

REPORT OF THE

SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC COMMISSION

5-9 JUNE 2000
MIRAMICHI, CANADA

Chairman: Mr Vladimir Moskalenko (Russian Federation)

Vice-Chairman: Mr Arni Isaksson (Iceland)

Rapporteur: Dr Niall Ó Maoiléidigh (European Union)

Secretary: Dr Malcolm Windsor

NEA(00)13

CONTENTS

PAGE

Report of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the North-East Atlantic Commission, 5-9 Juin 2000, Miramichi, Canada	103
Compte rendu de la Dix-septième réunion annuelle de la Commission de l'Atlantique du nord-est, 5-9 Juin 2000, Miramichi, Canada	113
Annex 1 Agenda, NEA(00)9	125
Annex 2 Returns under the North-East Atlantic Commission Resolution to Protect Wild Salmon Stocks from Introductions and Transfers, NEA(00)4	127
Annex 3 Exploitation of Salmon in the United Kingdom and Ireland (Tabled by the European Union), NEA(00)6	147
Annex 4 Trends in the Management of Salmon Fisheries in Norway, NEA(00)7	161
Annex 5 Decision regarding the Salmon Fishery in Faroese Waters, 2001, NEA(00)12	165
Annex 6 Request for Scientific Advice from ICES, CNL(00)60	167
Annex 7 List of North-East Atlantic Commission Papers	169

NEA(00)13

Report of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the North-East Atlantic Commission of the North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization 5-9 June 2000, Miramichi, Canada

1. Opening of the Meeting

- 1.1 The Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the North-East Atlantic Commission was opened by the Chairman, Mr Vladimir Moskalenko (Russian Federation), who welcomed the delegates to Miramichi.
- 1.2 A list of participants at the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Council and the Commissions is included on page 305 of this document.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

- 2.1 The Commission adopted its agenda, NEA(00)9 (Annex 1), after the inclusion of a new agenda item 7 entitled “Application of the Precautionary Approach to the Work of the Commission”.

3. Nomination of a Rapporteur

- 3.1 The Commission nominated Dr Niall Ó Maoiléidigh (European Union) as its Rapporteur for the meeting.

4. Election of Officers

- 4.1 The Commission re-elected Mr Vladimir Moskalenko (Russian Federation) as Chairman and Mr Arni Isaksson as Vice-Chairman for a period of two years.

5. Review of the 1999 Fishery and ACFM report from ICES on Salmon Stocks in the Commission Area

- 5.1 The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) advised the Commission that no commercial or research fishing was carried out at Faroes in 1999.
- 5.2 The representative of ICES, Mr Tore Jakobsen, Chairman of the ACFM, presented the scientific advice from ICES relevant to the North-East Atlantic Commission, CNL(00)12, prepared in response to a request from the Commission at its Sixteenth Annual Meeting. The ACFM Report from ICES, which contains the scientific advice relevant to all Commissions, is included on page 229 of this document.
- 5.3 The representative of Iceland sought clarification as to whether salmon of Icelandic origin are included in the Northern Stock for the purposes of the model presented in CNL(00)12. This was confirmed.

6. Salmonid Introductions and Transfers

- 6.1 The Chairman of the Commission noted that the Commission had adopted a Resolution to Protect Wild Salmon Stocks from Introductions and Transfers, NEA(97)12, at its Fourteenth Annual Meeting. The Secretary presented paper NEA(00)4 (Annex 2) detailing the first returns under the Resolution and sought confirmation that the Commission wished to continue these returns on an annual basis.
- 6.2 The representative of the European Union acknowledged that the information in this report was useful but suggested that there was a need for some standardisation of subsequent returns. The Secretary responded that the returns were presented in the exact wording in which they had been submitted by the Parties. He agreed to look at the opportunity for standardising future returns through consultation with the Parties.
- 6.3 The representative of Iceland noted that the term “non-indigenous” is not defined in the Resolution and suggested that this should be clarified. The representative of the European Union agreed that standardisation of responses and clarification of terms would be useful for future reports. The Secretary agreed to develop a definition of “non-indigenous” for consideration by the Commission at its next meeting.
- 6.4 The Chairman noted that this was an important issue and that there was a need for clear responses from the Parties for next year’s returns.

7. Application of the Precautionary Approach to the Work of the Commission

- 7.1 The Chairman of the Commission referred to the deliberations in the Council relating to the Application of the Precautionary Approach to Salmon Fisheries Management and the provisional adoption of the Decision Structure contained in Annex 4 of CNL(00)18.
- 7.2 The representative of the European Union stressed the need to carry the process forward. The European Union is committed to evaluating the Decision Structure on selected rivers or groups of rivers in the UK and Ireland. The outcome of these evaluations will be reported to the Commission and the Standing Committee on the Precautionary Approach at the next annual meeting.
- 7.3 The representative of Norway outlined the approach to be used in the application of the Precautionary Approach in Norway, indicating that some of the issues were already being addressed. Norway has developed an improved system of classification for all rivers. There are plans for improved monitoring of stocks in homewaters which is a vital element of the Decision Structure. Norway is also moving towards a quota-based management system to balance the sea fisheries and in-river fisheries in order to limit the number of stocks affected by mixed stock fisheries.
- 7.4 The representative of Iceland reminded the Commission that Iceland had been entirely free of coastal netting for two years as all remaining salmon fisheries had been

purchased either by the state or by private funds and this had cost in the region of £500,000 to £600,000.

- 7.5 The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) stressed the need to take forward the principles of the Precautionary Approach and reminded the Commission that this issue was also being addressed in other fisheries fora. He would be raising with the Faroese authorities how the principles of the Precautionary Approach can be implemented in legislation. He stressed that there was a need for greater understanding of the terms of the Precautionary Approach and the implications for mixed stock fishing. While Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) had not developed an action plan, as there are few salmon rivers in the Faroes, they were intending to move the process forward.
- 7.6 The Chairman of the Commission acknowledged that, while some decisions were being taken by Contracting Parties to implement the Decision Structure, they may not be in a position to present specific action plans, and that it may be possible to have a more detailed exchange of information next year. Considering the importance of the application of the Precautionary Approach and its implications in other international fora, he indicated that this would be a regular agenda item for consideration by the Commission.

8. Regulatory Measures

- 8.1 The representative of the European Union presented document NEA(00)6 (Annex 3) detailing measures taken in the UK and Ireland. He stressed that previous reports had not adequately described the combined effect of management measures and voluntary reduction in effort as these had been reported on a year-to-year basis. The current information in NEA(00)6 showed the cumulative effects of these measures over the past 25 years. This was important as the islands of Great Britain and Ireland together produced a large proportion of the European salmon.
- 8.2 In addition to the measures reported for Ireland in NEA(00)6, details of the following measures were also given:
- A National Salmon Commission had been established;
 - Installation of fish counters on 30 important salmon rivers;
 - Carcass-tagging salmon caught by all methods and logbooks from 2001;
 - 6 major salmon rivers had been designated for special funding to act as pilot schemes for all other catchments;
 - Significant investment for sophisticated surveillance equipment and vessels for the fishery protection services;
 - The national plan as outlined would allow an annual review of all rivers and the National Salmon Commission would identify rivers which were below conservation limits and advise on methods to improve these stocks. The co-operation of colleagues in Northern Ireland was acknowledged.
- 8.3 The representative of the European Union hoped that the information provided would allow a clear understanding of the salmon management measures being taken within the European Union and the targets being achieved. He acknowledged that there was

still more to do as a result of the adoption of the Precautionary Approach, and he would therefore update this information at future meetings of the Commission.

- 8.4 The representative of Norway tabled a document, NEA(00)7 (Annex 4), outlining trends in the management of salmon fisheries in Norway. The biggest changes in Norwegian salmon management have resulted from the ban on drift nets, reduction in the number of bend nets and development of more diversified and locally adapted fishing regulations.
- 8.5 The representative of the European Union referred to his intervention at the last meeting on ongoing negotiations between the European Union and Norway on a new agreement for the Tana and Neiden Rivers. These negotiations are still ongoing but the Parties are making substantial progress. He indicated that he would report to the Commission next year on progress. The representative of Norway agreed that, while significant progress had been made in these important negotiations, he hoped that the remaining issues could be resolved before the next annual meeting.
- 8.6 The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) stated that NASCO had established a quota of 300 tonnes for the previous year, and that other limiting measures were also agreed such as a restriction on the number of days fishing, a limit on the number of licences allowed and a commitment that in the event of a fishery taking place only 260 tonnes would be fished. As reported in CNL(00)12, no fishery took place at Faroes in 1999. In 2000, a small catch was taken, consistent with the Precautionary Approach. He reiterated that Faroes are very dependent on fishing and he maintained their right to fish for salmon. Examination of the historical trend would show that the Faroes quota had been reduced by more than 70%. He concluded that the Faroes research fishery had not had any impact on salmon stocks in the North Atlantic and the most recent catch had been taken under precautionary conditions.
- 8.7 The representative of the European Union stated the right of countries to fish for fish which were confined to their own waters, or that the Faroes are dependent on fishing, was not being contested. However, he did not agree that this could be enlarged to say that the Faroes needed to fish for salmon as Faroes had not had a commercial salmon fishery for several years. He had been informed that the Faroes had a commercial fishery in 2000, which was contrary to the terms agreed for the year 2000. He indicated that the Chairman of the ACFM had clearly stated that more damage was caused by mixed stock fishing in Faroes than mixed stock fishing in homewaters. He further stated that there should not be a commercial fishery at Faroes and that fishing should be restricted to a research fishery only.
- 8.8 The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) reiterated that he had not suggested that Faroes relied on salmon fishing and pointed out that previous agreements had allowed Faroes to fish in the early part of 2000 and they had retained this right. He reiterated that mixed stock fishing also occurs in homewaters and that the total North Atlantic catch of salmon had been 3,245t which included a substantial unreported catch. He concluded by stating that declines in stocks were not attributable to the Faroes fishery.

- 8.9 The representative of Norway suggested that the present discussion was not new and that the clear information on status of stocks indicated that the Faroes fishery should be limited to a research fishery only. He was not questioning the right of the Faroes to fish for salmon, but the use of this right in a situation where stocks were low. He further stated that it was fair to say that Faroes are not responsible for the state of the stocks and that the cause of the problem lay outside their waters. However, he pointed out that if Faroes were to start fishing again this would not help the situation. For this reason Norway could only accept a solution in this year's regulations to restrict the Faroes fishery.
- 8.10 The representative of the European Union indicated that if the present quota of 260 tonnes or even 300 tonnes were fished this was equivalent to between 65,000 and 70,000 fish, and questioned whether there were that many fish available to the Faroes fishery. If this was not the case then the Commission was setting a "paper quota". He stated that, within the principles of the Precautionary Approach, "paper fish" should never be part of a management quota.
- 8.11 The representative of Iceland stated that the situation was such that extreme care needed to be exercised. The scientific advice was that exploitation of 2SW salmon in homewaters or at Faroes should not be allowed. He also pointed out that great caution was also needed in coastal salmon fisheries and noted the importance of adhering to the principles of the Precautionary Approach.
- 8.12 The representative of the Russian Federation pointed out that he did not doubt the advice from ICES. According to tagging studies, the proportion of Russian fish in Faroes waters was 16%. Earlier tagging experiments had shown that fish recaptured in Faroes originated from the Kola Peninsula, Archangel, White Sea and Barents Sea. Today there are practically no salmon in Archangel or Karelia. Populations in the Barents Sea and the Kola Peninsula had been reduced dramatically. This had forced the authorities to reduce allocated catches from 300 tonnes to 3.7 tonnes in the year 2000. The Faroes quota had been reduced by less than half over the same period. He believed, therefore, that it would be appropriate to reduce the quota at Faroes to a level of 200 tonnes to allow a greater possibility of increasing returns of Russian salmon to homewaters.
- 8.13 The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) queried whether this was a proposal from the representative of the Russian Federation for a quota at Faroes and suggested that they would need to come back to this at a later stage if it was. He stressed that Faroes had not been fishing the entire quota over the period indicated by the representative of the Russian Federation, and therefore the Faroes fishery was not affecting the status of stocks in Russia. He further suggested that it was the quota which NASCO was regulating, not the catch, which was nearly 0 (or a small amount in the research fishery). He reminded the Commission that Faroes had in the past been able to fish over 1,000 tonnes in the 1980's. In the early 1990's the catch was much lower than this. He stated that whether or not the quota could be caught was a good question. This was the only regulatory measure which NASCO had established within the Commission and he drew attention to the total catch in this regard. He was not in a position to say what would come out of the meeting but stated that they had reached a "bottom line" which was important if the Faroes

Government was to accept a quota for fishing at all. They had to wait to see what NASCO would decide on this issue.

- 8.14 The representative of the European Union stated that it was important to remember that NASCO's role is about saving wild salmon. He expressed his astonishment that the Faroes had reached a "bottom line" at the same time as subscribing to the principles of the Precautionary Approach. He asked if the statement by the Faroes meant that they would not be able to accept a quota of less than 300t and for an explanation of the "bottom line".
- 8.15 The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) indicated that the "bottom line" referred to his opening statement to the Council and that, as previously stated, the Faroes quota had been reduced by more than 70% since they had become a member of NASCO. They would, therefore, have to consider their position if a regulatory measure for a quota in 2001 could not be agreed.
- 8.16 The representative of the European Union suggested that the Parties should be willing to seek a reasonable compromise. He acknowledged that the Faroes had a right to fish but also had an obligation under international treaties of UNCLOS and within the principles of the Precautionary Approach. All Parties had agreed to this. ICES advice stated that fishing should not take place on mixed stock fisheries. However, he felt that Faroes could retain their right to fish fully and legally while stating that it was not their intention to fish the quota.
- 8.17 The representative of Norway agreed, but asked what plan the representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) had for the fishery in the coming year, and what their views were on the consequences for stocks if they fish the quota.
- 8.18 The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) had noted the views of the Contracting Parties in relation to maintaining an "open door" on negotiations. However, he was of the view that they should wait to see how far this would go. In relation to the scientific advice, he reiterated that it had not been possible to show the effect of the Faroes fishery on homewater stocks. However, before any statement was made regarding their intentions, he wished to hear whether the other Contracting Parties were willing to make statements indicating their intention not to fish mixed stock fisheries.
- 8.19 The representative of Norway pointed out that all salmon fisheries in the Faroes were on mixed stock fisheries. The intention now was to clarify how big the fishery would be. He noted that the fisheries conducted in recent years were small and only limited catches were made. He sought clarification on the fishery in 2001 as the intention appeared to be that the Faroes might fish a significant part of their quota.
- 8.20 The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) replied that he was not in a position to give a full answer as he had no clear impression of the intentions of the other Contracting Parties with regard to their mixed stock fisheries.

- 8.21 The representative of the European Union asked if this implied that Faroes would increase fishing on mixed stocks in their waters if there were mixed stock fisheries by other Contracting Parties.
- 8.22 The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) replied that he had not specified whether or not they would increase fishing on mixed stocks but that they would wait to see what would happen in regard to mixed stock fisheries by other Contracting Parties.
- 8.23 The representative of Norway suggested that Faroes had previously taken a responsible attitude to fishing and the protection of wild salmon stocks and did not feel that they would fish a significant part of their quota. Previous catches of only 8 tonnes indicated that Faroes were committed to protecting stocks but he sought clarification that this was the case.
- 8.24 The representative of the European Union asked whether it was likely that the Faroes would fish more than 10 or 20 tonnes as this would help him to consider how to further the negotiations. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) replied that it was difficult to indicate at this stage what was likely. However, he wished to underline their right to fish.
- 8.25 The representative of the European Union asked whether the fishery of 7.6 tonnes in 2000 had been profitable. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) indicated that they had no problem with the income or in selling the fish and confirmed that it had been profitable.
- 8.26 The Chairman of the Commission tabled document NEA(00)10 which had been prepared to facilitate a resolution to the issues being discussed, and asked the delegates to consider it carefully.
- 8.27 The representative of the European Union stated that this was a useful document from the Chairman and that he would get his delegation to consider it carefully. However, he proposed some changes to the draft which did not affect the substance of the text in any way.
- 8.28 The representative of the European Union then made the following statement in relation to the adoption of the draft decision for the salmon fishery at Faroes for 2001: "I must put on record the European Union's regret that the Faroe Islands have authorised the resumption of a commercial fishery for salmon. Any significant increase in the size of this fishery would mean an increase in the level of exploitation of Northern and Southern European multi-sea-winter stocks. Such an increase would be contrary to the advice we received from ICES, which is that great caution should be exercised in the management of these stocks, particularly in mixed stock fisheries, and exploitation should not be permitted to increase. I am, therefore, reassured by the commitment that the Faroe Islands has given to manage this fishery in a precautionary manner, with a view to sustainability, taking into account relevant factors. In the view of the European Union, the advice from ICES is a highly relevant factor. If, however, there is a significant increase in the level of exploitation in the Faroe Islands fishery, contrary to ICES advice, I must reserve the right of the European Union to call for a special meeting of this Commission".

- 8.29 The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) also made a statement: “Mr Chairman, We remind you of the successive cuts that have been made in Faroese salmon fisheries. In recent years these fisheries have been negligible. During the last decade our fisheries have been reduced from 10% to less than 1% last year of the total catches of all NASCO Parties. On the other hand, we have pointed to the fact that it has proved impossible to detect any significant effect upon the stocks from the sacrifices we have made. In this connection, we mentioned the problem of unreported catches, a problem which gradually is being brought to the surface here in NASCO, but which is still unsolved in many fisheries. We stated the obvious conclusion that the main reason for the recent decline of salmon stocks was not the oceanic fisheries. It had to be found somewhere else. Therefore NASCO could only attain its objective of promoting the conservation, restoration, enhancement and rational management of salmon stocks in the North Atlantic by focussing on other matters than restrictions for the oceanic fishermen. We urged NASCO to address the serious problems affecting salmon in homewaters and we urged other NASCO members to make binding commitments for the benefit of the salmon stocks. In other areas the results were less conspicuous. We looked in vain for binding undertakings from the Contracting Parties regarding homewater fisheries, including mixed stock fisheries. Evidently the Faroese fisheries have to be classed as mixed stock fisheries. We have noted the advice from ICES to regulate such fisheries with great caution and we are following with interest how other Contracting Parties are dealing with such fisheries in their own waters. As far as the Faroese fishery is concerned it was not possible to establish a new NASCO regulatory measure. The North-East Atlantic Commission took due note of the scientific advice from ICES on the salmon stocks contributing to the Faroese fishery and discussed the many factors which had caused a decline in some of these stocks. The Faroese authorities will, of course, keep NASCO informed about their management decisions, which will be made on the basis of precautionary principles. The fishery will be monitored closely and organised in such a way that relevant scientific knowledge is obtained. We are convinced that, as things stand, this way of handling the issue will give the optimum results, not only for Faroese society, but also for the evolution of a permanent, mutually acceptable and consistent regime for the management of salmon in the area covered by the North-East Atlantic Commission”.
- 8.30 The representative of Iceland referred to the scientific advice from ICES. He further pointed out that Iceland is categorically opposed to fisheries for salmon at sea and that this has been their position for some time. However, they had some understanding for the situation of their neighbours in Faroes who are totally dependent on the resources of the sea. He also wished to point out that he agreed with the statement made by the representative of the European Union. Iceland has abstained from voting on regulatory measures in previous years and they would also abstain from voting this year.
- 8.31 The representative of Norway indicated that he was able to agree with the draft decision as he felt confident that Faroes would act in a responsible manner as they had in the past. He acknowledged that there were management challenges in homewater fisheries and specifically highlighted offshore mixed stock fisheries which are carried out by the some of the Commission’s Contracting Parties.

8.32 The Commission adopted NEA(00)12 (Annex 5) regarding the salmon fishery in Faroes waters in 2001.

9. Announcement of the Tag Return Incentive Scheme Prize

9.1 The Chairman announced that the winner of the Commission's \$1,500 prize was Mr M.D. Kay of Warrington in England. The Commission offered its congratulations to the winner.

10. Recommendations to the Council on the Request to ICES for Scientific Advice

10.1 The Secretary of NASCO tabled document SSC(00)3 containing recommendations to the Council on the request to ICES for scientific advice. This was adopted without amendment. The request to ICES, as agreed by the Council, CNL(00)60, is contained in Annex 6.

11. Other Business

11.1 There was no other business.

12. Date and Place of Next Meeting

12.1 The Commission agreed to hold its next meeting during the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the Council, 4-8 June 2001.

13. Consideration of the Draft Report of the Meeting

13.1 The Commission agreed a draft report of the meeting, NEA(00)5.

NOTE: The annexes mentioned above begin on page 125, following the French translation of the report of the meeting.

NEA(00)13

Compte rendu de la Dix-septième réunion annuelle de la Commission de l'Atlantique du Nord-Est de l'Organisation pour la Conservation du Saumon de l'Atlantique Nord 5-9 juin 2000, Miramichi, Canada

1. Ouverture de la réunion

- 1.1 La Dix-septième réunion annuelle de la Commission de l'Atlantique du Nord-Est a été ouverte par le Président, M. Vladimir Moskalenko (Fédération de la Russie), qui a souhaité la bienvenue à Miramichi aux délégués.
- 1.2 Une liste des participants à la Dix-septième réunion annuelle du Conseil et des Commissions figure à la page 305 de ce document.

2. Adoption de l'ordre du jour

- 2.1 La Commission a adopté son ordre du jour, NEA(00)9 (annexe 1), après insertion du nouveau point 7 intitulé « Application de l'approche préventive au travail de la Commission ».

3. Nomination d'un Rapporteur

- 3.1 La Commission a nommé le Dr Niall Ó Maoiléidigh (Union européenne), Rapporteur de la réunion.

4. Election des responsables

- 4.1 La Commission a réélu Président de séance et Vice-président, Messieurs Vladimir Moskalenko (Fédération de Russie) et Arni Isaksson, pour une période de deux ans.

5. Examen de la pêche de 1999 et du rapport du CGCP du CIEM sur les stocks de saumons dans la zone de la Commission

- 5.1 Le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) a informé la Commission qu'aucune pêche n'avait été effectuée aux îles Féroé en 1999 – que ce soit à des fins commerciales ou scientifiques.
- 5.2 Le président du CCGP et représentant du CIEM, M. Tore Jakobsen, a fait état des recommandations scientifiques du CIEM intéressant la Commission de l'Atlantique du Nord-Est, CNL(00)12, formulées suite à une demande émanant de la Commission lors de la Seizième réunion annuelle. Le rapport du CCGP du CIEM contenant les

recommandations scientifiques pour l'ensemble des Commissions figure à la page 229 du présent document.

- 5.3 Le représentant de l'Islande a cherché à obtenir la confirmation que les saumons d'origine islandaise avaient été inclus au nombre des stocks du groupe des pays du nord lors de l'élaboration du modèle proposé dans le document CNL(00)12. Ceci a été confirmé.

6. Introductions et transferts de salmonidés

- 6.1 Le Président de la Commission a rappelé que la Commission avait adopté une Résolution visant à protéger les stocks de saumons sauvages contre les introductions et les transferts, NEA(97)12, lors de la Quatorzième réunion annuelle. Le Secrétaire a présenté le document NEA(00)4 (annexe 2) qui détaillait les premiers renvois d'information effectués au terme de cette Résolution et s'est enquis auprès de la Commission pour savoir si celle-ci désirait continuer de recevoir ces informations annuellement.
- 6.2 Le représentant de l'Union européenne a reconnu que l'information contenue dans ce rapport était utile. Il a toutefois suggéré qu'il serait bon de standardiser la présentation des prochains renseignements. Le Secrétaire a répondu que les renvois d'information étaient présentés tels qu'ils avaient été soumis par les Parties. Il a convenu toutefois de consulter les Parties en vue d'étudier la possibilité de standardisation des informations futures.
- 6.3 Le représentant d'Islande a fait remarquer que la Résolution n'offrait pas de définition pour l'expression « non-indigène ». Il a alors suggéré que ceci soit éclairci. Le représentant de l'Union européenne a convenu que la standardisation des réponses et l'éclaircissement de termes faciliteraient les prochains comptes rendus. Le Secrétaire a convenu de formuler une définition pour l'expression « non-indigène » qu'il soumettrait à la Commission pour étude lors de la prochaine réunion.
- 6.4 Le Président a noté que ceci était une question importante et qu'il importait que les Parties fournissent des réponses claires lors de leurs renvois d'informations l'an prochain.

7. Application de l'approche préventive au travail de la Commission

- 7.1 Le Président de la Commission a rappelé les délibérations du Conseil concernant l'Application de l'approche préventive à la gestion des pêcheries de saumons et l'adoption provisoire d'une Structure de décisions, telle qu'elle figure à l'annexe 4 du CNL(00)18.
- 7.2 Le représentant de l'Union européenne a souligné le besoin de faire progresser le processus. L'Union européenne s'est engagée à tester la Structure de décisions dans certaines rivières ou groupes de cours d'eau au Royaume-Uni et en Irlande. Les résultats de ces évaluations seront communiqués à la Commission et au Comité permanent chargé de l'approche préventive lors de la prochaine réunion annuelle.

- 7.3 Le représentant de la Norvège a donné un aperçu de l'approche qui sera employée en Norvège pour introduire l'approche préventive dans ce pays, indiquant que certaines questions étaient déjà en cours de résolution. La Norvège avait affiné le système de classification applicable à l'ensemble des rivières. Elle envisageait par ailleurs d'améliorer le contrôle des stocks dans les eaux territoriales, élément vital de la Structure de décisions. La Norvège progressait également vers un système de gestion basé sur les quotas de façon à équilibrer les pêcheries en mer avec celles des eaux territoriales. Ceci limiterait le nombre de stocks touchés par les pêcheries à stock mixte.
- 7.4 Le représentant d'Islande a rappelé à la Commission que le pays n'avait plus, depuis deux ans, de filets sur ses côtes puisque les dernières pêcheries de saumons avaient toutes été rachetées soit par l'Etat soit par des fonds privés ; cet exercice ayant coûté approximativement entre 500 000 et 600 000 livres sterling.
- 7.5 Le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) a souligné le besoin de faire avancer l'application des principes de l'approche préventive et a rappelé à la Commission que les autres fora de pêche abordaient également cette question. Il étudierait de concert avec les autorités féroésiennes comment ces principes pouvaient devenir loi. Il a signalé qu'il importait de mieux comprendre ce que l'on entendait par approche préventive et ce que ceci signifiait dans le cadre de la pêche à stock mixte. Bien que le Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) n'ait pas mis au point de programme d'actions, puisqu'il n'y avait qu'un petit nombre de rivières à saumons aux Îles Féroé, le pays avait cependant l'intention de faire avancer le processus d'application.
- 7.6 Le Président de la Commission a reconnu que, même si les Parties signataires prenaient des décisions afin de mettre la Structure de décisions en application, elles n'étaient pas nécessairement en mesure de proposer des programmes d'actions spécifiques. Il a également reconnu qu'il serait possible d'établir un échange d'informations plus détaillées l'année prochaine. Etant donné l'importance que revêtaient l'application de l'approche préventive et ses implications au sein d'autres fora internationaux, le Président a indiqué que cette question constituerait un point fixe de l'ordre du jour de la Commission.

8. Mesures de réglementation

- 8.1 Le représentant de l'Union européenne a présenté le document NEA(00)6 (annexe 3) décrivant les mesures prises par le Royaume-Uni et l'Irlande. Il a fait remarquer que les comptes rendus précédents n'avaient pas décrit correctement les effets combinés des mesures de gestion et de la réduction volontaire d'effort puisque celles-ci ne portaient que sur une année à la fois. L'information actuelle contenue dans le NEA(00)6 représentait l'effet cumulatif de ces mesures sur les dernières 25 années. Ceci était important puisque les îles de Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande produisaient une grande proportion du saumon européen.
- 8.2 Outre les mesures notées pour l'Irlande dans le document NEA(00)6, on notait également les détails de mesures suivantes :

- l'établissement d'une Commission nationale du saumon ;
- l'installation de stations de comptage de poissons sur 30 importantes rivières à saumons ;
- le marquage des carcasses de saumons capturés par tout type de méthodes et la tenue de carnets de bord à partir de 2001 ;
- la sélection de 6 grands cours d'eau à saumons pour l'allocation de fonds spéciaux, en tant que projets pilotes pour tous les autres bassins hydrographiques ;
- Un investissement important dans des équipements et vaisseaux de surveillance sophistiqués destinés aux services de protection de pêche ;
- Enfin le programme national, tel qu'il a été ébauché, permettrait un examen annuel de chaque cours d'eau. La Commission nationale du saumon identifierait alors ceux qui figureraient en dessous des limites de conservation et offrirait ses recommandations quant à la manière d'améliorer ces stocks. La coopération des collègues en Irlande du Nord était appréciée dans ce domaine.

8.3 Le représentant de l'Union européenne espérait que les renseignements fournis faciliteraient la compréhension des mesures prises au niveau de l'Union européenne dans le cadre de la gestion du saumon ainsi que des objectifs en cours de réalisation. Reconnaissant qu'il restait encore beaucoup à faire à la suite de l'adoption de l'approche préventive, le représentant de l'Union européenne s'est, par conséquent, engagé à mettre à jour l'information offerte, lors des prochaines réunions de la Commission.

8.4 Le représentant de la Norvège a présenté le document NEA(00)7 (annexe 4) qui ébauchait les grandes lignes de la gestion des pêcheries de saumons en Norvège. Les changements les plus notables provenaient de l'interdiction placée sur les filets dérivants, la réduction du nombre de filets du type « bend nets » et la mise en place d'une réglementation de la pêche plus large et mieux adaptée à la localité.

8.5 Le représentant de l'Union européenne s'est reporté à l'intervention qu'il avait faite lors de la dernière réunion sur les négociations en cours entre l'Union européenne et la Norvège, négociations qui portaient sur un nouvel accord concernant les rivières Tana et Neiden. Ces négociations étaient toujours en cours, mais les Parties réalisaient des progrès notables. Le représentant de l'Union européenne a indiqué qu'il transmettrait à la Commission tout développement à ce sujet, l'an prochain. Le représentant de la Norvège a convenu que de grands progrès avaient été réalisés dans ces importantes négociations. Il espérait toutefois que les questions qui restaient à résoudre le seraient avant la prochaine réunion annuelle.

8.6 Le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) a déclaré que l'OCSAN avait établi un quota de 300 tonnes l'année précédente. L'on avait également convenu d'autres mesures de limitation, telles que la restriction du nombre de jours de pêche, la réduction du nombre de licences octroyées et l'engagement qui stipulait que dans toute éventualité de pêche, les récoltes ne devraient pas dépasser 260 tonnes. Comme indiqué dans le document CNL(00)12, aucune pêche n'a eu lieu aux Îles Féroé en 1999. En l'an 2000, les prises avaient été très basses et conformes à l'approche préventive. Le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le

Groenland) a réitéré que les Îles Féroé dépendaient grandement de la pêche et maintenaient leur droit à la pêche au saumon. Or un examen des tendances historiques révélerait que le quota aux Îles Féroé avait été réduit de plus de 70%. En conclusion, il a ajouté que la pêcherie effectuée à des fins scientifiques au large des Îles Féroé n'avait eu aucun effet sur les stocks de saumons dans l'Atlantique Nord et que les captures les plus récentes avaient été prises conformément aux conditions de l'approche préventive.

- 8.7 Le représentant de l'Union européenne a reconnu le droit des pays à la pêche des poissons qui se limitaient à leurs propres eaux territoriales. Il ne contestait pas non plus que les Îles Féroé dépendaient de la pêche. Cependant, il n'était pas d'accord que l'on puisse élargir ces faits au point d'avancer l'opinion que les Îles Féroé avaient besoin de pêcher le saumon puisque ces Îles n'avaient plus de pêcherie commerciale de saumons depuis plusieurs années. Il avait été informé qu'une pêcherie commerciale avait cependant eu lieu aux Îles Féroé en l'an 2000 ce qui ne respectait pas les termes convenus pour cette année. Il a rappelé que le Président du CCGP avait clairement indiqué que la pêche de stock mixte au large des Îles Féroé causait plus de dommages que ce même type de pêche effectuée dans les eaux territoriales. Il a par ailleurs ajouté qu'il ne devrait y avoir aucune pêcherie commerciale aux Îles Féroé et que la récolte devait se confiner à une pêche à des fins scientifiques uniquement.
- 8.8 Le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) a réitéré qu'il n'avait pas suggéré que les Îles Féroé dépendaient de la pêche au saumon et a fait remarquer que les accords antérieurs avaient autorisé les Îles Féroé à pratiquer une pêche au début de l'an 2000 et qu'ils avaient conservé ce droit. Il a répété que la pêche de stock mixte avait également lieu dans les eaux territoriales et que l'ensemble des captures de saumons nord atlantiques s'était élevé à 3 245 tonnes dont un volume important de captures non déclarées. Il en concluait que l'on ne pouvait pas imputer le déclin enregistré dans les stocks à la pêcherie des Îles Féroé.
- 8.9 Le représentant de la Norvège a suggéré que ce débat n'était pas nouveau et que les informations portant sur l'état des stocks indiquaient clairement que la pêcherie des Îles Féroé devait se limiter à une pêcherie effectuée à des fins scientifiques uniquement. Il ne mettait pas en doute le droit des Îles Féroé à la pêche au saumon, mais plutôt l'exercice de ce droit quand les stocks étaient bas. Il a ajouté qu'il était juste de reconnaître que les Îles Féroé n'étaient pas responsables quant à l'état des stocks et que la cause du problème se trouvait au-delà de leurs eaux. Cependant, il a fait remarquer que si les Îles Féroé commençaient de nouveau à pratiquer la pêche ceci serait loin d'améliorer la situation. Aussi, la Norvège ne pouvait-elle accepter, dans le règlement de cette année, qu'une solution qui restreindrait la pêcherie aux Îles Féroé.
- 8.10 Le représentant de l'Union européenne a indiqué que dans la mesure où le quota actuel de 260 tonnes ou même 300 tonnes était pêché, ceci équivaldrait à environ 65 000 et 70 000 poissons. Il se demandait si la pêcherie des Îles Féroé avait accès à tant de poissons. Si ceci n'était pas le cas, la Commission fixait alors des « quotas papier ». Il a déclaré que, selon les principes d'une approche préventive, le « poisson papier » ne devrait jamais faire partie d'un quota de gestion.

- 8.11 Le représentant d'Islande a déclaré que la situation était telle qu'il importait de prendre toutes les précautions nécessaires. Les recommandations scientifiques ne permettaient pas l'exploitation des saumons 2HM ni dans les eaux territoriales, ni aux Îles Féroé. Il a également souligné que la prudence était de mise dans le cas des pêcheries côtières au saumon et a fait remarquer combien il était important de respecter les principes de l'approche préventive.
- 8.12 Le représentant de la Fédération de la Russie a indiqué qu'il n'avait aucune réserve quant aux recommandations du CIEM. Selon les études de marquages, la proportion de poissons russes présents dans les eaux féroéennes était de 16%. Des essais de marquages antérieurs avaient indiqué que les poissons repris aux Îles Féroé provenaient de la presqu'île de Kola, d'Arkhangelsk, de la mer Blanche et de la mer de Barents. Aujourd'hui, il n'existait pratiquement plus de saumons ni dans la province d'Arkhangelsk ni en Carélie. Quant aux populations de la mer de Barents et de la presqu'île de Kola, elles avaient nettement baissé. Ceci avait conduit les autorités à réduire l'allocation de captures de 300 à 3,7 tonnes en l'an 2000. Le quota des Îles Féroé avait été diminué de moins de la moitié pour la même période. Il était par conséquent d'avis qu'il serait approprié de réduire le quota aux Îles Féroé à 200 tonnes de façon à accroître les chances de plus nombreux retours de saumons russes vers leurs eaux territoriales.
- 8.13 Le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) a demandé si le représentant de la Fédération russe proposait ici un quota pour les Féroé et a suggéré qu'à l'affirmative, il serait bon de revenir plus tard sur ce sujet. Il a souligné qu'au cours de la période mentionnée par le représentant de la Fédération russe, les Îles Féroé n'avaient pas pêché la totalité de leur quota, et par conséquent, la pêche aux Îles Féroé n'affectait pas l'état des stocks en Russie. Il a par ailleurs suggéré que l'OCSAN réglait le quota et non les captures, qui ne dépassaient d'ailleurs guère zéro (soit la petite quantité prélevée lors de la pêche effectuée à des fins de recherches scientifiques). Il a rappelé la Commission que les Îles Féroé avaient été autorisées dans les années 1980 à pêcher plus de 1 000 tonnes. Les captures étaient clairement plus basses que ceci au début des années 1990. Il a déclaré que la question de savoir si le quota pouvait ou non être récolté était intéressante. Le quota représentait la seule mesure de réglementation que l'OCSAN avait établie au sein de la Commission et il a attiré l'attention, à ce sujet, sur l'ensemble des captures. Il n'était pas en mesure de prédire ce qui ressortirait de cette réunion, mais il a fait remarquer qu'ils avaient atteint la « limite », ce qu'il était important de reconnaître si l'on désirait que les autorités féroéennes acceptent un quota de pêche. Il ne restait qu'à voir ce que l'OCSAN déciderait à ce propos.
- 8.14 Le représentant de l'Union européenne a indiqué qu'il était important de se souvenir que le rôle de l'OCSAN était de sauvegarder le saumon sauvage. Le fait que les Îles Féroé avaient atteint leur « limite », alors qu'elles souscrivaient aux principes de l'approche préventive, le surprenait. Il a demandé si la déclaration faite par les Îles Féroé signifiait qu'elles ne pouvaient pas accepter de quota inférieur à 300 tonnes. Il souhaitait également que l'idée de « limite » lui soit expliquée.
- 8.15 Le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) a répondu que l'idée de « limite » se rapportait à la déclaration d'ouverture qu'il avait prononcée au

sein du Conseil et au fait que, tel qu'il a été déjà mentionné, le quota des Îles Féroé avait baissé de plus de 70 % depuis qu'elles étaient devenues membres de l'OCSAN. Elles se verraient par conséquent contraintes de reconsidérer leur situation si un accord ne pouvait être atteint sur une mesure de réglementation qui fixerait le quota pour 2001.

- 8.16 Le représentant de l'Union européenne a fait entendre que les Parties devaient se montrer disposées à trouver un compromis acceptable. Il reconnaissait que les Îles Féroé avaient le droit d'exercer leur droit à la pêche, mais qu'elles avaient également des obligations au terme des traités internationaux d'UNCLOS et dans le cadre des principes de l'approche préventive. Les Parties avaient toutes pris cet engagement. Les recommandations du CIEM indiquaient qu'aucune pêche ne devait avoir lieu dans les pêcheries à stock mixte. Il était d'avis cependant que les Îles Féroé pouvaient conserver leur droit général à une pêche légale tout en indiquant qu'il n'était pas dans leur intention de récolter la totalité du quota.
- 8.17 Le représentant de la Norvège a signalé qu'il appuyait ces derniers propos. Il a toutefois demandé que le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) explique ce qu'il envisageait pour la pêcherie de l'année en cours, and quelle était l'opinion du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) quant aux conséquences sur les stocks si le quota était récolté.
- 8.18 Le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) avait pris note des opinions des Parties signataires quant au désir de maintenir une « porte ouverte » sur les négociations. Il était cependant d'avis qu'elles devraient attendre de voir jusqu'où ceci mènerait. Pour ce qui était des recommandations scientifiques, il a répété qu'il avait été impossible de démontrer les effets de la pêche aux Îles Féroé sur les stocks d'eaux territoriales. Avant que les autres Parties signataires ne déclarent leurs intentions, le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) désirait savoir si elles étaient disposées à se prononcer sur la résolution de ne pas pêcher dans les pêcheries à stock mixte.
- 8.19 Le représentant de la Norvège a fait remarquer que les pêcheries de saumons dans les Îles Féroé consistaient toutes de pêcheries à stock mixte. L'objectif était maintenant de clarifier le volume de la pêcherie. Le représentant de la Norvège a pris note du fait que les pêcheries effectuées ces dernières années étaient réduites et qu'elles ne consistaient que d'un nombre limité de captures. Il a demandé que l'on éclaircisse la situation quant à la pêcherie de 2001 puisque l'intention semblait indiquer que les Îles Féroé pêcheraient une grande partie de leur quota.
- 8.20 Le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) a répondu qu'il n'était pas en mesure d'apporter une réponse complète à cette question car il n'avait aucune impression claire des intentions des Parties signataires quant à leurs propres pêcheries de stock mixte.
- 8.21 Le représentant de l'Union européenne a demandé si ceci signifiait que les Îles Féroé augmenteraient la pêche de stock mixte dans leurs eaux, si les autres Parties signataires pratiquaient ce même type de pêche.

- 8.22 Le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) a répondu qu'il n'avait pas spécifié s'ils allaient augmenter la pêche de stock mixte, mais qu'ils attendraient de savoir ce qui se passerait en ce qui concerne les pêches de stock mixte effectuées par les autres Parties signataires.
- 8.23 Le représentant de la Norvège a avancé que les Îles Féroé avaient dans le passé adopté une attitude responsable quant à la pêche et à la protection des stocks de saumons sauvages. Il était ainsi d'avis qu'elles ne pêcheraient qu'une petite partie de leur quota. Les captures antérieures de 8 tonnes uniquement prouvaient que les Îles Féroé étaient engagées à protéger les stocks. Le représentant de la Norvège a toutefois demandé confirmation de ce fait.
- 8.24 Le représentant de l'Union européenne a demandé s'il était probable que les Îles Féroé pêchent plus de 10 ou 20 tonnes car ceci l'aiderait à envisager comment faire progresser les négociations. Le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) a répondu qu'il était difficile pour l'instant d'indiquer ce qui serait probable. Il souhaitait cependant mettre l'accent sur leur droit à la pêche.
- 8.25 Le représentant de l'Union européenne a demandé si la pêcherie de 7,6 tonnes en l'an 2000 avait été lucrative. Le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) a indiqué qu'ils n'avaient eu aucun problème quant au revenu ou à la vente du poisson et a confirmé que la pêcherie avait en effet été rentable.
- 8.26 Le Président de la Commission a présenté le document NEA(00)10, rédigé spécifiquement pour faciliter la résolution des questions en cours de discussion, et a demandé aux délégués de l'étudier attentivement.
- 8.27 Le représentant de l'Union européenne a indiqué que ce document était utile et qu'il inviterait sa délégation à l'étudier attentivement. Il a proposé toutefois quelques modifications qui ne changeraient en rien la substance du texte.
- 8.28 Le représentant de l'Union européenne a ensuite prononcé la déclaration suivante concernant l'adoption de la décision provisoire sur la pêcherie de saumons aux Îles Féroé en 2001 : « Il m'incombe d'exprimer officiellement le regret de l'Union européenne quant à l'autorisation donnée par les Îles Féroé à la reprise d'une pêcherie commerciale au saumon. Toute augmentation considérable du volume de cette pêcherie impliquerait une augmentation du niveau d'exploitation des stocks PHM d'Europe septentrionale et méridionale. Une telle augmentation contreviendrait aux recommandations reçues du CIEM, qui consistent à exercer une grande prudence en matière de gestion de ces stocks, surtout dans le cas des pêcheries à stock mixte. L'on ne devrait ainsi pas permettre d'augmentation d'exploitation. Je suis, par conséquent, rassuré par le fait que les Îles Féroé se sont engagées à gérer cette pêcherie d'une manière préventive, en tenant compte des facteurs appropriés, de façon à promouvoir une exploitation durable. L'Union européenne est d'avis que les recommandations du CIEM constituent un facteur particulièrement approprié. Si, cependant, contrairement aux recommandations du CIEM, on augmentait sensiblement le niveau d'exploitation

dans la pêche des Îles Féroé, je dois me réserver le droit, au nom de l'Union européenne, de réclamer une réunion spéciale de cette Commission ».

- 8.29 Le représentant de Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) a également prononcé une déclaration : « M le Président, Nous voudrions vous rappeler les réductions successives qui ont été effectuées sur les pêcheries au saumon des Îles Féroé. Ces pêcheries ont été ces dernières années négligeables. Au cours de la dernière décennie, elles sont en effet passées de 10% de la totalité des captures effectuées par l'ensemble des Parties à moins de 1% l'année dernière. Par ailleurs, nous avons souligné comment il s'était avéré impossible de détecter les effets de nos sacrifices sur les stocks. A ce propos, nous avons mentionné le problème des captures non déclarées, un problème qui commence à faire surface ici au sein de l'OCSAN, mais qui demeure non résolu dans maintes pêcheries. Nous avons exprimé l'évident en indiquant que la cause principale du déclin récent des stocks de saumons ne résidait pas dans les pêcheries océaniques. Il fallait la rechercher ailleurs. L'OCSAN ne pourra atteindre son objectif, à savoir la promotion de la conservation, restauration, accroissement et gestion rationnelle des stocks de saumons dans l'Atlantique Nord que si elle porte son attention sur des questions autres que celle des restrictions visant les pêcheurs en océan. Nous conseillons vivement à l'OCSAN de faire face aux sérieux problèmes qui affectent les saumons dans les eaux territoriales et nous conseillons vivement aux autres membres de l'OCSAN de s'engager fermement pour le bienfait des stocks de saumons. Ailleurs, les résultats sont moins visibles. Nous avons cherché en vain par exemple des engagements liants pris par les Parties signataires en ce qui concerne les pêcheries en eaux territoriales, y compris les pêcheries de stock mixte. Les pêcheries féringiennes doivent incontestablement être classées comme pêcheries de stock mixte. Nous avons pris note que le CIEM recommandait une grande prudence dans la réglementation de ces pêcheries et nous suivons avec intérêt ce que les autres Parties signataires réalisent dans ce domaine, dans leurs propres eaux. En ce qui concerne la pêche féringienne, il s'est avéré impossible de formuler une nouvelle mesure de réglementation de l'OCSAN. La Commission de l'Atlantique du Nord-Est a pris bonne note des recommandations scientifiques du CIEM concernant les stocks de saumons contribuant à la pêche féringienne. Elle a par ailleurs débattu les nombreux facteurs qui avaient entraîné un déclin chez certains de ces stocks. Il va de soi que les autorités féringiennes tiendront l'OCSAN au courant de leurs décisions en matière de gestion, décisions qui seront prises en fonction des principes de prévention. La pêche sera contrôlée de près et organisée de façon à obtenir les informations scientifiques appropriées. Nous sommes convaincus que, dans les présentes circonstances, cette façon d'aborder la question permettra d'obtenir les meilleurs résultats, non seulement pour la communauté féringienne, mais aussi pour le développement d'un régime de gestion du saumon dans la zone couverte par la Commission de l'Atlantique du Nord-Est qui soit permanent, cohérent et acceptable pour tous ».
- 8.30 Le représentant d'Islande s'est référé aux recommandations scientifiques du CIEM. Il a en outre souligné que l'Islande était catégoriquement opposée à la pêche au saumon en mer et que cela faisait longtemps qu'elle maintenait cette position. Il comprenait cependant la situation de ses voisins féringiens qui dépendaient totalement des ressources maritimes. Le représentant d'Islande désirait également souligner qu'il appuyait la déclaration faite par le représentant de l'Union européenne. L'Islande

s'était abstenue de voter sur les mesures de réglementations les années précédentes et elle ne voterait pas non plus cette année.

8.31 Le représentant de la Norvège a indiqué qu'il était en mesure d'accepter la décision provisoire car il était persuadé que les Îles Féroé agiraient d'une manière responsable, comme elles l'avaient prouvé par le passé. Il a reconnu que les pêcheries en eaux territoriales posaient des défis de gestion. Il a aussi souligné tout particulièrement les pêcheries de stock mixte au large, effectuées par certaines des Parties signataires de la Commission.

8.32 La Commission a adopté le document NEA(00)12 (annexe 5) concernant la pêche au saumon dans les eaux des Îles Féroé en 2001.

9. Annonce du prix du programme d'encouragement au retour des marques

9.1 Le Président a annoncé que le gagnant du prix de 1 500 dollars de la Commission était M. M. D. Kay, de Warrington, en Angleterre. La Commission a offert ses félicitations au gagnant.

10. Recommandations au Conseil s'inscrivant dans le cadre de la demande au CIEM de recommandations scientifiques

10.1 Le Secrétaire de l'OCSAN a présenté le document SSC(00)3 qui contenait les recommandations au Conseil s'inscrivant dans le cadre de la demande au CIEM de recommandations scientifiques. Le document a été adopté sans modification. La demande de recommandations scientifiques adressée au CIEM et approuvée par le Conseil, CNL(00)60, figure à l'annexe 6.

11. Divers

11.1 Aucune autre question n'a été traitée.

12. Date et lieu de la prochaine réunion

12.1 La Commission a convenu de tenir sa prochaine réunion au cours de la Dix-huitième réunion annuelle du Conseil, qui se tiendra du 4 au 8 juin 2001.

13. Examen du compte rendu préliminaire de la réunion

13.1 La Commission a approuvé le compte rendu préliminaire de la réunion, NEA(00)5.

NEA(00)9

**Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the
North-East Atlantic Commission
Rodd Miramichi River Signature Hotel, Miramichi, Canada
5-9 June 2000**

Agenda

1. Opening of the Meeting
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Nomination of a Rapporteur
4. Election of Officers
5. Review of the 1999 Fishery and ACFM Report from ICES on Salmon Stocks in the Commission Area
6. Salmonid Introductions and Transfers
7. Application of the Precautionary Approach to the Work of the Commission
8. Regulatory Measures
9. Announcement of the Tag Return Incentive Scheme Prize
10. Recommendations to the Council on the Request to ICES for Scientific Advice
11. Other Business
12. Date and Place of the Next Meeting
13. Consideration of the Draft Report of the Meeting

North-East Atlantic Commission

NEA(00)4

*Returns under the North-East Atlantic Commission Resolution to Protect
Wild Salmon Stocks from Introductions and Transfers*

NEA(00)4

Returns under the North-East Atlantic Commission Resolution to Protect Wild Salmon Stocks from Introductions and Transfers

1. In 1997, the Commission unanimously adopted a Resolution to Protect Wild Salmon Stocks from Introductions and Transfers, NEA(97)12. The Commission agreed that, in the interests of transparency, it would be desirable to introduce a regular reporting system for measures taken in accordance with the Resolution, and in 1999 a format for reporting actions was adopted. This request for the return of information was circulated to members of the North-East Atlantic Commission on 13 January 2000. The returns are attached. At the time of preparation of this paper, information has not been received from some EU Member States which have salmon interests. No information is available for Denmark, France, Portugal or Spain.
2. The main areas of note are as follows:
 - (a) During 1999 1 million ova were imported to Galway, Ireland from Tasmania for aquaculture development. There were no other movements into the Commission area of live Atlantic salmon or their eggs which originated from outside the Commission area. Eggs were imported to Scotland from Tasmania in 1998.
 - (b) There were no proposals to release transgenic salmonids to the environment or use them in aquaculture during 1999.
 - (c) Most Parties have established epidemiological zones with monitoring to confirm the disease status of the zones. The only reported movements of live salmonids and their eggs from a zone where a specified disease was present to a zone free of the disease occurred in Norway. In this case two transfers of live salmonids were made from an ISA zone into an ISA-free zone but ISA had not been recorded in the county where the transfers originated since 1991.
 - (d) New fish health legislation is being prepared in Faroe Islands and new fish health regulations were introduced in Norway. A wild fish monitoring programme aimed primarily at detection of ISA and *Gyrodactylus* will be introduced in Ireland during 2000. In Norway, the programme for control of *G. salaris* has been revised and revised regulations on sea lice control will enter into force in 2000.
 - (e) There were no known movements from hatcheries to areas with salmon, or facilities where there is a risk of transmission of infection to such areas, without prior health inspections, except in Ireland where some movements of unfed fry resulting from stripping of wild adults occurred from small hatcheries. Examination before stocking only occurs in the event of a problem.

- (f) The only reported introduction of non-indigenous anadromous salmonids into the Commission area was the release of 164,000 pink salmon in the river Uмба, Russia.
- (g) There has been limited progress in introducing the system of classifying rivers for the purpose of developing management measures concerning introductions and transfers.
- (h) With regard to unintentional introductions, the use of live bait is prohibited in a number of countries. There is concern that the gudgeon, thought to have been introduced to the river Numedalslågen, Norway, with live bait in 1991, could become a serious competitor of Atlantic salmon. Regulations concerning ships' ballast water are being introduced through national and international initiatives.

Secretary
Edinburgh
30 May, 2000

Article 1: Movements originating from outside the North-East Atlantic Commission Area

1.1 Details of known movements into the Commission area of live Atlantic salmon and their eggs which have originated from outside the Commission area

Denmark (Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

No movement of live Atlantic salmon and their eggs has taken place into the Faroese area. According to Act no. 26 of 3 April 1987 of the Faroese Parliament, it is prohibited to import live fish, shellfish, crab, fry and spawn from these.

European Union

Finland

There are no movements into the rivers Teno and Näätamo.

Ireland

500,000 ova from Purves Fisheries, Tasmania, Australia were imported to Galway Aquatic Enterprises Ltd, Corrandulla, Co. Galway, during the period 6 July 1999 - 31 July 1999.

500,000 ova from Springfield Hatchery, Tasmania, Australia were imported to Galway Aquatic Enterprises Ltd. during the period 9 July 1999 - 12 July 1999.

Please note the above information relates to aquaculture development.

Sweden

No action.

United Kingdom

None in 1999. Eggs imported into Scotland from Tasmania in 1998.

Iceland

No movement.

Norway

There have been no movements into Norway of live Atlantic salmon and their eggs, which have originated from outside the Commission area, in 1999.

Russia

No action.

Article 2: Transgenic Atlantic Salmon

2.1 Details of any proposals to release transgenic salmonids to the environment (including their use in aquaculture) and details of any risk assessment undertaken

Note: Under Article 2 of the Resolution, when conducting any risk assessment, the threats to the wild stocks should be recognised and there should be a strong presumption against any activity which would risk the introduction of transgenic salmonids to the wild.

Denmark (Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

No proposals to release transgenic salmonids into the Faroese area have been put forward.

European Union

Finland

Ireland

No proposals.

Sweden

No action.

United Kingdom

None.

Iceland

No transgenic salmon in use, even experimentally.

Norway

There has been no application for release of transgenic salmonids, and at the moment there is no research on-going with the aim of using transgenic salmonids in aquaculture in Norway.

The Norwegian Gene Technology Act regulates this field and anyone who wishes to release transgenic salmonids needs approval from the competent authorities. With the knowledge we have today of possible environmental effects of such a release there would be a small chance of gaining approval, even with a thorough risk assessment.

Russia

No proposals reported.

Article 3: Movements within the North-East Atlantic Commission Area

3.1 Specified diseases and parasites

3.1.1 Details of any epidemiological zones, i.e. zones free of specific pathogens, which have been established

Note: Under Article 3 of the Resolution zones should be established for at least the following diseases: Viral Haemorrhagic Septicaemia (VHS), Infectious Haematopoietic Necrosis (IHN), Infectious Salmon Anaemia (ISA) and the parasite Gyrodactylus salaris.

Denmark (Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

The Faroe Islands are free of infections caused by VHS virus, IHN virus and *Gyrodactylus salaris* in farmed salmonids. An outbreak of ISA has been recorded in a salmon farm located in Fuglafjørður in March 2000. All infected fishes have been killed and destroyed and non-ISA-infected fishes in the sea farm will be slaughtered before new smolt are introduced into the sea farm.

European Union

Finland

In the rivers Teno and Näätamo VHS, IHN, ISA and *G. salaris* have not been found.

Ireland

Ireland is free from the diseases IHN and ISA. Ireland, with the exception of Cape Clear Island (off the South-West of the country), is free from VHS. Ireland is also free from *G. salaris*.

Sweden

No action.

United Kingdom

Great Britain (except for the island of Gigha) and Northern Ireland are approved zones for VHS and for IHN. They are considered to be free of *G. salaris*, and have additional guarantees under the EU Fish Health Regime to prevent its introduction from infected areas or those of unknown status.

Iceland

Iceland is basically one zone but stringent measures apply regarding movement of wild salmonids.

Norway

For 1999, there are the following freezones in force:

Infectious Haematopoietic Necrosis (IHN): Buffer zone along the border with Russia. Freezone in the rest of the country.

Viral Haemorrhagic Septicaemia (VHS): Buffer zone along the border with Russia. Freezone in the rest of the country, except for a small area in Sogn og Fjordane county, around Rødegeevannet.

Infectious Salmon Anaemia (ISA): Freezone in a region in the south-eastern part of Norway, from the border between the municipalities of Hå and Eigersund in Rogaland county, to the border with Sweden.

Russia

No measures reported.

3.1.2 If epidemiological zones have been established:

- (a) *Details of any new management measures (including monitoring to confirm the disease status of the zone and eradication) which have been undertaken*

Denmark (Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

Fuglafjørður is established as ISA-infected zone and there is a ban against moving aquaculture animals (salmonids) in and out of the zone. Samples of all groups of fishes in the sea farm have been tested for the ISA virus with negative results.

European Union

Finland

Yearly sampling of juvenile salmon to control *G. salaris* in the Rivers Teno and Näätaamo.

Ireland

All freshwater and marine aquaculture sites in the country are monitored as outlined in Directive 91/67/EC and Decision 93/53/EC. Immediately VHS was diagnosed on Cape Clear in 1997, all stock was cleared from the site as demanded by the legislation mentioned above. This site has been followed since 1997.

Sweden

No action.

United Kingdom

No new measures. All farms are screened for VHS, IHN and *G. salaris* under the EU regime.

Iceland

Not applicable.

Norway

For IHN and VHS: Live fish, gametes, eggs and ungutted dead fish of susceptible species that are reared or caught outside the freezone, are not permitted to enter the freezone. A surveillance program, including yearly inspection of every fish farm, and sampling and virological testing of 30 fish from every fish farm every second year, has been operating since 1994. The sampling is conducted on a rotation basis so that 50 % of the farms are tested each year.

For ISA: Live fish, gametes undisinfected eggs and ungutted salmon that are reared or caught outside the freezone, are not permitted to enter the freezone, or to be exported to other parts of the European Economic Area (EEA). No particular monitoring has been introduced.

Russia

No measures reported.

- (b) ***Details of any known movements of live salmonids and their eggs from a zone where any of the specified diseases is present to a zone free of these diseases***

Note: Under Article 3 of the Resolution movements of salmonid eggs are permitted where there is no risk of transmission of the specified disease or parasite.

Denmark (Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

No movement of live Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) and their eggs has taken place from the ISA-infected zone (Fuglafjörður) to other zones after the outbreak of ISA had taken place.

European Union

Finland

All salmon releases are prohibited in the Rivers Teno and Näätamo.

Ireland

No such movements are permitted into Ireland.

Sweden

No action.

United Kingdom

None.

Iceland

Not applicable.

Norway

In 1999, two transfers of live salmonids from the ISA zone into ISA freezone were accepted. The salmonids came from an area close to the ISA freezone, and ISA has not been recorded in that county since 1991. Additionally, it was a requirement of the transfer that the fish had not been fed moist feed, that they had not been supplied with seawater, that they had been kept under shelter, and that they were protected from potentially infectious seawater during transport.

Russia

No measures reported.

3.2 Unknown diseases and parasites

3.2.1 Details of new procedures and changes to existing procedures for the early identification and detection of, and rapid response to, an outbreak of any new disease or parasitic infection likely to affect Atlantic salmon

Note: Under Article 3 of the Resolution it is stated that these procedures should include the establishment of official surveillance services responsible for the monitoring of the health of both wild and farmed fish. The procedures should also demand the rapid introduction of restrictions on the movement of salmonids in the case of an outbreak of a disease or parasitic infection until its status is known.

Denmark (Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

New legislation concerning diseases of aquaculture animals according to EU rules is in preparation.

European Union

Finland

Ireland

A national surveillance programme for farmed fish is already in place as described above. A monitoring programme for wild fish is to be put in place within the next few weeks. Although this programme is directed primarily towards the detection of ISA and *G. salaris*, other disease agents would be picked up if present, and appropriate restriction measures would be imposed.

Sweden

No action.

United Kingdom

No new measures.

Iceland

Not applicable.

Norway

According to the Fish Diseases Act the public authorities shall be notified immediately when there is reason to believe that aquatic animals have been or are in danger of being attacked by an infectious disease. The obligation to provide notification rests with everyone who is responsible for aquatic animals.

A regulation in pursuance of the Fish Diseases Act, with a list of notifiable diseases of aquatic organisms, is in force. Usually only diseases listed as Group A or Group B diseases are subject to official measures. However, the Regional Veterinary Officer may also make diseases listed as Group C subject to official measures. The Ministry of Agriculture may decide, without further notice, that new disease conditions of presumed infectious nature shall be subjected to official measures as for Group A and B diseases. If official countermeasures are introduced to combat new disease conditions, the condition shall be described, and a proposal to include the disease on the list of notifiable diseases shall be presented for comment to interested parties within one year. If this is not done, the official measures shall be withdrawn.

New regulations in pursuance of the Fish Diseases Act and the Aquaculture Act came into force on the 1st January 1999. Regular health control is now mandatory for all aquaculture units in Norway.

A national program for control of sea lice was established in 1997, and is revised every year. As a part of the program, the first regulations in order to control sea-lice infestations came into force in 1998. After revision new regulations came into force in February 2000.

The national program for control of *Gyrodactylus salaris* has been revised.

The official surveillance program for *Gyrodactylus salaris* is under revision.

Russia

No measures reported.

3.2.2 Details of any additional protective measures which have been introduced

Note: Under Article 3 of the Resolution it is stated that when establishing or reviewing rules on transfers of fish, the Parties should consider additional protective measures such as the establishment of zones to limit the spread of parasites and diseases to wild stocks; restrictions on the movement of salmonids to trade in eggs; strengthening and amendment of disease controls to take full account of the special situation of wild fish.

Denmark (Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

See 3.2.1.

European Union

Finland

Ireland

All movements of salmonids in Ireland are authorised by the Department of the Marine and Natural Resources. All such movements are vetted from a fish health perspective. In this way, potential disease risks may be controlled at source.

Sweden

No action.

United Kingdom

None.

Iceland

Not applicable.

Norway

The Fish Diseases Act, Section 9, provides for the establishment of regions and inter-regional measures on a general basis, without reference to status of specific diseases:

“§ 9. *Establishment of regions, inter-regional measures, etc.*

In order to prevent infectious disease, the King may establish epidemiologically separate regions, for which regulations are issued regulating and prohibiting:

- a) the transport of live or dead aquatic animals, animal waste, by-products and objects which can transmit infection, into or out of the regions
- b) use of means of transport between the regions.”

Russia

No measures reported.

3.3 Health inspection of donor facilities

3.3.1 Details of any known movements of live salmonids and their eggs from hatcheries to areas containing Atlantic salmon stocks, or to facilities where there is a risk of transmission of infection to such areas, other than those from facilities where regular inspections have not detected significant diseases and parasites

Denmark (Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

All freshwater salmon farms are participating in a surveillance program which includes regular visits by a veterinarian. Movements of salmonids and their eggs are only allowed with the permission of the Chief Veterinary Officer when the risk of spreading diseases is considered to be minimal.

European Union

Finland

Ireland

The fish from all ranching programmes are screened prior to smolt release. Similarly, the broodstock from which the ova are stripped for this purpose are also health-screened. The Fishery Boards operate certain small hatcheries where broodstock are removed and stripped in November and December. The offspring are then returned to the relevant river systems as unfed fry. These fish are examined only if a problem arises and is reported to the Fish Health Unit by the Fishery Board.

Sweden

No movements have been reported.

United Kingdom

None. Introductions are only from sites subject to inspection programmes, and not subject to controls for notifiable diseases.

Iceland

Regulatory measure regarding transport of salmonids (number 401/1988) has just been revised. Will be reported with 2000 returns.

Norway

There are no known such movements. All movements of salmonids from hatcheries require a health certificate confirming that at least 2 health inspections have been carried out during the year, in the case of fry, and at least 4 inspections in the case of older salmonids. (In commercial fish farms, the requirement is at least 12 health inspections during the year). The health certificate also requires post-mortem autopsy of at least 50 fish, during the last month (in commercial fish farms at least 300 fish during the last 3 months).

Russia

No measures reported.

Article 4: Movements of Non-Indigenous Fish

4.1 Details of any known introductions of non-indigenous fish species into a river containing Atlantic salmon

Note: Under Article 4 of the Resolution, a thorough evaluation of the potential adverse impacts on the Atlantic salmon population(s) which indicates that there are no risks of adverse ecological interactions is required before non-indigenous fish species are introduced into rivers containing Atlantic salmon. Where a decision is taken to proceed with the introduction of a non-indigenous species it should be carried out in accordance with the Codes of Practice developed by ICES and EIFAC.

Denmark (Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

No introduction of non-indigenous fish into Faroese rivers has been reported.

European Union

Finland

All fish releases outside the Rivers Teno and Näätamo are prohibited.

Ireland

No such transfers reported.

Sweden

No action.

United Kingdom

None.

Iceland

Not applicable for Iceland.

Norway

Escaped farmed salmon are found in almost all Atlantic salmon rivers in Norway.

Escaped farmed rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) are found in several river-systems on the western coast of Norway, especially in Hordaland county.

The European minnow (*Phoxinus phoxinus*) has been spread to several watercourses with anadromous salmonids. However, this introduced species is not considered to be a serious competitor to Atlantic salmon.

In the Pasvik river system vendace (*Coregonus albula*) was detected in 1989. Vendace fry escaped as a result of an accident at a hatchery located by Lake Enaresjøen in Finland, and had spread downstream to the river outlet in Norway. 15 fish species have been recorded in the Pasvik river system including salmon (*Salmo salar*) and the introduced vendace.

Gudgeon (*Gobio gobio*) was recorded for the first time in the river Numedalslågen in 1991. Gudgeon is a non-indigenous species in Norway, and occur only in this river. Tourists fishing for salmon have probably introduced the gudgeon to the river as live bait. The gudgeon exploit the same habitat as the salmon (*Salmo salar*) and sea trout (*Salmo trutta*), and may, therefore, become a serious competitor to the salmon.

Russia

No measures reported.

4.2 Provide details of any known introductions of non-indigenous anadromous salmonids into the Commission area

Denmark (Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

No introduction of non-indigenous fish into the Commission area has been reported to the Faroese authorities the past many years, but in 1966-67 we imported some rainbow trout from Denmark.

European Union

Finland

Ireland

No such introductions reported.

Sweden

No introduction has been reported.

United Kingdom

None.

Iceland

Not applicable.

Norway

Russia

In the river Umba 164,000 larvae of pink salmon were released.

Article 5: Classification of Rivers

5.1 Has the NEAC system of classifying rivers been introduced for the purpose of developing management measures concerning introductions and transfers?

Note: Under Article 5 of the Resolution, rivers in the North-East Atlantic Commission Area should be classified using the NASCO Salmon Rivers Database but with groupings of certain categories as follows:

Group 1 rivers: Rivers with no self-sustaining salmon stocks.

Group 2 rivers: Rivers in which there is a self-sustaining salmon stock.

Group 3 rivers: Rivers in which there is a self-sustaining salmon stock which is considered to be in a pristine condition or which is considered to be of particular value.

Denmark (Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

In the Faroe Islands we only have a very small number of small rivers with salmon and therefore there has been no classification of the rivers.

European Union

Finland

The Rivers Teno and Näätamo are in Group 3. Salmon stocks will be developed by management regulations.

Ireland

No.

Sweden

A preliminary classification has been worked out in a proposal for a long-term national action program including 23 rivers but the proposal has still not been considered by the relevant authorities.

United Kingdom

No.

Iceland

Most Icelandic rivers fall into groups 2-3 depending on the definition of the term “pristine”.

Norway

No.

Russia

No measures reported.

Article 6: Management Measures

6.1 Details of any new management measures developed for each class of river detailed in the Resolution

Denmark (Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

See 5.1.

European Union

Finland

Ireland

Sweden

No action.

United Kingdom

Not applicable.

Iceland

Not applicable.

Norway

Russia

No measures reported.

Article 7: Unintentional Introductions and Releases

7.1 Details of any steps which been taken to limit the risks from unintentional introductions (e.g. in ships' ballast water, through release of live bait, etc.)

Denmark (Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

Regulations concerning ships' ballast water will be included in the new legislation on diseases of aquaculture animals (see 3.2.1).

European Union

Finland

In the River Teno the use of live bait is prohibited.

Ireland

The use of live bait is banned.

Sweden

No action.

United Kingdom

No new measures.

Iceland

Not applicable.

Norway

Norway is handling the question about ships' ballast water together with other nations in IMO (International Maritime Organisation), where international regulations are under consideration.

Russia

No measures reported.

Other Information

Details of other relevant information in relation to the implementation of the Resolution

European Union

Finland

Ireland

Sweden

A proposal for a national policy for introductions and releases of fish has been worked out by the National Board of Fisheries.

United Kingdom

Iceland

None.

Norway

According to the Animal Welfare Act, (Act No. 73 of December 1974) Section 8, it is forbidden to use live animals in order to catch other animals, i.e. use of live baits is not allowed in Norway.

Act No. 47 of May 1992 Relating to Salmonids and Fresh-Water Fish etc. says in section 8: “It is prohibited to import live anadromous salmonids, freshwater fish, eggs or fry of such fish, or animal species eaten by such fish without permission from the Ministry.”

Russia

No measures reported.

North-East Atlantic Commission

NEA(00)6

*Exploitation of salmon in the United Kingdom and Ireland
(Tabled by the European Union)*

NEA(00)6

Exploitation of salmon in the United Kingdom and Ireland

(Tabled by the European Union)

Introduction

1. Levels of exploitation in salmon fisheries can be controlled either by limiting catches directly through quotas or by restricting fishing effort. In the UK and Ireland the second of these options has traditionally been used. This is principally because of the large number of salmon fisheries - there are over six hundred significant salmon rivers in the UK and Ireland, some with several distinct stocks - and the lack of the data needed to set quotas for individual river fisheries. Quotas may also be more difficult to enforce than effort controls in a large number of widely distributed fisheries.
2. Given the difficulty of setting quotas for so many fisheries, effort controls are likely to remain the principal means of controlling exploitation of salmon for the foreseeable future in both the UK and in Ireland, although Ireland is introducing global quotas for rod and net fisheries as a supplementary measure.
3. Effort controls work by limiting the time that fishermen can operate and the efficiency of their gear. They can take a number of forms: close seasons, close times and closed areas are used in both rod and net fisheries; in net fisheries there are limits on numbers of nets; there are also restrictions on the design and use of nets and on method and lures used by anglers. In addition, catch and release is an increasingly common practice among anglers and in England and Wales it is compulsory to release all salmon caught before 15 June.
4. There is no doubt that effort controls can be an effective way of controlling exploitation. Unlike quotas, they tend to operate on the level of exploitation, not on the level of the catch. As a result, catches tend to vary in line with stock abundance. This is an advantage where fisheries are largely exploiting individual or local stocks, because salmon abundance in different rivers may vary independently from year to year. With fixed quota systems, levels of exploitation tend to rise when stocks are low and fall when they are high; there is therefore a need to adjust quotas annually and this is impractical for over 600 stocks. Effort controls avoid these problems; although they still tend to result in increased exploitation when stocks are low, the effect is not as great as with quotas.
5. Because with effort controls catches tend to fluctuate in line with stock abundance, additional restrictions on effort do not have an entirely predictable effect on catches, although they will, all things being equal, reduce levels of exploitation. In this they differ from quotas, since a reduction in a quota should mean a commensurate reduction in the catch. Over time, however, extra restrictions on effort are likely to reduce average catch levels, assuming that average stock abundance remains unchanged.
6. Reductions in effort, of course, are not always the result of increased legal restrictions. Economic factors, such as declining profitability in net fisheries, are a

major factor. In Scotland, for example, economic and social factors have reduced netting effort by over 80% between 1975 and 1999, a reduction encouraged by the fact that under Scottish law net fisheries are privately owned and can be bought out by angling interests. Effort reductions on this scale may well make extra legal restrictions on effort in net fisheries unnecessary.

7. The combined effect of effort controls and voluntary restrictions on effort have led to very substantial reductions in the fishing effort in the UK and Ireland over the past 30 years. Table 1 and Figure 1 show the fall in number of legal instruments in these countries over this period, and Table 2 and Figure 2 show the changes in catch levels. These data are discussed below in relation to the management of salmon in the different parts of the UK and Ireland.

England and Wales

8. There is a public right to net or trap salmon in coastal waters and estuaries in England and Wales, but all salmon fishermen are required to hold licences and the number of licences in each net fishery is limited by law. There are currently some sixty separate salmon and sea trout net and trap fisheries, employing a wide range of methods, from coastal drift nets to hand held haaf nets. In all fisheries there are rules regulating the design and use of the gear. Average catches per licence in individual net fisheries vary from less than 5 fish a year to over 150.
9. In the past 25 years the total number of licences issued for salmon netting has been reduced from 923 to 437, a 53% decrease (Table 1 and Figure 1). Most fisheries exploit salmon from a single river or a small number of rivers flowing into a common estuary, and reductions in the number of licences have mainly been targeted at those where there has been a need to protect individual river stocks. A small number of fisheries, including the major North East coast salmon drift net fishery, operate in coastal waters and exploit stocks from more than one river; it is Government policy to phase these fisheries out. In the North East coast fishery, the number of net licences has fallen from 142 in 1992 to 72 in 1999, a reduction of 49%.
10. All net and trap fisheries are subject to an annual close season, and most have a minimum weekly close time of at least 42 hours (a few licensed trap fisheries are subject to close seasons but no close times). Increases in both annual and weekly closure periods have been used in many fisheries to reduce the level of exploitation on particular stock components. In 1999, for example, the close season for all salmon net fisheries was extended until 1 June; for the great majority of fisheries it starts on 1 September. This has further reduced the potential fishing effort; thus, for example, although the number of licensed nets has declined by 38% since 1991, additional measures to limit the length of the season in different fisheries have reduced the number of net days available for fishing by 48%.
11. The right to fish for salmon in freshwater in England and Wales is a private one, and the great majority of salmon rod fisheries are privately owned. All salmon anglers must hold a salmon rod licence, but these are issued on demand. Salmon exploitation by anglers is limited by close seasons and by restrictions on methods and gear. The opening and closing dates of the close season vary widely between rivers. The close season must by law be at least 92 days. Restrictions on methods and gear can take

various forms: on some rivers only fly fishing is permitted during certain parts of the season and on others the use of baits is banned for all or part of the season. Since 1999 anglers in England and Wales have been required to release unharmed all salmon caught before 16 June. Many angling clubs have also introduced their own measures to reduce the numbers of salmon that are killed, including voluntary catch and release. In 1999, 44% of all rod caught fish were released.

12. Catches of salmon in England and Wales have shown a similar pattern of decline to the fishing effort (Table 2 and Figure 2). Overall the declared catch has fallen by 45% between the late 1970s (1975-79) and the late 1990s (1995-99). It is believed that the actual decline in catches has been even greater than this because catch reporting has improved considerably in this period.

Scotland

13. Salmon fishery management in Scotland has been devolved to District Salmon Fishery Boards which operate within a legislative framework set up by Parliament. There are 83 salmon fishery districts, of which 51, including all the major rivers, have Boards in place; in the remainder management is undertaken by owners. This management structure therefore operates on a river-by-river basis, and is funded by the owners of the salmon fishing rights. These rights, whether for fishing in fresh water or in the sea, are private, heritable titles, which may be held separate from any land. No fishing licences are required in Scotland, but it is an offence to fish for salmon without the legal right or without written permission from a person having such a right. The methods that may be used are also defined by law, and the main methods employed in different areas are: rod and line in freshwater, in estuaries and on the coast; net and coble (seine nets) in freshwater, in estuaries and on the coast, and fixed engines (various types of trap nets) on the coast outside estuary limits. Drift netting was banned in 1962.
14. There have been progressive moves to reduce the exploitation of salmon by nets in Scotland over the past 50 years. This has been achieved, in part, by buying-out private netting rights, and many fisheries have been completely closed. This has contributed to the 83% reduction in the netting effort (expressed as the number of crew (net and coble) or trap (fixed engine) months fished) between 1975 and 1999 (Table 1 and Figure 1). These figures give a more complete picture of the reduction in netting effort over this period than the number of nets used because they take account of changes in the fishing pressure at different times of year, in particular the marked reduction in fishing effort on spring-running multi-sea-winter salmon.
15. The method of operation and the construction of nets and traps are also prescribed by law. No net or part of a net may be designed or constructed for the purpose of catching fish by enmeshing them, and the use of monofilament netting for salmon fishing is prohibited. In addition no part of any trap net, except mooring ropes and anchors, may extend more than 1300 metres from the shore.
16. Net fisheries are further regulated by weekly and annual close times. The weekly close time was increased by 43% in 1988 and now extends for a continuous period of 60 hours over the week-end. The annual close time varies between salmon fishery districts but must be a continuous period of not less than 168 days (153 days on the

River Tweed). Angling is also controlled by close periods; the weekly close time for angling is Sunday, and the annual close season varies between salmon fishery districts, ranging from 60 to more than 130 days, with most districts having close times between 100 and 110 days. Angling is further restricted in 18 salmon fishery districts by regulations which ban variously the use of natural baits and lures with more than one set of hooks.

17. The management structure for salmon fisheries in Scotland also favours the widespread use of non-statutory rules to restrict fishing activities. Thus, for example, the owners of fisheries may restrict fishing to fly only for all or part of the season, a number have chosen not to start fishing until a month or more after the official starting date of the season and catch and release is being practised very widely. On the River Dee, for example, in recent years, most proprietors have volunteered to delay the start of their fishing seasons until the beginning of March, instead of 1 February, and rod fishermen released almost all spring fish in 1999 and an estimated 75% of fish over the season. Many other Boards are putting in place tough spring salmon conservation policies for the 2000 season. These measures even extend to net fisheries; for example, the River Tweed nets will not be operated in the spring until 2003. Members of the Salmon Net Fishing Association of Scotland deferred voluntarily the start of their fishing operations by six weeks at the start of the 2000 fishing season.
18. The widespread reductions in fishing effort have been matched by a 70% decrease in the total catch (including rod fisheries) between 1975-9 and 1995-9. Data for the River North Esk for the latter part of this period show that the exploitation of 1SW salmon has been reduced from 30% in the late 1980s to 17% in last five years; the exploitation rate of 2SW salmon from this river have declined from 33% to 13% in the same periods.

Northern Ireland

19. In Northern Ireland the exploitation of salmon fisheries is strictly controlled through regulations made under the provisions of the Fisheries Act (NI) 1966 and the Foyle Fisheries Act 1952. The main exploitation occurs in the Foyle estuary and seaward and the regulations applying in the Foyle area are arguably the most restrictive in the EU.
20. The two main commercial methods of salmon exploitation in Northern Ireland are drift net fishing and fixed bag and draft net fishing. All commercial salmon netmen are required to hold licences. The number of gear units licensed in Northern Ireland has fallen by over 50% since 1975 (table 1 and figure 1). This reduction reflects a policy of not increasing the number of licences issued in any year above the previous year's level combined with natural wastage, ie lapsed licences not being reapplied for. Commencing in 2001 the number of drift net licences available for issue in the Foyle area will be capped at 55. Furthermore it is clear that a considerable number of licensees, perhaps 50%, are not actively fishing. Overall the nominal catch in Northern Ireland Irish net fisheries has declined by 35% since 1975.
21. The commercial season in the Foyle and Carlingford areas is restricted to 6 weeks (15 June to 31 July). Fishing is restricted to 4 days per week and additionally drift net

fishermen are only permitted to fish 12 hours per day. There are also restrictions on the length and depth of nets, on boat size and the use of monofilament net is prohibited. The commercial season in the rest of Northern Ireland, which is regulated by the Fisheries Conservancy Board (FCB), is from 18 March to 15 September although the timing of the main salmon runs effectively curtails the season to around late May to the end of August. Restrictions also apply to the length of the fishing week, and to the length and depth of nets and boat lengths. The use of monofilament nets is also prohibited.

22. Salmon fishing rights in freshwater are mainly in private ownership or leased by angling clubs. All salmon anglers must hold a game rod licence and these are issued on demand. Salmon angling exploitation is regulated through close seasons, restrictions on the type of fishing methods and in some areas bag limits are imposed.
23. A management system based on estimated spawning requirements has been operating in the River Foyle fishery area for many years. Stock reference levels have been set based on a scientific study of stock/recruitment relationships for the system. If, at certain dates during the season, target numbers of fish have not been counted upstream at three sites in the system, then specified closures of the angling and/or net fisheries take place. New regulations, The Foyle Area (Control of Fishing) Regulations 1999, introduced in 1999 have refined and formalized this mechanism.
24. A Salmon Management Plan is also being drawn up for the FCB area. The objective of the plan is to establish salmon conservation limits at a river, regional and national level. The central aim of management will be to ensure that, in most rivers in most years, sufficient adult salmon are spawning to ensure compliance with conservation limits. A Salmon Carcase Tagging Scheme is currently under consideration and should be in operation through the island of Ireland by 2001.

Ireland

25. There are seven designated salmon fishing regions in the Republic of Ireland. Statistics are collected by staff of the Regional Fisheries Boards and collated into a national data set by the Marine Institute. The Foyle Fisheries Area which is managed by a Commission representing both the Department of the Marine and Natural Resources in the south of Ireland and the Department of Agriculture for Northern Ireland.
25. The principal commercial salmon fisheries in the Republic of Ireland are: surface gill nets fished at sea; draft nets and traps operated in estuaries; and a range of local traditional methods (snap, loop bag and pole nets) operated mainly in inshore areas. Effort in these fisheries is controlled by a combination of restrictions on the gear and where and how it may be used, plus closed periods and closed times.
26. Major changes to the management of these fisheries were introduced in response to the 1996 report of the Salmon Management Task Force. The main recommendations of the Task Force are summarised at **Appendix 1**. The principal conservation measures it recommended were implemented in 1997. These involved a cap on the number of commercial licences, deferring the start of the draft net season till mid-May and of the drift net season to 1 June, reducing the fishing week from 5 days to 4,

restrictions on night-time fishing and limiting fishing at sea to within 6 (rather than 12) nautical miles of the coast. These measures have reduced effort in commercial fisheries by at least 20%. As a result of the later opening of the season, fishing effort on spring salmon stocks (mainly due to the inshore draft and snap nets) has also been reduced in recent years.

27. The maximum number of public drift net and draft net licences allowed under the Control of Fishing for Salmon Orders (1980 and 1982) was 847 and 604 respectively. Following the Task Force recommendations, a 'cap' was placed on the number of commercial fishing licences to be issued at the 1995 level of 775 drift nets and 464 draft nets, a 15% overall reduction on the early 1980s. Half this reduction (7%) had been achieved by 1999. Restrictions have also been placed on the other commercial fishing methods - excluding private or special local area licences.
28. Rod fisheries in Ireland may be privately owned, state owned or public, but all anglers require a rod licence, which are issued on demand. Catch and release is encouraged nationally and is compulsory, for wild salmon, on the Burrishoole and Delphi systems. The release of coloured, fly-caught, salmon in the autumn is fast becoming standard practice in Ireland. Angling effort is limited by close seasons and by restrictions on methods and gear. A total of 30,954 rod licences were issued to anglers in 1999. Although the number of licences increased after 1992, this was due to the introduction of special *one day* and *21 day* licences.
29. Considerable efforts have been made to increase marine surveillance by the Navy and Regional Fisheries Boards in recent years, and this has contributed to a marked reduction in the use of illegal gear, illegal fishing and under-reporting of catches. Low prices of wild salmon, coupled with fewer people entering the fishery, have also contributed to the reduction in fishing effort in the past three seasons.
30. The mean catches in the period following the introduction of new regulatory measures (i.e. 1997 to 1999) have been significantly lower than the preceding seven years in all areas except the Western Region, where catches may have included significant numbers of hatchery reared fish. Similarly, the national draft net catch (excluding the North Western Region where the Moy River draft net was suspended in 1994) has also been significantly lower in the most recent three years.

Appendix 1: *Principal Recommendations of Irish Salmon Management Task Force (1996)*

The Salmon Management Task Force (1996) was commissioned at a time when statistics for the North Atlantic as a whole were showing an absolute decline in catch for all methods of capture. The report of the Task Force recommended a radical approach to the management of Irish salmon stocks which includes a shorter season, a shorter fishing week, the introduction of carcass tagging and the imposition of quotas on the commercial salmon catch. Implicit in the report's findings is an assumption that there is a future for the tradition of salmon drift netting, provided that the number of licences is controlled and stocks are enhanced through strict conservation measures. The report also accepts that inevitably:

“the balance of advantage on conservation, environmental and economic grounds should lie increasingly with redirecting salmon stocks from interceptory commercial exploitation towards recreational fishing”.

The Task Force recognised that additional technical research was required to underpin their detailed proposals, particularly in relation to the targeting of the recreational salmon fishery as a principal source of future game angling revenue. They identified the following areas:

- Stock recruitment relationships, in particular quantifying the effect of additional escapement on smolt production and spawning stock levels
- The value of catch and release as a salmon conservation and management tool
- Relative effectiveness of angling under varying levels of total allowable catch
- Development of catchment management technology
- Selective enhancement of multi-sea-winter stocks

Following consideration of the Task Force report by the Minister for the Marine, the Department of the Marine and the Dáil Committee on Economic Strategy and Enterprise, it was decided to implement its principal conservation measures for the 1997 season.

The new management system envisages:

- setting *spawning escapement targets* for rivers, which can be achieved in the short term;
- determining *optimum spawning escapement targets* which could be achieved, if all factors limiting production were removed;
- determining compliance with such *spawning escapement targets* by providing spawning estimates (*population estimates of the number of spawning salmon*);
- setting *quotas* to ensure compliance;
- providing a legislative and scientific framework to allow the management system to operate (*carcass tags and logbooks*)
- using *fishery management plans* (catchment management plans) to move from spawning targets to optimum spawning numbers and to assist in the allocation of the resource by the beneficial users.

Progress towards these aims has been made with the recent establishment (March'00) of the National Salmon Commission. It is envisaged that the full implementation of the carcass tagging and logbook scheme will occur in 2001.

Figure 1

Table 1

Figure 2

Table 2

North-East Atlantic Commission

NEA(00)7

Trends in the Management of Salmon Fisheries in Norway

Trends in the Management of Salmon Fisheries in Norway

Since 1989 Norway has implemented a number of regulatory measures which have led to a restructuring of the salmon fisheries. The biggest changes have been brought about by the ban on driftnets and reduction in the number of bendnets and development of more diversified and locally adapted fishing regulations.

The objective is to develop a fishery that can be adapted to the condition of the stocks which it exploits. We found, like many others, that offshore fisheries are contrary to this objective, since they exploit a large number of stocks, and the effect on the individual stock is unpredictable. By restricting the commercial fishery to one type of shore-based fishing gear, the bag net, the bulk of the fishery has been shifted to the fjords where it exploits local stocks and can be locally regulated. The management authorities are following up by developing local regulations, which take into account the state of the local stocks. This process is still in progress and new regulatory means, like local quotas, are being discussed and will be tested.

Short Overview of Regulatory Measures and Reduction of Fishing Effort in Norwegian Salmon Fisheries

In Norway, all salmon anglers and net fishermen are required to purchase a state fishing licence. The number of licences issued has been almost halved, from 143,000 in 1989 to 90,000 in 1999, representing a substantial reduction in fishing effort during this period.

Marine Fisheries

The number of fixed gears has been reduced from 8,000 units in 1970 to 2,600 units in 1999 (a 68% reduction). In addition, Norway has removed all driftnets, which, at the peak of the driftnet fishery, totalled 30,000 units.

Since the driftnet fishery was banned in 1989, there have been further reductions in effort in the marine fisheries:

- From 1996 to 1999 the number of bagnets declined by 28%.
- From 1996 to 1999 the number of bendnets declined by 65.4%. This was due to the removal of all bendnets along the coast with the exceptions of the county of Finnmark and the Skagerrak coast. In total, the number of bendnets has been reduced from 4,100 units in 1989 to 989 units in 1999 (a 76% reduction). From the year 2002 the ban on bend nets will be extended to the entire coast with the exception of the Finnmark county.
- During the 1990s, prohibition zones were established in marine areas close to important salmon rivers.

- The length of the bagnet season has been reduced by about 30% with the exception of the county of Finnmark and the Skagerrak coast. In several fjords with threatened stocks the bagnet fishery has been greatly reduced or banned. Trolling with multi-hook lines and fishing with otter-boards has been totally banned in the same area.

River fisheries

Since 1989 there has been a substantial reduction in fishing effort in the rivers:

- During the 1990s, the opening of the fishing season in the rivers was gradually delayed, and in most rivers the season has been shortened by 2 – 4 weeks.
- There have been reductions in fishing effort as a result of restrictions on gear and limitations of catch.

North-East Atlantic Commission

NEA(00)12

Decision regarding the salmon fishery in Faroese waters 2001

The North East Atlantic Commission,

RECOGNIZING the right of the Faroe Islands to fish for salmon in their area of fisheries jurisdiction;

ACKNOWLEDGING the restraint demonstrated by the Faroe Islands by not utilizing their quotas for a number of years;

INTENDING to work expeditiously with ICES to improve the estimation of a combined conservation limit and thus enable catch advice for the Faroe Islands salmon fishery to be given on an effort or a quantitative basis;

FURTHER AGREEING to work together to establish an agreed mechanism, to allocate any exploitable surplus between the Faroe Islands and homewater fisheries on a fair and equitable basis;

MINDFUL OF the advice from ICES regarding the stocks contributing to the Faroese salmon fishery, and the ICES recommendation that the research fishery in the Faroese area be resumed, and noting the intention of the Faroe Islands to manage the salmon fishery in a precautionary manner with a view to sustainability, taking into account relevant factors, such as socio-economic needs and other fisheries on mixed stocks;

NOTING ALSO the intention of the Faroe Islands to make management decisions with due consideration to the advice of ICES concerning the biological status of the stocks contributing to the fishery, and that such fishing will be limited in scope, subject to close national surveillance and control, and will be organized in close cooperation between the fishermen and the authorities, taking due regard of the recommendation by ICES to provide further scientific knowledge of the salmon resource;

decides not to set a quota for the Faroe Islands fishery for 2001.

CNL(00)60

Request for Scientific Advice from ICES

1. With respect to Atlantic salmon in the North Atlantic area:
 - 1.1 provide an overview of salmon catches and landings, including unreported catches by country and catch and release, and worldwide production of farmed and ranched salmon in 2000;
 - 1.2 report on significant developments which might assist NASCO with the management of salmon stocks;
 - 1.3 use case studies to illustrate options for taking account of risk in the provision of catch advice and comment on the relative merits of each option;
 - 1.4 assess the possible reasons for the differences in occurrence of escaped farmed salmon in fisheries and stocks in different areas;
 - 1.5 advise on potential biases in the catch advice resulting from the inclusion of fish farm escapes in the assessment models;
 - 1.6 provide a compilation of tag releases by country in 2000.

2. With respect to Atlantic salmon in the North-East Atlantic Commission area:
 - 2.1 describe the events of the 2000 fisheries and the status of the stocks;
 - 2.2 update the evaluation of the effects on stocks and homewater fisheries of significant management measures introduced since 1991;
 - 2.3 further develop the age-specific stock conservation limits where possible based upon individual river stocks;
 - 2.4 provide catch options or alternative management advice with an assessment of risks relative to the objective of exceeding stock conservation limits;
 - 2.5 update information on by-catch of salmon post-smolts in pelagic fisheries;
 - 2.6 identify relevant data deficiencies, monitoring needs and research requirements.

3. With respect to Atlantic salmon in the North American Commission area:
 - 3.1 describe the events of the 2000 fisheries and the status of the stocks;
 - 3.2 update the evaluation of the effects on US and Canadian stocks and fisheries of management measures implemented after 1991 in the Canadian commercial salmon fisheries;
 - 3.3 update age-specific stock conservation limits based on new information as available;
 - 3.4 provide catch options or alternative management advice with an assessment of risks relative to the objective of exceeding stock conservation limits;
 - 3.5 identify relevant data deficiencies, monitoring needs and research requirements.

4. With respect to Atlantic salmon in the West Greenland Commission area:

- 4.1 describe the events of the 2000 fisheries and the status of the stocks;
- 4.2 update the evaluation of the effects on European and North American stocks of the Greenlandic quota management measures and compensation arrangements since 1993;
- 4.3 provide a detailed explanation and critical examination of any changes to the model used to provide catch advice and of the impacts of any changes to the model on the calculated quota;
- 4.4 provide catch options or alternative management advice with an assessment of risks relative to the objective of exceeding stock conservation limits;
- 4.5 evaluate potential causes for changes in the Continent of origin of salmon captured in the West Greenland fishery, including potential changes in marine migration patterns;
- 4.6 identify relevant data deficiencies, monitoring needs and research requirements.

Notes:

1. *With regard to question 1.3, ICES is requested to provide information that will assist with the implementation of and evaluation by NASCO and its Contracting Parties of the decision structure (Annex 4 of document CNL(00)18) provisionally adopted by the Council.*
2. *In the responses to questions 2.1, 3.1 and 4.1 ICES is asked to provide details of catch, gear, effort, composition and origin of the catch and rates of exploitation. For homewater fisheries, the information provided should indicate the location of the catch in the following categories: in-river; estuarine; and coastal. Any new information on non-catch fishing mortality of the salmon gear used and on the by-catch of other species in salmon gear and of salmon in any new fisheries for other species is also requested.*
3. *In response to question 4.1, ICES is requested to provide a brief summary of the status of North American and North-East Atlantic salmon stocks. The detailed information on the status of these stocks should be provided in response to questions 2.1 and 3.1.*
4. *With regard to question 4.3, “changes to the model” would include the development of any new model.*

List of North-East Atlantic Commission Papers

<u>Paper No.</u>	<u>Title</u>
NEA(00)1	Provisional Agenda
NEA(00)2	Draft Agenda
NEA(00)3	Election of Officers
NEA(00)4	Returns under the North-East Atlantic Commission Resolution to Protect Wild Salmon Stocks from Introductions and Transfers
NEA(00)5	Draft Report of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the North-East Atlantic Commission
NEA(00)6	Exploitation of Salmon in the United Kingdom and Ireland (tabled by the European Union)
NEA(00)7	Trends in the Management of Salmon Fisheries in Norway
NEA(00)8	Presentation to the North-East Atlantic Commission by ICES
NEA(00)9	Agenda
NEA(00)10	Draft Decision Regarding the Salmon Fishery in Faroese Waters, 2001
NEA(00)11	Draft Decision Regarding the Salmon Fishery in Faroese Waters, 2001
NEA(00)12	Decision Regarding the Salmon Fishery in Faroese Waters, 2001
NEA(00)13	Report of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the North-East Atlantic Commission

NOTE: This is a listing of all the Commission papers. Some, but not all, of these papers are included in this report as annexes.

