If tournament organizers undertake the process via the [www.neatfish.com](http://www.neatfish.com) Web site, a running tally of the score is recorded as the various sections are completed, and the total scores and NEATFish rating are calculated automatically when all relevant sections of the standard have been completed. The relationship between points scored and the NEATFish rating is shown in Table 6. A score of greater than 90 is required to achieve the highest 5-star rating.

Official recognition of the NEATFish score of the tournament is obtained by lodging a

Table 5.—Issues raised and scores allocated in the Risk Management (Section 6, 10 points).

<b>Points awarded</b>		
Section /heading	Issue	Points added
6.1 Addressing public safety and risk management issues	The tournament organizers and any subcontractors hold liability insurance and develop a risk management plan, which can include emergency evacuation plans, contingency plans, and so forth	4
	Fisheries and boating authorities have been notified and full compliance with their regulations required	1
	Additional safety regulations over and above legal requirements are required	4
	Provision of sunscreen or sun safety equipment for competitors	1

Table 6.—The relationship between points scored in the questionnaire and NEATFish rating.

Total points score obtained in the standard questionnaire	NEATFish rating
<20	★
21–30	★½
31–40	★★
41–50	★★½
51–60	★★★
61–70	★★★½
71–80	★★★★
81–90	★★★★½
>91	★★★★★

certification fee, a declaration of conformity with the standard, and the tournament's score sheet into the national database. The relevant documents are automatically submitted to the independent certification management body when the process is undertaken via the [www.neatfish.com](http://www.neatfish.com) Web site. In contrast, submissions done on spreadsheets or manually when using the earlier versions of the NEATFish Standard require direct correspondence with the certification management body in order to initiate the official recognition process. Once the score sheet has been checked for accuracy (usually against copies of the tournament's rules and regulations) and payment has been received, the tournament's application will be approved, after which the organizers receive an official NEATFish certificate (Figure 1), the background of which can be customized by submitting a high-resolution electronic image relating to the tournament at the time of lodgment of the fee. Each NEATFish certificate is individually numbered and represents evidence to show that the tournament's NEATFish rating has been officially recognized. The tournament details and its score are then lodged in a database that is accessible to the public through the [www.neatfish.com](http://www.neatfish.com) Web site. Each certificate remains the property of Recfish Australia and is valid for 1 year if there are no major changes to the way in which the tournament is run.

## Discussion

The development of NEATFish since its inception in 2005 has received positive feedback and support from numerous stakeholders in the

recreational fishing industry in Australia. The organizers of 30 tournaments throughout every Australian state and territory were contacted and invited to participate in the trial project during its development, and we were also approached by organizers of several other tournaments who sought details about the certification process. From these, 16 tournaments submitted scoring sheets and were assessed under NEATFish during the trial period, with those events rating between 3 and 5 stars. Since the end of the trial period and the transition into developing NEATFish into a commercial product, additional tournaments have continued to voluntarily apply for certification on a regular basis. Most of these tournaments have since used their NEATFish ratings in publicity and promotional materials placed on Web sites and in their correspondence to competitors, sponsors, insurance agencies, and local and state government authorities.

The current NEATFish scoring system has set a reasonably high standard. The majority of average, well-run mixed catch-and-release/catch-and-retain fishing tournaments have obtained ratings of 3–3.5 stars. Well-managed release tournaments with live weigh-ins and top spearfishing tournaments have generally scored 3.5–4 stars while top tournaments that utilize best-practice catch and release (with immediate release of fish at the site of capture after tagging and/or length measurement and photographs) have scored between 4.5 and 5 stars. Several large tournaments with outdated catch-and-retain formats have inquired about NEATFish but have yet to seek official recognition under the standard. There is evidence



Figure 1.—Example of an official NEATFish certificate, which provides evidence to show that a tournaments NEATFish rating is officially recognized.

to suggest that these tournaments would score 2.5 stars or less in their current form and that they will need to alter their regulations and format to improve their ratings. The Australian National Sportfishing Association has actively encouraged its state branches and its national network of affiliated clubs to adopt NEATFish, especially for those types of tournaments where public participation is involved.

One of the key benefits of NEATFish is that it has been initiated and developed by the recreational fishing industry rather than being imposed by government or third parties. There has always been a risk that governments could move to regulate fishing competitions if no action was taken. In some Australian states, governments were already considering regulation and this could lead to compulsory systems being introduced that may impact tournaments significantly. Instead, positive feedback on NEATFish has generally been obtained from government fisheries agencies and marine parks authorities.

Indeed, because of the development of NEATFish, the Queensland Department of Primary Industries & Fisheries has decided not to progress a code of practice for fishing tournaments in Queensland, but rather they have supported development of the NEATFish Standard. There have also been suggestions that, in the near future, the standard may be used by marine parks authorities in both New South Wales and Queensland to assist in defining minimum environmental standards for fishing tournaments that are held in multiple-use marine parks that contain marine-protected areas.

One insurance company has offered a rebate on public liability insurance for competitions that are rated under NEATFish. An important principle has been established by their offer in that the rebate is dependent on the tournament's NEATFish rating. Their offer is based on the rebate system in Table 7 and will apply each year that the tournaments NEATFish certificate remains valid.

Table 7.—Sliding scale rebate offered by one insurance company based on a tournaments NEATFish rating.

NEATFish rating	Insurance rebate
★★★	\$25
★★★½	\$25
★★★★	\$50
★★★★½	\$50
★★★★★	\$100

In essence, the offer provided by this insurer defrays most of the administrative fee associated with seeking compliance with the standard and indeed makes the NEATFish process cost neutral if the tournament scores a 4-star rating or higher. From a marketing perspective, development of the 1–5-star scoring system provides a way to immediately clarify a tournaments environmental, social, and economic status to sponsors, participants, government, and the public. Because of this, it is likely that in the future, more companies and sponsors may offer other forms of rebate or bonuses to organizers based on their tournaments performance under the standard.

The NEATFish Standard will continue to be refined based on feedback that is received from tournament organizers, environmentalists, sponsors, and the general public, and updated versions will be made available on a regular basis. The first online version of the standard at [www.neatfish.com](http://www.neatfish.com) went live at the end of 2008, and since then, the Web-based standard has become the preferred interface for tournament organizers due to its convenience. Environmental groups and some sectors within the recreational fishing industry have suggested these changes as they considered that there should be more penalty points allocated when tournaments are known to take fish during spawning and prespawning aggregations, given the disproportionately detrimental impacts on sustainability that can occur when fishing effort is focused on these aggregations (de Mitcheson et al. 2008). Others have suggested the section on risk management (currently worth 10 points and 1/2 star) should carry a larger proportion of the total score in recognition of the need to ensure competitor safety. Recfish Australia has also considered increasing the number of pen-

alty points in the section on recordkeeping for failure to maintain adequate records from the current 10 points to 20 points. This has been suggested to better convey the need for accurate recordkeeping in light of the importance of this step as part of the self-assessment process. Rewarding tournament organizers with more points for cooperating with research scientists has also been suggested. Indeed, involving recreational fishers in resource management practices can have many positive benefits (Granek et al. 2008), and it is well recognized that fishing tournaments can provide scientists with data and access to specimens that otherwise may be very difficult to obtain (Meyer et al. 2001).

Several environmental groups were approached to provide feedback during the development of the standard, including the Australian Marine Conservation Society, World Wildlife Fund, Australian Conservation Foundation, and Marine Stewardship Council. Only the Australian Conservation Foundation (ACF) provided feedback and constructive criticism of the concept and drafts of the standard. The ACF suggested a number of items worth consideration, including greater penalties for tournaments that targeted fish in spawning aggregations, greater penalties for tournaments in which organizers took possession of fish for auction or sale, reduction in the length of the accreditation period from 3 years to annually, consultation with environmental groups during tournament planning, provision of recycling facilities at tournament venues, and rewarding organizers with bonus points for minimization of the carbon footprint associated with the tournament. Indeed, several of these suggestions, including moving to annual accreditation, are planned for implementation during establishment of the [www.neatfish.com](http://www.neatfish.com) Web site.

Implementation of these types of changes will result in a requirement for a higher overall standard of environmental performance, fulfilling one of the objectives of NEATFish in that it will help to continually improve the social, economic, and environmental performance of fishing tournaments accredited under the standard. Certainly development of the concept is ongoing, mainly through establishment of the interactive Web site [www.neatfish.com](http://www.neatfish.com) where tournament organizers can undertake the process and gain accreditation online, a tool that

we predict will greatly increase the utility and uptake of the standard in years to come.

### Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the organizers of some of Australia's top fishing tournaments who assisted with the development of the operational components of the standard, as well as the sponsors, peak representative bodies, recreational fishers, insurance agencies, certification bodies, state and federal government fisheries authorities, and environmental groups who provided support and input into the development process. Funding for this project was provided by the Fisheries Research and Development Corporation on behalf of the Australian Government under projects 2005/235, 2006/057, and 2008/215.

### References

- Arlinghaus, R., S. J. Cooke, A. Schwab, and I. G. Cowx. 2007. Fish welfare: a challenge to the feelings-based approach, with implications for recreational fishing. *Fish and Fisheries* 8:57–71.
- Broadhurst, M. K., C. A. Gray, D. D. Reid, M. E. L. Wooden, D. J. Young, J. A. Haddy, and C. Damiano. 2005. Mortality of key fish species released by recreational anglers in an Australian estuary. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 321:171–179.
- Cooke, S. J., and L. U. Sneddon. 2006. Animal welfare perspectives on recreational angling. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 104:176–198.
- Cooke, S. J., J. F. Schreer, D. H. Wahl, and D. P. Philipp. 2002. Physiological effects of catch-and-release angling practices on largemouth bass and smallmouth bass. Pages 489–512 in D. P. Philipp and M. S. Ridgway, editors. *Black bass: ecology, conservation, and management*. American Fish Society, Symposium 31, Bethesda, Maryland.
- de Mitcheson, Y. S., A. Cornish, M. Domeier, P. L. Colin, M. Russell, and K. C. Lindeman. 2008. A global baseline for spawning aggregations of reef fishes. *Conservation Biology* 22:1233–1244.
- Granek, E. F., E. M. P. Madin, M. A. Brown, W. Figueira, D. S. Cameron, Z. Hogan, G. Kristianson, P. DeVilliers, J. E. Williams, J. Post, S. Zahn, and R. Arlinghaus. 2008. Engaging recreational fishers in management and conservation: global case studies. *Conservation Biology* 22:1125–1134.
- Hanson, K. C., S. J. Cooke, C. D. Suski, and D. P. Philipp. 2007. Effects of different angling practices on post-release behaviour of nest-guarding male black bass, *Micropterus* spp. *Fisheries Management and Ecology* 14:141–148.
- Henriques A, and J. Richardson. 2004. *The triple bottom line: does it all add up?* EarthScan, London.
- Kwak, T. J., and M. G. Henry. 1995. Largemouth bass mortality and related causal factors during live-release fishing tournaments on a large Minnesota lake. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 15:621–630.
- Meyer, C. G., K. N. Holland, B. M. Weatherbee, and C. G. Lowe. 2001. Diet, resource partitioning and gear vulnerability of Hawaiian jacks captured in fishing tournaments. *Fisheries Research* 53:105–113.
- Oh, C.O., and R. B. Ditton. 2004. A stated preference discrete choice approach to understanding angler preferences for tournament policies and characteristics. Report prepared for Texas Parks and Wildlife, Coastal Fisheries Division, Austin.
- Oh, C. O., R. B. Ditton, and R. Riechers. 2007. Understanding anglers preferences for fishing tournament characteristics and policies. *Environmental Management* 40:123–133.
- Sawynok, W., B. K. Diggles and J. Harrison. 2008. Development of a national environmental management and accreditation system for business/public recreational fishing competitions RecFish Australia, South Melbourne, Victoria.
- Schramm H. L. Jr., M. L. Armstrong, N. A. Funicelli, D. M. Green, D. P. Lee, R. E. Manns, Jr., B. D. Taubert, and S. J. Waters. 1991a. The status of competitive fishing in North America. *Fisheries* 16:4–12.
- Schramm H. L., Jr., M. L. Armstrong, A. J. Fedler, N. A. Funicelli, D. M. Green, J. L. Hahn, D. P. Lee, R. E. Manns, Jr., S. P. Quinn, and S. J. Waters. 1991b. Sociological, economic, and biological aspects of competitive fishing. *Fisheries* 16:13–21.
- Suski, C. D., S. J. Cooke, S. J. Killin, D. H. Wahl, and D. P. Phipp. 2005. Behaviour of walleye, *Sander vitreus*, and largemouth bass, *Micropterus salmoides*, exposure to different wave intensities and boat operating conditions during livewell confinement. *Fisheries Management and Ecology* 12:19–26.
- Wilde, G. R., C. E. Shavlik, and K. L. Pope. 2002. Initial mortality of black bass in B.A.S.S. fishing tournaments. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 22:950–954.

