



**West Greenland Commission
Inter-Sessional Meeting**

WGCIS(18)14

**Response to the Second Set of Questions asked of the Representative
of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), after
the 2018 Copenhagen Inter-Sessional Meeting and in Relation to
Their Report on the West Greenland Salmon Fishery in 2017**



Members of West Greenland Commission

Answers on questions from members of WGC

09-05-2018
Sags nr.:
Akt nr.: 7848756

1. Question: Can Greenland explain why the 2016 and 2017 harvests were approximately 27 t when the quotas were 32 t and 45 t respectively? For instance, are the reduced catches in 2016 and 2017 due to reduced effort or reduce fishing success? It was noted in the past that many fishers were concentrating effort on other, possibly higher value species;

Postboks 269
3900 Nuuk
Tlf. (+299) 34 50 00
Fax (+299) 34 63 55
E-mail: apn@nanoq.gl
www.naalakkersuisut.gl

Answer: The answer is likely a combination of targeting of alternative species and reduced effort, lack of factory landing and changes in salmon distribution/abundance. In 2016-17 the landings of cod in the Sisimiut (1B) and Maniitsoq (1C) area have increased substantially to more than 20.000 tonnes, but with little change in landings south of Nuuk. For Greenland halibut, landings have increased in the Sisimiut (1B), Paamiut (1E) and south Greenland (1F) area and remained at a high level in Nuuk (1D). Increased interest in other species can account for part of the decreased landings observed for salmon and wolffish. In the phone surveys fishermen in the Disko bay have reported trouble with glacier ice preventing the fishery in the last two years and others have been troubled with bycatches of cod in their salmon gillnets further south in Greenland.

2. Question: Is there a reason why private, unlicensed fishers who have provided catch reports previously are not included in the phone survey? Can they be included?

Answer: A phone survey could be made based on the group of non-licensed fishermen that have in previous years reported catch. However, such a survey would not be an independent/random subset of the potential group of non-licensed fishermen. Furthermore, unlike for the licensed segment, where we know the total number of licensed fishermen, we do not know the final/total number of non-licensed fishermen. The survey would therefore only give an idea about whether non-licensed fishermen fish can report and fish every year or not. We are therefore considering alternative ways to gain knowledge about the unlicensed people fishing for their own consumption. The phone survey was not finalized in 2017 due to lack of resources. In spite of the phone survey conducted in 2014-2016 season, no significant change has been observed in the number of licensed fishermen reporting catches (1/3). Furthermore, estimates of non reported catch for the last 2/3 of license holders that fail to report has revealed only a limited amount of non-reported catch in this segment (about half the 10 tonnes added by ICES yearly).

3. Question: Can you expand on the reasons given for not implementing the requirement to expand licensing requirements to non-professional fishermen? For instance, why is this controversial?

Answer: We are still considering potential ways to gain knowledge about the number of unlicensed fishermen and women. Perhaps making a simple license system.

4. Question: Can you explain why implementing a penalty on a fisherman that does not provide a catch report, even if it is a zero catch report, is controversial? Are there any fisheries where a penalty of some sort is administered for non-reporting?

Answer: The question is internal matter.

5. As we understand it, the 2015 Executive Order outlines provisions for assessing penalties for non-reporting of harvest. Can you please outline the process, timeline, and actions for assessing penalties (e.g. communication with fishers, assessment of fine, etc.)?

Answer: The question is internal matter.

6. Question: What was the impact of not having factory landing on the overall harvest level in 2016 and 2017?

Answer: Most likely the harvest levels were significantly lower in 2016 and 2017 than they would have been, if factory landings had been allowed. However, data is not available to give a more precise estimate of the effect of disallowing factory landings.

7. What specific progress has been made with having the market managers reporting landings in addition to the individual fishers reporting their own landings?

Answer: A significant effort has been made by GFLKs officers to gather catch reports from market managers over the past 3 years. In general, only minor discrepancies have been found between market records and what has been reported directly by fishermen to GFLK. A side effect of receiving catch reports referring to the same catches from disparate sources (when fishermen also individually send reports of their catches) has been the need of additional quality control of catch records with regards to establishing which reports are unique and which have in effect been reported more than once. In general, therefore, the measure has not been found to increase the quality of catch reporting in an effective manner.

8. Question: Can you provide a report on what further analysis on this year's fishery might help inform a NASCO measure for 2018 (e.g. analysis of phone surveys, estimates on the individual number of private fishers reporting over time, analysis of catches of other species to inform salmon fishery dynamics, etc.). It is important that the Parties receive this information as part of the report agreed

in Paragraph 6.1 of the West Greenland Commission's inter-sessional meeting and agreed in Copenhagen to be delivered by 4 May, 2018;

Answer: The question is internal matter.

9. Can you explain the process that Greenland must go through prior to setting a quota? How is this process related to your Executive Order? What is the timing of the quota setting process?

Answer: The question is internal matter.

10. Can Greenland provide additional information on the efforts made to improve the monitoring, management control and surveillance of its salmon fishery since 2015, as per Paragraph 5 of the multi-annual regulatory measure, WGC(15)21?

Answer: Extended roundtrips to villages and fishing areas have been organized each year during the season by GFLK officers. The time on these trips has been split between meetings with fishermen, municipal fisheries consultants and market managers, and patrolling fishing grounds. Nets have been inspected and illegal nets, i.e. nets not removed after the end of the season have been confiscated.

National radio spots during the season have contributed to a high general awareness in the population on the rules surrounding salmon fisheries and catch reporting. At GFLKs offices, salmon catch records are continuously registered and the quota uptake is included in a weekly publication of coastal fisheries quotas. Effort is made to monitor the received catch records to be able to identify missing reports from certain regions and be able to act on this quickly.

11. Can Greenland explain what are the challenges it encounters in introducing a carcass tagging scheme?

Answer: Of course, it will require administrative and other challenges in connection with this form of scheme, as we are a small management in Greenland. We believe that it will be an additional burden on our administrative system and will not match what we eventually get for Greenland's salmon deal with NASCO. Especially when you think there are approx. 77 settlements and cities in Greenland. It will require a lot of logistical problems, here are the huge kilometers of coastline. So that makes no sense in this context.

Best regards

Emanuel Rosing