Agenda Item 9.1
For Information

Council

CNL(13)13

Summary of Annual Reports on Implementation Plans

CNL(13)13

Summary of Annual Reports on Implementation Plans

Background

1. The Council's Guidelines for the Preparation of Implementation Plans and for Reporting on Progress, NSTF(06)10, indicate that written annual reports should be provided to the Council. The reports summarised here are the last be be made on the first cycle of Implementation Plans. From 2014, a new format for Annual Progress Reports will be used in relation to the 2013 - 2018 Implementation Plans. The primary purpose of the annual reports is to provide a summary of all the actions that have been taken under the Implementation Plans in the previous year, including details of any actions taken in accordance with Articles 14 and 15 of the Convention. For the 2012 returns, additional information was sought on the number of salmon that escaped from salmon farms (both freshwater and marine facilities). The information sought is as follows:

   - details of any significant changes to the management outlined in the introduction to the Implementation Plan;
   - a description of any significant changes in the status of stocks and information on catches;
   - a description of any new factors which may significantly affect the abundance of salmon stocks;
   - an account of all actions taken under the Implementation Plan;
   - details of any proposed revisions to the Implementation Plan;
   - information on the number of salmon that escaped from salmon farms (both freshwater and marine facilities).

2. Annual returns, using the agreed format, have been received from the following Parties and jurisdictions: Canada (CNL(13)36); Denmark (in respect of Faroe Islands and Greenland) – Faroe Islands (CNL(13)34); Denmark (in respect of Faroe Islands and Greenland) - Greenland (CNL(13)22); EU – Denmark (CNL(13)21); EU – Finland (CNL(13)24); EU – France (CNL(13)30); EU – Germany (CNL(13)31); EU – Ireland (CNL(13)35); EU – Spain (CNL(13)32); EU – Sweden (CNL(13)23); EU – UK (England and Wales) (CNL(13)26); EU – UK (Northern Ireland) (CNL(13)25); EU – UK (Scotland) (CNL(13)33); Norway (CNL(13)28); Russian Federation (CNL(13)29); and the USA (CNL(13)27).

Changes to management outlined in the Introduction to Implementation Plans

3. The following changes have been notified:

Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) – Greenland: For the first time since 2001, the Government of Greenland established a national quota for subsistence fisheries in 2012. The quota was 35 tonnes and this was for internal consumption only. This is a significant change and indicates Greenland's commitment to rational management and the goals of NASCO.

EU – Spain:

Asturias
Since 2010, there has been a significant change in fishing periods and quotas, as well as in catch and release promotion in order to protect the declining populations. Fishing for salmon in the sea or on the coast is prohibited but angling is permitted in the rivers. There are only sports licenses and there is a prohibition on the sale of salmonid caught. From 2010 the maximum catch is one salmon per angler per day, and a maximum of three salmon per fisherman annually. Each fishermen may only fish on two days a year. To reduce the rate of capture, a new system of zoning rivers has been introduced. In many preserves and upland watersheds only catch and release is now allowed. In other areas fly-fishing is only allowed from June 15. Thus, from 15 June to 15 July, grilse may be retained but all large salmon must be released.

Navarra
Limitations have been introduced on the minimum size of hooks used in each of the different types of recreational fishing.

EU – UK (Scotland): The National Fisheries Management Demonstration, under the direction of Marine Scotland Science, taking place on the River South Esk completed the first year of operation and is being further developed to progress for the next two years.

In October 2012, the Scottish Government introduced an Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Bill before the Scottish Parliament that will underpin the sustainable development of the fish farming and freshwater fishing sectors. The purpose of the Bill is to ensure that farmed and wild fisheries - and their interactions with each other - continue to be managed effectively, maximising their combined contribution to supporting sustainable economic growth with due regard to the wider marine environment. Key features of the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Bill include: new legal measures for fish farm operators including statutory farm management agreements, requirements for technical equipment standards, and control mechanisms for the operation of wellboats; moves to improve the management and governance of District Salmon Fisheries Boards, making them more transparent and accountable, with powers for Ministers to intervene if that is not the case; safeguards for the shellfish industry, with measures to ensure shellfish waters continue to be protected from pollution once the EU Shellfish Waters Directive is repealed in 2013; powers to impose charges in connection to services provided by Marine Scotland in carrying out of functions relating to fish and shellfish farming, freshwater fisheries, and sea fisheries; some additional enforcement powers to support sea fishery officers in

carrying out monitoring and investigation duties, and the extension of Fixed Penalty Notices to respond to issues of regulatory non-compliance

It is anticipated that the Bill will conclude its passage through the Scottish Parliament by early summer 2013.

The Scottish Government has recently announced that it will commission an independent review of the management of all salmon and freshwater fisheries. The terms of the review are currently being scoped.

Norway: The Act relating to Salmonids and Freshwater Fish etc. has been revised. The main changes are obligatory organisation of fishing right owners in rivers, and implementation of National Salmon Rivers and Salmon Fjords in the act. A new regulatory regime was introduced. There is now one regulation for river-fishing in all Norway compared to 16 earlier when the County Governor had the responsibility for fishing-regulations in rivers.

USA: In 2009, the US issued a final rule listing the Gulf of Maine Distinct Population Segment (GOM DPS) of Atlantic salmon as an endangered species as well as a final rule designating Critical Habitat pursuant to the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The effect of these actions is to protect greater numbers of Atlantic salmon and to protect the features of their habitat that are essential to the conservation of the species. The "take" of species listed under the ESA is considered a violation of the ESA unless an incidental take permit or incidental take statement is provided. Take is defined to include harm, harass, trap, collect, kill or injure. Federal agencies conducting, authorizing or permitting work that may affect the GOM DPS of Atlantic salmon must consult with the National Marine Fisheries Service and the US Fish and Wildlife Service to ensure that they do not jeopardize the continued existence of Atlantic salmon and/or adversely modify or destroy critical habitat.

In August of 2011, Tropical Storm Irene produced severe floods that damaged the White River National Fish Hatchery (WRNFH), a primary source of egg and fry production for the Connecticut River Program in southern New England. The USFWS determined that the hatchery had to be de-populated and shutdown by December 2011. A brief but intensive spawning effort at WRNFH salvaged 1.2 million eggs. The remaining broodstock were provided to Northeast Indian Tribes for their ceremonial purposes (food), in December and early January. The estimated cost of rebuilding and repairs was over $5 million dollars. A decision to stop raising salmon at this facility was announced in 2012. This decision was in response not only to the loss of this hatchery, but low returns in recent years and recognition that restoration efforts in the southern extent of the range are dependent on ocean conditions improving. The state of Connecticut is continuing to operate the Kensington hatchery to maintain a "legacy program" that seeks to maintain some level of salmon restoration in the Connecticut River.

Changes in Stock Status and Catch Statistics

4. The catch statistics and information on unreported catches and on catch and release are presented in Annex 1 using the format previously agreed by the Council.

EU - UK (England and Wales): The annual review of stock status for 2012 showed:

- 9 rivers (14%) were currently classified as 'not at risk' – i.e. had a high probability (>95 %) of meeting the management objective;
- 15 rivers (23%) were currently classified as 'probably not at risk' – i.e. had a probability of 50% to 95% of meeting the management objective;
- 18 rivers (28%) were currently classified as 'probably at risk' – i.e. had a probability of 5% to 50% of meeting the management objective;
- 22 rivers (34%) were currently classified as 'at risk' – i.e. had a very low probability (<5%) of meeting the management objective.

[The 'at risk' category does not mean that stocks are in danger of becoming extinct, but rather that they are falling well short of the management objective – i.e. of meeting or exceeding the conservation limit in four years out of five, on average.]

There has been a progressive decrease in the proportion of rivers regarded as 'at risk' over the past 9 years and a marked increase in the proportion of rivers assessed as 'probably at risk' and 'probably not at risk'. These trends are predicted to continue. The changes in categorisation over the time series suggest an overall increase in the number of rivers moving towards compliance with the management objective of meeting the CL four years out of five, on average.

USA: The National Marine Fisheries Service maintains databases for data collected by fisheries observers, commercial fish dealers, and trip reports from commercial fishers. All three databases were queried for incidents of salmon captures in 2012 and revealed no salmon reported as being caught.

New factors which may significantly affect the abundance of salmon stocks

5. The following new factors have been reported:

EU - France: A study on the evolution of the migratory characteristics of French salmon populations since 1985 is being carried out by the French National Institute for Agricultural Research and the results will be made available as soon as possible. Returns in the Adour-Garonne basin were lower in 2012 than in 2011. Increased rod catch figures indicate improved reporting of catch. However, in some areas the number of kelts caught may be under-reported. It is difficult to know to what extent this may be the case. There have been reports of poaching on the Gave d'Oloron, especially where up-stream migration is delayed by obstructions which do not have sufficient fish passage measures in place. The National Police have been asked to help with this matter. Poaching is also suspected on the Gave de Pau and the Nive (Ustaritz).

EU - Germany:

Under the ICPR's "Master Plan migratory fish Rhine", the measures identified will be implemented gradually and should positively influence the development of salmon stocks. Numerous of the measures, planned in the Master Plan have already been implemented. Up to 2005, 126 barrages had been made passable in the Rhine and its tributaries. By the end of 2012 a total of 479 barrages have been made passable for salmon and other fish species in the entire Rhine catchment. The Haringvliet Sluices, an important “entrance” for salmon into the Rhine and Meuse river system,will open in 2015. Important restoration measures have been implemented in several tributaries of the Rhine.

In Baden-Wuerttemberg, the ecological improvement program for salmon rivers continued. in 2012. Obstacles have been redesigned to improve the longitudinal connectivity, and structural improvement measures have been implemented to optimize the quality of the habitat. Predation on downstream migrating smolts by piscivorous birds significantly reduces salmon stock levels.

In Brandenburg and Saxony-Anhalt, increasing siltation in salmon habitats due to expansion of maize and rape cultivation for biofuel production, increasing beaver stocks leading to new barriers to salmon migration and contamination of salmon streams by manure and silage effluent leaking fom storage facilities are all having negative impacts on salmon stocks.

EU – Spain:

Bizkaia
The presence of barriers in the beds of the rivers, the decrease of flow and the alteration of riparian vegetation affect salmon.

Navarra
2012 was a particularly favourable for the recruitment of juvenile salmon.

EU - Sweden: In 2011 a new gill net fishery conducted by commercial fishermen commenced in the coastal area. No commercial gill net fishing has been conducted on the coast for many years The catches are 7-8 tonnes annually, comprising 23-25% of the total national catch in weight. The gill net fishing is in a region with rivers with hydropower stations and compensatory releases of ranched salmon smolts. The Swedish Implementation Plan for 2013 – 2018 has an action to implement new fishing rules in the sea and rivers in order to phase-out mixed-stock fisheries in the sea and rivers.

EU - UK (England and Wales):

- Many areas in England and Wales experienced very dry conditions in the spring of 2012, with record low flows for this time of year on some rivers;
- This was followed by record rainfall and extreme high flows in many areas in the late spring, summer and autumn of 2012; April and June were the wettest in the England and Wales time-series, dating from 1766, while the summer months (June, July, August) were the wettest since 1912;
- This had major effects on fisheries, and it is likely that it will have affected salmon populations at various freshwater stages in the lifecycle.

EU - UK (Northern Ireland): Marine survival of salmon to the R Bush remains very low and consistent with other NASCO jurisdictions, it is the major factor affecting abundance in Northern Irish populations.

No commercial fishing for salmon took place in the Foyle area in 2012 and angling on the River Finn was restricted to catch and release only. Four commercial coastal salmon licences were issued in 2012 in the DCAL area, however by agreement none of the fishermen fished their nets. A small commercial catch was taken in fresh water in the DCAL area, with a total of 20 salmon taken in 2012. Overall this represents a continuation of a very significant reduction in licensing of commercial salmon fishing engines in 2011. Provisional data suggest a significant increase in rod catch in the Loughs Agency area in 2012 compared to 2011. Declared rod catch data in 2012 was 6,142. (Note: part of the Loughs Agency area is in the Republic of Ireland). The number of rod caught salmon killed in the DCAL area was considerably down on the 2011 figures due to a significant uptake in the voluntary catch and release by anglers.

Whilst monitoring data indicates that implementation of the Salmon Management Strategy (Implementation Plan) is conserving and rebuilding stocks in fresh water, this management activity remains against a background of low marine survival relative to before 1997. Thus, reduced exploitation and freshwater habitat management measures can only buffer that decline. This being the case the Minister for the Department of Culture, Arts and Leisure (DCAL) again asked anglers to operate voluntary catch and release for all rod caught salmon in the 2012 season in the DCAL area. Provisional data indicates that there was a 62% catch and release rate for anglers in 2012 compared to 22% in 2011. A public consultation exercise was carried out in July 2012 to canvas views on salmon conservation in the DCAL area. After consideration of this the DCAL Minister made a statement on salmon conservation to the Northern Ireland Assembly in December 2012 and indicated that a) legislation would be brought forward in 2014 to impose mandatory catch and release for all salmon caught by anglers where rivers have not met their conservation limits b) that there would be a cessation of all commercial salmon netting in the DCAL area until stocks recover to a sufficient level.

USA: The significant reduction in the Connecticut River Program described in section 1 above is expected to result in continued and accelerated declines in the low numbers of adult returns to the Connecticut River, the southernmost salmon river in the western Atlantic.

Management Actions taken under the Implementation Plans

6. Information on the management actions taken in accordance with Implementation Plans is reported in the returns for each jurisdiction and is not summarised here.

Revisions to Implementation Plans

7. The following revisions to Implementation Plans have been reported:

EU – Finland: Negotiations have continued in 2012 on revision of the Agreement between Finland and Norway on Fishing in the River Tenojoki. A new round of negotiations aims to modernise the existing treaty and to better implement NASCO's guidelines.

EU – France: The French Implementation Plan will be provided to NASCO at the beginning of the third quarter of 2013. A Working Group comprising those involved in salmon management will hold three meetings in order to produce the Plan. This timescale will also allow work on the Data Collection Framework and preparatory work on the Migratory Fish Management Plans for the individual river basins (which should be approved by the end of 2015) to be carried out simultaneously.

EU – Spain:

Navarra
The forecast is to initiate the drafting of the Management Plan of Atlantic Salmon in the River Bidasoa basin.

EU – Sweden: The present Implementation Plan will not be revised as a new plan for 2013-2018 has been produced. Scheduled measures for 2013-2018 are:

- Implementing new fishing rules to lessen exploitation of wild salmon in rivers with low stock status;
- Phasing out mixed-stock fisheries on wild salmon in the two largest rivers with both wild (in tributaries) and compensatory releases (hydropower stations) of reared salmon smolts in the mainstrem, and mixed-stock fisheries on the coast. Action is planned for 2013-2014;
- Reducing over-exploitation of MSW in rivers through restrictions on landing large fish;
- Establishing criteria for BAT (best available technology) for hydropower generation;
- Setting conservation limits for each river (today only on a national scale).

EU – UK (Northern Ireland): The 2008 - 2013 Implementation Plan outlined a timetable of DCAL rivers on which habitat surveys would be conducted and Biological Reference Points (BRPs) established. Most of the main rivers outlined in the Plan have been completed on schedule during 2008 - 2013 including all the Lough Neagh tributaries and most coastal rivers. A number of potential salmon rivers, however, are outstanding and these have been prioritised and scheduled for derivation of BRPs during the 2013 - 2018 Implementation Plan. These rivers include principally the Agivey, Glenarm and Kilkeel rivers.

Information on the number of salmon that escaped from salmon farms (both freshwater and marine facilities)

8. The following information was reported by jurisdictions:

Canada: Of the incidents reported in 2012 for New Brunswick, one resulted in less than 100 fish escaping (although the exact number will not be confirmed until the site is harvested) and 3 potential breaches did not result in any change in observed biomass. In Newfoundland there were nine incidents of breaches due to net damage by sharks and tunas and one incident of net damage by equipment, but no escapes were reported although small numbers of escapes (<20) were identified in fisheries monitoring. In Nova Scotia there were no reported escape incidents.

Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) – Greenland: No aquaculture of any species in Greenland, hence no escapees.

EU – Denmark: There are only two hatcheries that produce salmon for stocking in rivers; there are no other facilities in Denmark

EU – Ireland: No escapees of farmed salmon were reported in 2012 from marine sites. No monitoring of freshwater sites is carried out but there were no reports of escapees from freshwater installations. No reports of escapees in catch scanning or broodstock collections were made suggesting that there were few if any escapes which were unreported.

EU – Spain:
Galicia
There is no estimate.

EU – Sweden: There are no salmon farms on the Swedish coast. Hence there are no escaped salmon from Swedish farms. Escaped salmon from other nations are, however, present in some rivers. The magnitude is not known, and fluctuates considerably. Reared salmon smolts are released annually (average 175 000 smolt per year).

EU - UK (Northern Ireland): Numbers of escaped farm fish trapped at the Bush in 2012 = 0
No reports were received of any salmon that escaped from the salmon farm in Northern Ireland and there is no estimate of unreported escapes.

EU – UK (Scotland):

http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/marine/science/Publications/MSFOIEIrDisclosures/Esacpes20082012

Freshwater sites - 3,180
Marine sites - 20

Norway: The total number of reported escapees from salmon farms in Norway was 38 000 individuals in 2012. This represent a 90 percent reduction compared to the total number reported for 2011. There were no reported escape incidents at land-based facilities. It is impossible to present a credible estimate of the number of unreported escaped farmed salmon in Norway. In 2012, the Directorate of Fisheries twice initiated DNA tracking in connection with reports of escapees that cannot be connected to known incidents. In addition, DNA tracking was used once to investigate suspected illegal dumping of dead fish. A focus on preventing drip escapees from land-based facilities is thought to have significantly reduced the extent of unreported escaped farmed salmon.

USA: Reported escapes: zero
Unreported escapes: No formal estimate is available. Independent third party auditors review containment management plans (including escape incidences and any escapes of farmed fish above the specified threshold of 50 fish). Corrective actions are required when there has been a failure at a specific critical control point that could have led to a breach of containment. Corrective action reports are kept on file and reviewed during the audit. There are very few corrective actions recorded annually; this may be a good indicator that few escapes are occurring from gear failure at critical control points. Further, the annual audits demonstrate 100% compliance rates for commercial marine salmon farms in Maine. Putative aquaculture-origin escapes did enter Maine rivers in 2012 indicating escapes of farmed fish are occurring. With the possible exception of one fish, genetic analyses conducted on farmed fish captured at fish passage facilities in Maine have indicated the origin of these fish are not from US farms. The Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Aquaculture in the province of New Brunswick, Canada, has reported several escape incidences occurring at marine salmon farms (2010-2012) that could have presumably led to farmed fish escapees entering US rivers.

Interim Secretary
Edinburgh
29 May 2013

Table 1: Official Catch Statistics

	Provisional 2012 Catch (Tonnes)	Provisional 2012 Catch according to Sea Age						Confirmed 2011 Catch (Tonnes)
		1 SW		MSW		Total		
		No	Wt	No	Wt	No	Wt	
Canada	135	46,891	79.9	11,671	54.8	58,562	134.7	179
Denmark (in respect of Faroe Islands and Greenland)								
Faroe Islands	0							0
Greenland	34							28
European Union	410							510
Norway	696							696
Russian Federation	82							89
USA	0							0

Note: The breakdown of the Canadian catch by sea-age is into ‘small’ and ‘large’ salmon.

Table 2: Catches of Atlantic Salmon by the Parties to the NASCO Convention

	Canada	Denmark (Faroe Islands and Greenland)	European Union	Finland	Norway	Russian Federation	Sweden	USA
1960	1636	60	2641		1576	1100	40	1
1961	1583	127	2276		1456	790	27	1
1962	1719	244	3894		1838	710	45	1
1963	1861	466	3842		1697	480	23	1
1964	2069	1539	4242		2040	590	36	1
1965	2116	861	3693		1900	590	40	1
1966	2369	1338	3549		1823	570	36	1
1967	2863	1600	4492		2058	883	25	1
1968	2111	1167	3623		1752	827	150	1
1969	2202	2350	4407		2083	360	76	1
1970	2323	2354	4069		1861	448	52	1
1971	1992	2511	3745		1847	417	35	1
1972	1759	2146	4261	32	1986	462	38	1
1973	2434	2402	4604	50	2126	772	73	3
1974	2539	1945	4432	76	1973	709	57	1
1975	2485	2086	4500	76	1754	811	56	2
1976	2506	1479	2931	66	1530	542	45	1
1977	2545	1652	3025	59	1488	497	10	2
1978	1545	1159	3102	37	1050	476	10	4
1979	1287	1694	2572	26	1831	455	12	3
1980	2680	2052	2640	34	1830	664	17	6
1981	2437	2602	2557	44	1656	463	26	6
1982	1798	2350	2533	83	1348	364	25	6
1983	1424	1433	3532	79	1550	507	28	1
1984	1112	997	2308	75	1623	593	40	2
1985	1133	1430	3002	49	1561	659	45	2
1986	1559	1490	3524	38	1597	608	53	2
1987	1784	1539	2593	49	1385	559	47	1

	Canada	Denmark (Faroe Islands and Greenland)	European Union	Finland	Norway	Russian Federation	Sweden	USA
1988	1311	1136	2833	34	1076	419	40	1
1989	1139	701	2450	52	905	359	29	2
1990	912	542	1645	59	930	316	33	2
1991	711	533	1139	69	877	215	38	1
1992	520	260	1506	77	867	166	49	1
1993	373	35	1483	70	923	140	56	1
1994	355	18	1919	48	996	141	44	0
1995	259	86	1852	-	839	130	-	0
1996	290	92	1474	-	787	131	-	0
1997	229	59	1179	-	630	111	-	0
1998	157	17	1183	-	740	130	-	0
1999	152	19	1016	-	811	102	-	0
2000	153	29	1336	-	1176	124	-	0
2001	148	42	1407	-	1267	114	-	0
2002	148	9	1245	-	1019	118	-	0
2003	141	9	1012	-	1071	107	-	0
2004	161	15	978	-	784	82	-	0
2005	139	14	884	-	888	82	-	0
2006	132	23	703	-	931	91	-	0
2007	112	25	453	-	767	63		0
2008	158	26	444	-	807	73	-	0
2009	126	26	327	-	595	71	-	0
2010	146	38	496	-	642	88	-	0
2011	179	28	510	-	696	89	-	0
2012	135	34	410	-	696	82	-	0

1. The European Union catch from 1995 includes the catches by Finland and Sweden.

2. The catch for Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) includes the catch for Greenland when it was a member of the European Union and the catches up to 1983 by Denmark.

3. Figures from 1986 are the official catch returns to NASCO but where no return to NASCO has been made ICES data have been used.

Catch and release

Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Canada	62,106	58,961	54,425	51,442	57,005	45,886	49,279	42,820	58,000	47,892	58,300	77,641	50,811
Denmark (Faroe Islands and Greenland)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
European Union	27,346	33,504	32,984	34,968	55,064	60,145	62,812	82,977	81,301	71,133	115,065	99,086	97,499
Norway	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,512	6,696	15,041	14,303	18,611
Russian Federation	12,624	16,410	25,248	33,862	24,679	23,592	33,380	44,341	41,881	-	14,585	-	4,743
USA	0	0	0	0	0	0	424	-	61	-	-	-	-
Total	**104,994**	**112,482**	**118,233**	**125,629**	**144,042**	**138,773**	**154,156**	**176,313**	**202,155**	**125,721**	**202,991**	**191,030**	**171,664**

Notes: Not all EU Member States provided complete information on catch and release. No data was provided by the authorities in Russia in 2009 or in 2011 and the information provided for 2010 and 2012 is incomplete. However, catch and release is understood to have remained at similar high levels (average 36,500 salmon) as in the 5 years from 2004 to 2008. In the US, recreational fisheries on post-spawned domestic broodstock occurred in the Merrimack River in 2012, an area south of the GOM DPS. Roughly 1,700 broodstock were released to the river to support the fishery with approximately 1,300 permits sold. Broodstock are known to be captured and killed in the fishery for consumption. However, the time-series of creel data for this fishery suggests that the majority of anglers practice catch and release.

Unreported catches

Year	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Canada	133	124	81	84	118	101	101	56	-	21	-	18	29	31
Denmark (Faroe Islands and Greenland)	10-15	10	10	11	10	11	11	11	12	10	5	12.3	10	10
European Union	215	240	169	165	125	116	114	95	72	54	47	70	71	59
Norway	320-540	440-760	500-860	410-690	320-600	252-420	285-475	299-499	247 - 411	260 - 432	166 - 338	206 - 344	298	298
Russian Federation	237-255	249-309	200-252	166-206	99-152	110	70-103	70-103	25 - 77	-	-	-	-	-
USA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	**917-1,160**	**1,065-1,445**	**962-1,374**	**838-1,158**	**674-1,007**	**593-761**	**584-807**	**534-767**	**360 - 576**	**362 - 534**	**218 - 390**	**306 - 444**	**408**	**398**

Note: The information for Canada in 2010 is incomplete, as only 3 of 4 administrative regions reported. In Canada in 2012, of the 15.3t of unreported catch for which a location was recorded, 65% was recorded as taking place in freshwater, 35% in tidal waters and less than 1% in marine waters. 57% of all the fish captured (retained plus released) in Canada in 2012 were released in the recreational fishery. Not all EU Member States provided an estimate of unreported catch. For EU – Sweden, all unreported catch is thought to be legal, especially by coastal gill nets by non-commercial fishermen.