2000

SEVENTEENTH
ANNUAL MEETING

MIRAMICHI, CANADA

5-9 JUNE 2000

President:	Mr Einar Lemche (Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland))
Vice-President:	Mr Ole Tougaard (European Union)
Secretary:	Dr Malcolm Windsor

CNL(00)57

CONTENTS

CNL(00)57

Report of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Council 5-9 June 2000, Miramichi, Canada

1. Opening Session

1.1 The President, Mr Einar Lemche, opened the meeting, welcomed delegates to Miramichi and made an opening statement on the work of the Organization (Annex 1).

1.2 The representatives of Canada, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), the European Union, Iceland, Norway, the Russian Federation and the United States of America made opening statements (Annex 2).

1.3 An opening statement was made by the North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission (Annex 3).

1.4 Four opening statements were made jointly on behalf of all Non-Government Organizations (NGOs) attending the Annual Meeting. In addition, opening statements were made by the Atlantic Salmon Federation, the Federation of Irish Salmon and Sea-Trout Anglers, the National Anglers Representative Association, the Norwegian Farmers Union and Norwegian Salmon Rivers, and the World Wildlife Fund. These opening statements are contained in Annex 4.

1.5 The President expressed appreciation to the Parties and to the observer organizations for their statements and closed the Opening Session.

1.6 A list of participants is given in Annex 5.

2. Adoption of Agenda

2.1 The Council adopted its agenda, CNL(00)42 (Annex 6).

3. Election of Officers

3.1 The Council unanimously elected Mr Jacque Robichaud (Canada) as President. The Council unanimously elected Mr Eidur Gudnason (Iceland) as Vice-President.

4. Administrative Issues

4.1 Secretary's Report

The Secretary made a report to the Council, CNL(00)6, on: the status of ratifications of and accessions to the Convention; membership of the regional Commissions; observers at NASCO's meetings; the Tag Return Incentive Scheme; a follow-up to the Eleventh ICES Dialogue Meeting, establishment of a NASCO website; the

Organization's financial affairs; the new NASCO handbook; the Headquarters Property; and the new Scottish Parliament.

The Secretary reported, CNL(00)32, that since the last Annual Meeting, the World Wildlife Fund – US had been granted observer status. There was an unresolved application for observer status by the Global Aquaculture Alliance and the Council agreed to admit this organization. In general, organizations devoted to aquaculture would be admitted under the rules for non-government organization observers.

In accordance with Financial Rule 5.5, the Secretary reported on the receipt of contributions for 2000. Contributions had been received from all the Parties except the Russian Federation.

With regard to the proposed joint meeting of NASCO, NPAFC and IBSFC the Council agreed that this should focus only on scientific issues and might be held in conjunction the NPAFC's Research, Planning and Co-ordination Meeting in March 2002. The Secretary was asked to liaise with the Secretary of NPAFC on this proposal.

The Council had previously recognised that there could be benefits from a joint meeting of all the North Atlantic Fisheries Commissions (i.e. NASCO, ICCAT, NEAFC and NAFO) to discuss issues of mutual interest such as the Precautionary Approach, control and enforcement schemes and data collection. The Council asked the Head of the EU Delegation and the Secretary to liaise with these organizations on this matter with a view to setting up a preparatory meeting in 2001 so that a joint session might be held in 2002.

The Council agreed to make the Organization's databases available for public access through the NASCO website from which information could be downloaded. The databases would not be available in an interactive format. The databases should clearly indicate the date on which they were last updated and, in the case of the laws, regulations and programmes database, it should be clearly stated that there would be a need to consult the relevant national authorities to confirm the validity of the information.

4.2 **Review of NASCO's Relationship with its Observer Oganizations**

At its 1999 meeting the Council decided to review its relationship with its observer organizations, including the question of an observer fee to reflect actual costs. The Secretary introduced a discussion document on this issue, CNL(00)7. The participation by observers in its meetings had been of mutual benefit and had enhanced transparency of international cooperation on salmon conservation and management. The Council decided that for the time being it would neither impose observer fees nor invite voluntary contributions from observer organizations.

Prior to the Seventeenth Annual Meeting some Parties to NASCO had been subjected by a Non-Government Organization to multiple e-mails. The Council deplored such methods which interfered with the effective operation of the Parties and of the Organization. The Council decided to adopt the following additional condition to govern representation by NASCO's Non-Government Observers:

"7. Non-adherence to these conditions by a Non-Government Organization may lead to the suspension of that Organization's observer status by the Council for one or more meetings".

The Council decided that NGO observer status should apply to all plenary sessions of the Council and Commissions whether they be at the Annual Meeting or at inter-sessional meetings. However, observer status would not apply to meetings of NASCO's Working Groups or Committees.

Norway proposed that condition 4 of the conditions for NGO representatives be amended so as to allow NGOs to make statements at any time at the discretion of the President, or that of a Commission Chairman. There was no unanimity on this issue and the Council decided that the issue of all of the conditions for observers should remain on the agenda of the Council for the next meeting.

The representative of the USA said that his delegation would support the Council's decision on this matter but, for the record, stated that it is the position of the USA that all NASCO meetings be as open as possible.

4.3 Methods of Calculating the Contributions to NASCO

Last year concern was expressed by the Icelandic delegation that major changes have taken place which have affected the catches used in calculating the contributions to NASCO. The Council had asked the Secretary to prepare a discussion paper on how the issues raised by Iceland on calculation of the contributions might be resolved without amending the Convention. The Secretary briefly introduced document CNL(00)8 which concluded that, without changes to the Convention, there appears to be little flexibility to address Iceland's concerns about the effects on contributions of the reduction in the number of NASCO Parties and the effects of compensation payments for not fishing quotas. With regard to exclusion of ranched fish, inclusion of unreported catches and inclusion of an element for catch and release, there might be flexibility to address these concerns without amendments to the Convention but only through an agreement on what is meant by the term "nominal catches".

The representative of Iceland introduced document CNL(00)34 which proposed a revised system for budget calculations based on a broader definition of nominal catches to include all man-handled salmon weighted, for example, with respect to their threat to wild stocks, their value for angling or to spawning stocks and with regard to the precision of the statistics.

The Council agreed to ask the Secretary to prepare a series of scenarios, including very low catches, and a high proportion of catch and release. These scenarios would be used to calculate contributions. The calculations might also include specific examples of what would happen if the fixed and catch-related proportions in the Convention were changed. The Council asked the Secretary to circulate these scenarios to the Parties before the end of the year.

4.4 **Report of the Finance and Administration Committee**

The Chairman of the Finance and Administration Committee, Dr Jean-Pierre Plé, presented the report of the Committee, CNL(00)9. Upon the recommendation of the Committee the Council took the following decisions:

(a) to accept the audited 1999 annual financial statement, FAC(00)3;

(b) to adopt a budget for 2001 and to note a forecast budget for 2002, CNL(00)53 (Annex 7);

(c) to allow any budget surplus at the end of the financial year to be credited to the Stabilisation Fund. To facilitate this the Council agreed to modify the last sentence of Financial Rule 6.3 to read:

"Any surplus above 60,000 pounds sterling shall, unless the Council decides otherwise, be credited to the Stabilisation Fund until the fund has reached 250,000 pounds sterling".

(d) to appoint PricewaterhouseCoopers of Edinburgh as auditors for the 2000 accounts;

(e) to adopt the report of the Finance and Administration Committee.

The Council decided not to accept donations from non-members and NGOs at present.

The President thanked Dr Plé for his valuable work and for that of the Committee.

4.5 **Report on the Activities of the Organization**

In accordance with Article 5, paragraph 6 of the Convention, the Council adopted a report to the Parties on the Activities of the Organization in 1999, CNL(00)10.

4.6 **Announcement of the Tag Return Incentive Scheme Grand Prize**

The President announced that the draw for the Tag Return Incentive Scheme was made by the Auditor at NASCO Headquarters on 24 May. The winner of the $2500 Grand Prize was Mr Bob Ritchie, Montrose, Scotland. The Council offered its congratulations to the winner.

5. Scientific, Technical, Legal and Other Information

5.1 **Scientific Advice from ICES**

The representative of ICES presented the report of the Advisory Committee on Fishery Management (ACFM) to the Council, CNL(00)12 (Annex 8).

5.2 **Report of the Standing Scientific Committee**

The Chairman of the Committee presented a draft request to ICES for scientific advice. Upon the recommendation of the Committee, the Council adopted a request for scientific advice from ICES, CNL(00)60 (Annex 9).

5.3 **Catch Statistics and their Analysis**

The Secretary introduced a statistical paper presenting the official catch returns by the Parties for 1999, CNL(00)14 (Annex 10), and historical data for the period 1960-1999, CNL(00)15. The statistics for 1999 are provisional and will be updated by the Parties.

5.4 **Review of International Salmon-Related Literature Published in 1999**

The Council took note of a review of the literature concerning Atlantic salmon published during 1999, CNL(00)16, which had been prepared in accordance with Article 13, paragraph 2 of the Convention.

6. Conservation, Restoration, Enhancement and Rational Management of Salmon Stocks

6.1 **Measures Taken in Accordance with Articles 14 and 15 of the Convention**

The Secretary presented a report on the returns made under Articles 14 and 15 of the Convention, CNL(00)17 (Annex 11). The representative of the USA described the background to the proposal to list the distinct population segment of Atlantic salmon in Maine under the Endangered Species Act and the implications if listing occurs. The representative of the European Union indicated that he would make information for other EU Member States available to the Secretariat.

6.2 **The Precautionary Approach to Salmon Management**

(a) Report of the Standing Committee on the Precautionary Approach on Application of a Precautionary Approach to Management of Salmon Fisheries

The Standing Committee on the Precautionary Approach, established in 1999 under the Council's Action Plan for Application of a Precautionary Approach, held its first meeting in Miami, Florida during 21-23 March 2000, on the topic of application of a Precautionary Approach to management of North Atlantic salmon fisheries. The Chairman, Dr Andrew Rosenberg (USA), introduced the Committee's report, CNL(00)18 (Annex 12). This had been the Committee's first meeting and the SCPA had agreed that it would be appropriate to consider further the guiding principles which apply to all aspects of application of a Precautionary Approach before proceeding to the specific terms of reference relating to management of North Atlantic salmon fisheries. The report includes some general comments on interpretation of these guiding principles, guiding definitions of terms used in salmon fisheries management, and a decision structure for use by the Council and Commissions

of NASCO and by the relevant authorities in the management of single and mixed stock fisheries.

The Council agreed the definitions and provisionally adopted the decision structure for use in the management of single and mixed stock fisheries pending a detailed evaluation over the next two years. It was agreed that this decision structure would be considered by NASCO's Commissions at their meetings and that each Contracting Party should apply the decision structure on a selection of rivers with different stock status and management policies. The Contracting Parties would report annually to the Commissions, and the Commissions and Contracting Parties would report back to the SCPA in the spring of 2002 so that there could be a thorough evaluation of the decision structure.

The Council also asked that the Secretary prepare a single document containing the Agreement on Adoption of a Precautionary Approach, the Action Plan for Application of a Precautionary Approach, the Decision Structure and the Definitions. This document should also be made available on the Organization's website.

(b) Future Actions in Relation to Application of the Precautionary Approach to Salmon Management

The Secretary introduced document CNL(00)30 which detailed possible next steps in relation to application of the Precautionary Approach.

The Council decided that the next steps would be to consider:

(i) the application of the Precautionary Approach to habitat protection and restoration;

(ii) the application of the Precautionary Approach to socio-economic issues.

With regard to (i), the Council adopted terms of reference, CNL(00)58 (Annex 13).

With regard to (ii), the Council agreed that the Contracting Parties should be requested to provide relevant background information and ideas on the implications of socio-economic issues for application of the Precautionary Approach. This and any other relevant information would be used by the SCPA to develop terms of reference for (ii).

Both tasks would be undertaken at a meeting of the SCPA to be held in February 2001 in conjunction with the next Liaison Group Meeting.

6.3 **Unreported Catches**

At its 1998 meeting the Council asked that the Secretary request, on an annual basis, from each Contracting Party:

1) a description of its management control and reporting systems by country;
2) an explanation of how it arrives at the figure for unreported catch;
3) the extent of catch and release fishing;
4) the measures taken to further minimise the level of unreported catches.

In 1999 the Council had agreed that, in future, the Parties would also be asked for an estimate of unreported catch for each country. The figure for all countries should be broken down to show the different categories of the unreported catch, indicating whether they result from legal or illegal activities. The Secretary introduced document CNL(00)19 (Annex 14) detailing the returns from the Parties. These returns indicate that despite best efforts by all Parties to obtain detailed and accurate catch statistics, in 1999 unreported catches were estimated to be between 917-1,160 tonnes compared to a total reported catch of 2,218 tonnes. Illegal fishing appears to be a major contributing factor to the continuing high level of unreported catches although not in all countries.

The Council welcomed the information contained in document CNL(00)19 which presented the information in a transparent manner. Continuing concern was expressed about the high level of unreported catches and the Council emphasised the need to take stronger measures to minimise the level of such catches. Norway and Russia had provided a breakdown of their unreported catch by category. The Council asked that the Secretary request all Contracting Parties to provide a breakdown of their reported catch in next year's returns, since this information might be useful when considering measures to minimise unreported catches.

The representative of the USA tabled a preliminary draft international plan of action to prevent, deter and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing, developed by an FAO expert consultation, CNL(00)40. While this plan applies to high seas areas, and unreported catches of salmon are from homewaters, the Council recognised that this was a welcome initiative. The plan of action will be considered further at the next meeting of the FAO's Committee on Fisheries. The Secretary was asked to keep in contact with this initiative.

The representative of the European Union tabled details of measures taken in England and Wales to reduce the illegal salmon catch, CNL(00)44. These measures include a mail shot to fishmongers, hotels and restaurants to reinforce awareness of the law, with follow-up by enforcement officers.

6.4 **By-catch of Atlantic Salmon**

At its Fourteenth Annual Meeting the attention of the Council was drawn to the enormous growth of fishing for pelagic species of fish in the North-East Atlantic Commission area, principally for herring and mackerel in ICES Division IIa. The concern had been raised that, even if a very small percentage of the catch in these fisheries is salmon post-smolts, the losses could be significant. Information provided by ICES suggests that the fishery with the greatest potential for catching post-smolts is probably the trawl fishery for mackerel. ICES had advised that a simple precautionary measure against post-smolt catches in commercial fisheries might be to operate pelagic trawls with the float line at a minimum of 5m below the surface.

Last year the Council had recognised that it needed further information on the possible by-catch of salmon in pelagic fisheries and asked that the Contracting Parties provide any available information. The Secretary reported, CNL(00)20, that no new information had been provided by the Parties. The representative of the USA referred to reports of by-catch of Atlantic salmon in a troll fishery for albacore off the west coast of Ireland. The representative of the EU indicated that he had no specific information about this but would try to get information for the next annual meeting.

The Council agreed that the issue of by-catch should be considered by the Working Group referred to in paragraph 6.6 below.

6.5 **Fishing for Salmon in International Waters by Non-Contracting Parties**

The Secretary presented a report, CNL(00)21, describing actions taken in relation to the Resolution on Fishing for Salmon on the High Seas. There have been no sightings since February 1994 but there have been few surveillance flights over the winter and spring period. The Council asked the Secretary to continue to liaise with the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) and the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC) with a view to obtaining relevant information on sightings. The Secretary was also asked to take action in relation to any future sightings.

6.6 **Scientific Research Fishing in the Convention Area**

The Secretary introduced document CNL(00)22 which summarised actions taken since the last annual meeting. Following the Sixteenth Annual Meeting the Secretary had received a letter on behalf of the NGOs attending that meeting referring to the problem of low marine survival, the high costs of the research required for a clearer understanding of the factors affecting salmon at sea and the need for international cooperation in such research.

The Council considered a proposal, CNL(00)43 (Annex 15), to establish a five-year international co-operative research programme funded by the Parties. The Council agreed to set up a Working Group, under Norwegian Chairmanship, to develop ideas for a programme to identify and explain the causes of the increased marine mortality of Atlantic salmon and to examine the possibilities to counteract the mortality. The Working Group should also advise on possible sources of funding for the research programme as well as how to organise it. The issue of by-catch in pelagic fisheries should be considered by the Group. It was agreed that the Working Group should meet in the autumn and that the Secretary should write to the Contracting Parties inviting nominations for the Group. The Council recognised the need to draw on existing information so as to avoid duplication of effort. In this regard the representative of Canada drew the attention of the Council to an upcoming scientific meeting in Halifax to investigate the possible causes of the high marine mortality.

6.7 **Impacts of Aquaculture on Wild Salmon Stocks**

(a) Special Liaison Meeting to Review Measures to Minimise Impacts of Aquaculture on the Wild Stocks

The Council held a Special Liaison Meeting at which there were presentations by the European Union on the measures taken to minimise the impacts of salmon aquaculture on the wild stocks. The presentations from this Special Liaison Meeting, CNL(00)49, CNL(00)51, CNL(00)52 and CNL(00)54, were made available to delegates. The representative of the European Union agreed to make all of the presentations available to the Secretariat, in a comprehensive form, by the autumn.

The Council confirmed that there would be a third Special Liaison Meeting on Aquaculture at its 2001 meeting with presentations by the United States of America, Iceland and the Faroe Islands.

(b) Report of the 1999 Special Liaison Meeting

The Council took note of a report of the 1999 Special Liaison Meeting at which there had been presentations by Canada and Norway, CNL(00)24. The Council agreed that the reports of the first and second Special Liaison Meetings should be made available to the Liaison Group.

(c) Returns made in Accordance with the Oslo Resolution

The Secretary presented a report, CNL(00)25 (Annex 16), on the returns made in accordance with Article 5 of the Oslo Resolution. The Council agreed that for subsequent returns it wished only to be advised of new measures and asked that the Secretary take this up with the Parties when requesting information for 2001.

(d) Liaison with the Salmon Farming Industry

The Chairman, Mr Andrew Thomson (EU), presented a report, CNL(00)26 (Annex 17), of the meeting of the Liaison Group between NASCO and the North Atlantic salmon farming industry, held in London on 10 and 11 February 2000. The Council welcomed this closer, more open and broader cooperation with the salmon farming industry and the commitment to work together on issues of mutual concern. The Council agreed:

- that the constitution for the Liaison Group was acceptable to NASCO;
- that the Chairman of the Liaison Group (if from the aquaculture industry side) be invited to attend future NASCO meetings;
- on the areas for discussion and cooperation at subsequent meetings as detailed in the report. Additionally, it was agreed that the Liaison Group should put NASCO's work on the Precautionary Approach on its agenda so that this can be taken into account in its future work;
- to hold a second meeting of the Liaison Group in North America in February 2001.

With regard to the Declaration detailing principles for cooperation between NASCO and the salmon farming industry in the North Atlantic, the Council felt that this should be seen as "Guiding Principles" or a "Statement of Objectives" rather than a "Declaration". The Council expressed the view that there was a lack of balance in the current wording, particularly that in paragraph 2.9. While there is a reference there to the benefits of aquaculture, there is no reference to its possible negative effects on the wild stocks. The risks of such negative effects were the reason for NASCO taking the initiative to establish the Liaison Group. In the Council's view, this imbalance would need to be adjusted. Furthermore, while the document refers to the North Atlantic salmon farming industry as NASFI, there is no such organization and this issue needed to be addressed. There was, therefore, a need for further consideration of the document at the next Liaison Group Meeting in February 2001 with these matters in mind.

(e) Development of Guidelines on Physical Containment and Husbandry Practices for Salmon Farming

The Council considered a report of the meeting of the Working Group to Develop Guidelines on Containment of Farmed Salmon, CNL(00)27 (Annex 18). A statement from the Chairman of the Working Group, Dr John Webster of the Scottish Salmon Producers' Organization, was read out. In this statement Dr Webster referred to the wide divergence of views expressed in the Working Group which had affected the final content of the guidelines to the extent that some would consider them to be a baseline standard. Dr Webster stated that he believed the industry in Scotland and elsewhere would be aiming to introduce significantly higher standards of containment than would result from implementation of the measures in the guidelines as drafted.

The Council welcomed the development of the draft guidelines but saw a need for further work to ensure that they would result in a higher standard of containment. As presently drafted they could only be considered to be a minimum standard. There was a need to include elements on monitoring, control and enforcement, and a requirement to adopt improved technology as this becomes available. The Council asked that these points be raised at the next meetings of the Liaison Group and of the Working Group to Develop Guidelines on the Containment of Farmed Salmon.

(f) Transgenic Salmon

At its Fourteenth Annual Meeting the Council had expressed its concerns about the risks posed by transgenic salmon and had adopted NASCO Guidelines for Action on Transgenic Salmon, designed to prevent impacts on the wild stocks. Under these guidelines the Parties agreed to advise the Council of any proposal to permit the rearing of transgenic salmonids, providing details of the proposed method of containment and other measures to safeguard the wild stocks. The Secretary reported, CNL(00)33 (Annex 19), that he had been advised by Canada that a company located in Eastern Canada is currently producing transgenic Atlantic salmon and rainbow trout

broodstock in a secure land-based facility. The Canadian Department of Fisheries and Oceans had not received any formal proposal for commercial rearing but if this should occur then the proposal would be thoroughly examined and a risk analysis performed as per the Fisheries Act and the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. The representative of the USA informed the Council of preliminary discussions between a company and the US Food and Drug Administration. He explained the permitting process which includes environmental analysis. He stated that the USA would keep NASCO informed of the permit process.

The Council recognised that while transgenic salmon are not presently being reared commercially, there is a need to consider this issue carefully under a Precautionary Approach. The Council therefore asked that when the Standing Committee on the Precautionary Approach considers the issue of introductions and transfers, it should also consider how the precautionary approach would apply to transgenic salmon.

6.8 **Atlantic Salmon Habitat Issues**

(a) Report of the Special Session held in 1999

The Council took note of a report of the Special Session on Habitat Issues held in 1999, CNL(00)28.

(b) Future Role of NASCO in relation to Habitat Issues

The Council considered a summary of the issues arising from the Special Session on Habitat Issues and the possible future role for NASCO, CNL(00)39 (Annex 20). The Council asked that this document be taken into account by the Standing Committee on the Precautionary Approach when it considers application of the Precautionary Approach to habitat issues.

6.9 **Predator-related Mortality**

The representative of Canada made a presentation and tabled a paper, CNL(00)48, on the effects of predators on Atlantic salmon. The Council noted that there is ongoing research on, and increasing understanding of, predator-related mortality.

6.10 **St Pierre et Miquelon Salmon Fisheries**

Last year, at the request of the North American Commission, the Council had asked the Secretary to write to the French authorities expressing concern about the increased level of salmon catches at St Pierre and Miquelon in 1998. The Secretary reported on these consultations, CNL(00)29 (Annex 21). The Council adopted a Resolution Concerning St Pierre and Miquelon, CNL(00)59 (Annex 22). In accordance with the Resolution the President will communicate through appropriate diplomatic channels to convey NASCO's concerns over the level of salmon harvest in St Pierre and Miquelon in 1998 and 1999, to urge France in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon to immediately set harvest limits for the 2000 salmon fishery at the lowest possible level

consistent with advice provided by ICES, and to request that information on the measures taken be made available to NASCO at its 2001 Annual Meeting.

The Council agreed that when the Resolution is transmitted to France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon) by the President, France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon) should be invited to attend the next annual meeting of NASCO, as an observer, to report on measures taken. The issue of whether to invite France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon) to become a Contracting Party to NASCO will be considered by the Council at its next annual meeting.

6.11 **Reports on Conservation Measures Taken by the Three Regional Commissions**

The Chairman of each of the three regional Commissions reported to the Council on their activities.

7. Other Business

7.1 There was no other business.

8. Date and Place of Next Meeting

8.1 The Council accepted an invitation to hold its Eighteenth Annual Meeting in Galicia, Spain, during 4-8 June 2001.

8.2 The Council agreed to hold its Nineteenth Annual Meeting from 3-7 June 2002, either in Edinburgh or elsewhere at the invitation of a Party.

9. Draft Report of the Meeting

9.1 The Council agreed the draft report of the meeting, CNL(00)37.

10. Draft Press Release

10.1 The Council adopted a press release, CNL(00)56 (Annex 23).

NOTE: The annexes mentioned above begin on page 27, following the French translation of the report of the meeting.

CNL(00)57

Compte rendu de la Dix-septième réunion annuelle du Conseil 5-9 juin 2000, Miramichi, Canada

1. Séance d'ouverture

1.1 Le Président, M. Einar Lemche, a ouvert la conférence, souhaité aux délégués la bienvenue à Miramichi et a prononcé une déclaration d'ouverture portant sur le travail de l'Organisation (annexe 1).

1.2 Les représentants du Canada, du Danemark (pour les îles Féroé et le Groenland), de l'Union européenne, de l'Islande, de la Norvège, de la Fédération de Russie, et des Etats-Unis d'Amérique ont prononcé leur déclaration d'ouverture (annexe 2).

1.3 Le représentant de la Commission des Poissons Anadromes du Pacifique Nord a prononcé une déclaration d'ouverture (annexe 3).

1.4 Les représentants des organisations non gouvernementales (ONG) présents à la réunion annuelle ont prononcé au nom de l'ensemble de ces organisations quatre déclarations d'ouverture. Les organismes ci-dessous ont également prononcé la leur : la Fédération du saumon atlantique, le Trust du saumon atlantique, l'Alliance européenne des pêcheurs à la ligne, la Fédération des pêcheurs à la ligne de saumons et de truites de mer d'Irlande, l'Association nationale représentant les pêcheurs à la ligne, le Syndicat des éleveurs et des agriculteurs norvégiens et les Rivières à saumons norvégiennes, et le WWF. Les déclarations figurent à l'annexe 4.

1.5 Le Président a exprimé sa reconnaissance aux Parties et aux organisations présentes en tant qu'observateurs pour leurs déclarations et a clos la séance d'ouverture.

1.6 Une liste des participants figure en annexe 5.

2. Adoption de l'ordre du jour

2.1 Le Conseil a adopté son ordre du jour, le document CNL(00)42 (annexe 6).

3. Elections des membres du comité directeur

Le Conseil a élu à l'unanimité M. Jacque Robichaud (Canada) en tant que Président et M. Eidur Gudnason (Islande) en tant que Vice-Président.

4. Questions administratives

4.1 Rapport du Secrétaire

Le Secrétaire a rendu compte au Conseil, de par son rapport CNL(00)6, des questions suivantes : état d'avancement des ratifications et des adhésions à la Convention, nombre des adhérents aux Commissions régionales, observateurs aux réunions de

l'OCSAN, programme d'encouragement au retour des marques, suivi de la onzième réunion-débat du CIEM, création du site web de l'OCSAN, état financier de l'Organisation, nouveaux textes fondamentaux de l'OCSAN, propriété du siège, et nouveau Parlement écossais.

Le Secrétaire a indiqué (CNL(00)32) qu'à la suite de la dernière réunion annuelle le titre d'observateur avait été accordé au World Wildlife Fund – US. La demande de statut d'observateur faite par le Global Aquaculture Alliance n'avait pas encore été acceptée. Le Conseil a alors décidé d'admettre cet organisme. En règle générale, les organisations vouées à l'aquaculture seraient admises en tant qu'observateurs a la condition qu'elles se plient aux règles s'adressant aux organisations non gouvernementales présentes à titre d'observateurs.

Conformément à l'article 5.5 du règlement financier, le Secrétaire a rendu compte des contributions versées pour 1999. Les Parties avaient toutes envoyé leurs contributions, à l'exception de la Fédération de Russie.

En ce qui concerne la proposition d'une réunion de l'OCSAN, la CPAPN et la CIPMB tenue conjointement, le Conseil a convenu que cette réunion devrait se limiter aux questions scientifiques. Elle pourrait par ailleurs coïncider avec celle de la CPAPN qui a lieu en mars 2002 et qui porte sur les questions de recherche, planification et coordination. A ce propos, le Secrétaire a été prié de rester en contact avec le Secrétaire de la CPAPN.

Le Conseil avait déjà reconnu qu'une réunion conjointe entre toutes les Commissions des pêcheries de l'Atlantique Nord, soit l'OCSAN, l'ICCAT, la CPANE et l'OPAN, faciliterait l'examen des questions d'intérêt mutuel, telles que l'approche préventive, les programmes de contrôle et d'application et la collecte des données. Ainsi, le Conseil a invité le Chef de la délégation de l'Union européenne et le Secrétaire à se mettre en rapport avec ces organismes en vue de fixer une réunion en l'an 2001 qui servirait de reunion préparatoire à une réunion conjointe en 2002.

Le Conseil a convenu de permettre au public d'accéder aux bases de données de l'Organisation par l'intermédiaire du site web de l'OCSAN d'où les informations pourraient être téléchargées. Il n'est toutefois pas prévu que ces bases de données soient disponibles dans un format interactif. Elles devront par ailleurs clairement indiquer la date de leur dernière mise à jour, et dans le cas de lois, règlements et programmes, il sera essentiel de souligner la nécessité d'une vérification des informations fournies auprès des autorités nationales appropriées.

4.2 Etude des rapports de l'OCSAN avec ses observateurs

Lors de sa réunion de 1999, le Conseil avait décidé d'étudier à nouveau la nature de ses relations avec les organismes présents en tant qu'observateurs, et d'envisager notamment l'introduction d'un tarif d'observateur proportionnel aux coûts réels. Le Secrétaire a présenté un avant-projet sur cette question, CNL(00)7. La participation des observateurs aux réunions de l'OCSAN s'était avéré d'un profit mutuel et avait amélioré la transparence de la coopération internationale dans le domaine de la conservation et gestion du saumon. Le Conseil a convenu que pour le moment il

n'imposerait pas de tarif et n'inviterait pas les organismes observateurs à verser de contributions volontaires.

Avant la Dix-septième réunion annuelle, certaines Parties signataires de l'OCSAN avaient été submergées de courriers électroniques multiples émanant d'une organisation non-gouvernementale. Le Conseil a déploré de telles méthodes qui entravent l'efficacité de la gestion des Parties et de l'Organisation. Le Conseil a décidé d'adopter la condition supplémentaire suivante concernant la présence des organisations non-gouvernementales présentes à titre d'observateurs à l'OCSAN :

« 7. Toute organisation non-gouvernementale qui ne respecterait pas ces conditions pourrait voir son statut d'observateur suspendu par le Conseil, et ce pour une ou plusieurs réunion(s). »

Le Conseil a décidé que le statut d'observateur des ONG devrait s'appliquer à toutes les séances plénières du Conseil et des Commissions, qu'elles aient lieu au cours de la Réunion annuelle ou au cours de réunions intermédiaires. Le statut d'observateur ne devrait cependant pas avoir d'application durant les réunions des groupes de travail et des comités de l'OCSAN.

La Norvège a proposé que la condition 4 visant les représentants des ONG soit amendée afin de leur permettre de se prononcer à tout moment, à la discrétion du Président du Conseil ou du Président d'une Commission. Cette question n'a pas fait l'unanimité des voix et le Conseil a ainsi convenu que la question des conditions régissant la participation des observateurs demeure à l'ordre du jour de la réunion suivante du Conseil.

Le représentant des Etats-Unis a indiqué que sa délégation appuierait la décision du Conseil prise à ce propos. Il a toutefois déclaré, pour le principe, que les Etats-Unis espéraient que les réunions de l'OCSAN soient toutes aussi ouvertes que possible.

4.3 Méthodes de calcul des contributions à l'OCSAN

L'an dernier la délégation d'Islande avait exprimé son inquiétude quant aux importantes modifications qui avaient eu lieu et qui avaient affecté le nombre de prises servant à calculer les contributions à l'OCSAN. Le Conseil avait demandé au Secrétaire de préparer un document de travail qui soumettrait une solution aux questions soulevées par l'Islande à propos du calcul des contributions sans toutefois amender la Convention. Le Secrétaire a brièvement présenté le document CNL(00)8. Celui-ci concluait qu'il semblerait difficile de calmer, sans amender la Convention, les inquiétudes de l'Islande concernant les effets de la réduction du nombre des Parties de l'OCSAN sur les contributions ainsi que les effets des paiements de compensation pour ne pas pêcher les quotas. A propos de l'exclusion du poisson de pacage marin, de l'intégration des captures non déclarées et de celle d'un élément pour les prises avec remise à l'eau des captures, il serait toutefois possible de régler ces questions sans amender la Convention à la condition que l'on tombe d'accord sur la signification de l'expression « prises nominales ».

Le représentant de l'Islande a présenté le document CNL(00)34. Celui-ci propose une révision du système de calcul du budget basée sur une définition plus large des prises

nominales. Cette définition engloberait, par exemple, l'ensemble des saumons manipulés par l'homme, hierarchisés selon la menace que ces poissons représentent envers les stocks sauvages, l'importance qu'ils revêtent pour la pêche à la ligne ou les stocks de reproduction ainsi que pour la précision des statistiques.

Le Conseil a convenu de demander au Secrétaire d'élaborer plusieurs scénarios, dont celui de la possibilité de captures très basses et celui d'une très haute proportion de captures avec remise à l'eau des prises. Les calculs pourraient aussi comprendre des exemples spécifiques de ce qui se passerait si l'on modifiait les proportions fixes ou liées aux prises de la Convention. Le Conseil a prié le Secrétaire de distribuer ces divers scénarios aux Parties avant la fin de l'année.

4.4 Rapport de la Commission financière et administrative

Le Président de la Commission financière et administrative, Dr. Jean-Pierre Plé, a présenté le rapport de la Commission, CNL(00)9. Suite aux recommandations de celle-ci, le Conseil a pris les décisions suivantes :

(a) accepter la déclaration financière révisée de 1999, FAC(00)3 ;

(b) adopter un budget pour 2001 et prendre acte du budget prévisionnel pour 2002, CNL(00)53 (annexe 7) ;

(c) permettre que tout surplus budgétaire de fin d'exercice soit crédité au Fond de stabilisation. Pour faciliter cette opération, le Conseil a convenu de modifier la dernière phrase de l'article 6.3 du règlement financier afin de lire :

« Tout surplus dépassant 60 000 livres sterling sera crédité, sauf si le Conseil en décide autrement, au Fond de stabilisation jusqu'à ce que ce dernier atteigne 250 000 livres sterling. ».

(d) nommer PricewaterhouseCoopers d'Edimbourg, vérificateur des comptes pour l'an 2000 ;

(e) adopter le rapport de la Commission financière et administrative.

Le Conseil a décidé de ne pas accepter pour l'instant de donations de la part des Parties non signataires et des ONG.

Le Président a remercié le Dr. Plé de son excellent travail et de celui de la Commission.

4.5 Rapports sur les activités de l'Organisation

Le Conseil a adopté le rapport sur les activités de 1999 de l'Organisation, CNL(00)10, adressé aux Parties conformément à l'article 5, paragraphe 6 de la Convention.

4.6 Annonce du gagnant du Grand Prix du Programme d'encouragement au retour des marques

Le Président a annoncé que le tirage au sort du Programme avait été effectué par le Commissaire aux Comptes, au siège de l'OCSAN, le 24 mai. Le gagnant du Grand Prix de 2 500 $ est M. Bob Ritchie, de Montrose, en Ecosse. Le Conseil a félicité le gagnant.

5. Questions scientifiques, techniques, juridiques et autres

5.1 Recommandations scientifiques du CIEM

Le représentant du CIEM a présenté au Conseil le rapport du Comité Consultatif sur la Gestion des Pêcheries (CCGP), CNL(00)12 (annexe 8).

5.2 Compte rendu du Comité scientifique permanent

Le Président du Comité a présenté une demande provisoire de recommandations scientifiques au CIEM. Fort de cet avis, le Conseil a adopté une demande de recommandations scientifiques au CIEM, CNL(00)60 (annexe 9).

5.3 Statistiques de captures et analyses

Le Secrétaire a présenté un document statistique portant sur les déclarations de captures officielles effectuées par les Parties en 1999, CNL(00)14 (annexe 10), et sur les données historiques pour la période 1960-1999, CNL(00)15. Les statistiques de 1999 sont provisoires et seront mises à jour par les Parties.

5.4 Revue des publications internationales portant sur le saumon parues en 1999

Le Conseil a pris acte d'un document synthétique des publications portant sur le saumon atlantique parues en 1999, CNL(00)16. Celui-ci avait été rédigé conformément à l'article 13, paragraphe 2 de la Convention.

6. Conservation, restauration, mise en valeur et gestion rationnelle des stocks de saumons

6.1 Mesures prises au titre des articles 14 et 15 de la Convention

Le Secrétaire a présenté un compte rendu sur les renvois effectués au terme des articles 14 et 15 de la Convention, CNL(00)17 (annexe 11). Le représentant des Etats-Unis a expliqué les raisons pour lesquelles ils proposaient de faire figurer le segment spécifique du saumon atlantique du Maine à la liste des espèces en danger régie par la loi. Il a par ailleurs indiqué les implications qu'une telle initiative entraînerait. Le représentant de l'Union européenne a souligné pour sa part qu'il mettrait les informations à ce sujet provenant des autres états membres à la disposition du Secrétariat.

6.2 **L'approche préventive dans le cadre de la gestion du saumon**

(a) *Rapport du Comité permanent de l'approche préventive portant sur l'application d'une approche préventive à la gestion des pêcheries de saumons*

Le Comité permanent chargé de la question de l'approche préventive (CPAP), établi en 1999 conformément au Programme d'actions du Conseil afin de faciliter la mise en place d'une approche préventive, a tenu sa première réunion à Miami en Floride du 21 au 23 mars 2000. La réunion portait sur l'application de l'approche préventive à la gestion des pêcheries de saumons nord-atlantiques. Le Président, le Dr. Andrew Rosenberg (Etats-Unis), a présenté le rapport du Comité, CNL(00)18 (annexe 12). Il s'agissait ici de la première réunion du Comité et le CPAP avait convenu qu'il serait bon d'étudier plus amplement les principes-guides s'adressant à chaque aspect de l'application de l'approche préventive avant de procéder à la définition de mandats spécifiques à la gestion des pêcheries de saumons nord-atlantiques. Le rapport comprenait quelques commentaires généraux sur l'interprétation de ces principes-guides et des définitions-guides des termes employés dans le domaine de la gestion des pêcheries de saumons. Il contenait aussi une structure de décisions à prendre par le Conseil et les Commissions de l'OCSAN ainsi que par les autorités appropriées chargées de la gestion des pêcheries à stock unique ou mixtes.

Le Conseil a approuvé les définitions et a adopté provisoirement la structure proposée pour les décisions à prendre dans le cadre de la gestion des pêcheries à stock unique ou mixte, en attendant l'évaluation détaillée qui se déroulera au cours des deux prochaines années. Il a été convenu que les Commissions de l'OCSAN examineraient cette structure au cours de leurs propres réunions et que chaque Partie signataire la mettrait en application sur un ensemble de rivières comportant différents niveaux de stock et soumises à différentes politiques de gestion. Les Parties signataires seraient tenues de faire parvenir un rapport au CPAP au cours du printemps 2002 afin de permettre une évaluation approfondie de ladite structure.

Le Conseil a également demandé au Secrétaire de préparer un document qui recouvrerait, sous une seule couverture, l'Accord de l'adoption de l'approche préventive, le Programme d'actions pour la mise en application d'une approche préventive, la Structure de décisions et les Définitions. Il serait également bon de mettre ce document à la disposition du public à partir du site web de l'Organisation.

(b) Mesures à prendre à l'avenir dans le cadre de l'application de l'approche préventive à la gestion du saumon

Le Secrétaire a présenté le document CNL(00)30 qui décrit les prochaines étapes éventuelles à franchir dans le cadre de l'application de l'approche préventive.

Le Conseil a décidé d'envisager en premier :

(i) l'application de l'approche préventive à la protection et restauration de l'habitat ;

(ii) l'application de l'approche préventive aux questions socio-économiques.

Le Conseil a adopté un mandat pour le point (i), CNL(00)58 (annexe 13).

Quant au point (ii), le Conseil a convenu que les Parties signataires seraient invitées à fournir toutes informations et suggestions appropriées sur les implications des questions socio-économiques sur l'application de l'approche préventive. Ces informations et tout autre renseignement en rapport serviront au CPAP à définir le mandat du point (ii).

Il est envisagé que ces tâches soient toutes deux remplies lors d'une réunion du CPAP devant avoir lieu, conjointement avec la prochaine réunion du groupe de liaison, en février 2001.

6.3 Captures non déclarées

Lors de la réunion de 1998, le Conseil avait prié le Secrétaire d'obtenir annuellement des Parties signataires les informations suivantes :

1) une description du contrôle de gestion et des systèmes de compte rendu par pays ;
2) une explication de la méthode par laquelle elles arrivaient au nombre de captures non déclarées ;
3) le volume de la pêche avec remise à l'eau des captures ;
4) les mesures prises afin de réduire encore plus le niveau des captures non déclarées.

En 1999, le Conseil a convenu que dorénavant on demanderait également aux Parties d'estimer les captures non déclarées pour chaque pays. Le total pour l'ensemble des pays devrait être ventilé par différents types de captures non déclarées, indiquant si celles-ci proviennent d'activités légales ou illégales. Le Secrétaire a présenté le document CNL(00)19 (annexe 14) contenant les informations fournies par les Parties. Ces renvois d'information indiquaient que, même si chacune des Parties déployait des efforts considérables pour obtenir des statistiques détaillées et exactes sur les prises, les captures non déclarées se situaient toujours en 1999 entre 917-1 160 tonnes (le total des captures déclarées s'élevait à 2 218 tonnes). Bien que ceci ne soit pas le cas dans tous les pays, la pêche illégale semble contribuer grandement au niveau des captures non déclarées qui continue à être élevé.

Le Conseil a accueilli favorablement les informations contenues dans le document CNL(00)19 qui présentait les faits avec transparence. Le niveau élevé des captures non déclarées continuait à susciter des inquiétudes. Le Conseil a ainsi souligné le besoin de prendre des initiatives plus fortes afin de minimiser le niveau de ces captures. La Norvège et la Russie avait fourni une ventilation de leurs prises non

déclarées par catégorie. Le Conseil a prié le Secrétaire de demander à chacune des Parties d'ajouter, à leur renvoi d'informations de l'année prochaine, une ventilation de leurs captures déclarées. Ce renseignement pourrait en effet être utile lors de l'étude des mesures à prendre pour réduire les captures non déclarées.

Le représentant des Etats-Unis a présenté un programme d'action international préliminaire visant à éviter, décourager et éliminer la pêche illégale, non déclarée et échappant au règlement. Ce programme avait été mis au point par des experts de la F.A.O., CNL(00)40. Le Conseil a accueilli favorablement cette initiative bien que ce programme ait été conçu pour les zones de haute mer et que les captures de saumons non déclarées s'effectuaient en eaux territoriales. Le programme d'action sera étudié d'une façon plus approfondie lors de la prochaine réunion du Comité des pêcheries de la F.A.O. Le Secrétaire a été prié de suivre les progrès de cette initiative.

Le représentant de l'Union européenne a présenté des détails significatifs de mesures prises en Angleterre et au Pays de Galles afin de réduire les captures illégales de saumons, CNL(00)44. Parmi ces mesures figure un publipostage destiné aux poissonniers, hôteliers et restaurateurs visant à accroître la prise de conscience générale de la loi, avec un suivi effectué par des inspecteurs.

6.4 Prises accidentelles de saumons atlantiques

Lors de la Quatorzième réunion annuelle, l'attention du Conseil avait été attirée sur le fait que la pêche aux espèces pélagiques dans la zone de la Commission de l'Atlantique du Nord-Eest avait énormément augmenté, surtout dans le cas du hareng et du maquereau dans la division IIa du CIEM. Le fait que les pertes en saumon pouvaient être considérables, même si les saumons post smolts ne représentaient qu'un faible pourcentage des captures dans ces pêcheries, avait en effet suscité des inquiétudes. Selon l'information fournie par le CIEM, la pêcherie au filet au maquereau représenterait le plus grand danger de récolte de post smolts. Le CIEM a indiqué qu'une simple mesure de précaution pourrait être instituée contre les captures de posts smolts au cours des pêches commerciales en exigeant que l'haussière des filets pélagiques se trouve à un minimum de 5 m sous la surface.

L'année dernière, le Conseil avait accepté la nécessité de plus amples renseignements sur la possibilité de prises accidentelles de saumons dans les pêches pélagiques et avait demandé que les Parties signataires fournissent toutes les informations qu'elles avaient à leur disposition. Le Secrétaire a signalé, CNL(00)20, que les Parties n'avaient envoyé aucune information. Le représentant des Etats-Unis a fait allusion à des comptes rendus de prises accidentelles de saumons atlantiques au large de la côte ouest d'Irlande. Celles-ci ont eu lieu au cours d'une pêcherie au thon albacore au chalut. Le représentant de l'Union européenne a déclaré qu'il n'avait aucune information spécifique à ce sujet, mais qu'il s'efforcerait d'obtenir des renseignements pour la prochaine réunion annuelle.

Le Conseil a convenu que la question des prises accidentelles devrait être examinée par le Groupe de travail, tel qu'il est mentionné au paragraphe 6.6 plus bas.

6.5 **Pêche au saumon effectuée en eaux internationales par les Parties non signataires**

Le Secrétaire a présenté le rapport CNL(00)21 décrivant les mesures prises dans le cadre de la Résolution sur la pêche au saumon en haute mer. Aucun navire n'avait été détecté depuis février 1994, mais il fallait noter qu'il n'y avait eu que peu de vols de surveillance au cours des périodes hivernale et printanière. Le Conseil a prié le Secrétaire de rester en contact avec l'OPANO et la CPANE en vue d'obtenir des renseignements sur les détections. Le Secrétaire a également été prié de prendre les mesures nécessaires dans l'éventualité de toute détection à venir.

6.6 **Pêche à des fins scientifiques dans la zone de la Convention**

Le Secrétaire a présenté le document CNL(00)22 résumant les mesures prises depuis la dernière réunion annuelle. A la suite de la Seizième réunion annuelle, le Secrétaire avait reçu une lettre de la part des ONG présentes à cette réunion qui faisait référence au problème de faible survie en mer, à la question des coûts élevés de la recherche portant sur les facteurs affectant le saumon dans le milieu marin et au besoin d'une coopération internationale dans ce domaine.

Le Conseil a étudié la proposition CNL(00)43 (annexe 15) visant à établir un programme de recherche internationale reposant sur la coopération et qui serait subventionné par les Parties. Le Conseil a convenu de former un Groupe de travail, présidé par la Norvège, qui formulerait des propositions en vue d'élaborer un programme d'identification et d'explications des causes de l'augmentation de la mortalité du saumon en mer et d'examiner comment pallier ce problème. Le Groupe de travail aurait également pour mandat d'apporter ses recommandations sur les différentes sources de subvention du programme de recherche et sur la façon d'organiser cette subvention. Le Groupe devrait par ailleurs examiner la question des prises accidentelles effectuées dans les pêcheries pélagiques. Il a été convenu que le Groupe de travail se rencontre en automne et que le Secrétaire écrive aux Parties signataires les invitant à proposer des nominations pour constituer le Groupe. Le Conseil a reconnu la nécessité de tirer parti des données existantes afin d'éviter de dupliquer les efforts. A ce propos, le représentant du Canada a attiré l'attention du Conseil sur une réunion scientifique qui se tiendrait prochainement à Halifax pour étudier les causes éventuelles du haut niveau de la mortalité marine.

6.7 **Effets de l'aquaculture sur les stocks de saumons sauvages**

(a) Réunion spéciale de liaison visant à examiner les mesures prises en vue deminimiser les effets nuisibles de l'aquaculture sur les stocks de saumons sauvages

Le Conseil a tenu une réunion spéciale de liaison durant laquelle l'Union européenne avait présenté des comptes rendus sur les mesures prises pour minimiser les effets de l'aquaculture du saumon sur les stocks sauvages. Les documents émanant de cette présentation, CNL(00)49, CNL(00)51, CNL(00)52 et CNL(00)54 ont été mis à la disposition des délégués. Le représentant de l'Union européenne a convenu de faire parvenir au Secrétariat, d'ici l'automne, l'ensemble de ces présentations dans leur intégrité.

Le Conseil a confirmé qu'une troisième réunion spéciale de liaison sur l'aquaculture aurait lieu lors de la réunion de 2001 et que les présentations proviendraient cette fois-ci des Etats-Unis d'Amérique, de l'Islande et des Iles Féroé.

(b) Compte rendu de la Réunion spéciale de liaison de 1999

Le Conseil a pris acte du compte rendu de la réunion spéciale de liaison de 1999 au cours de laquelle le Canada et la Norvège avaient fait des présentations, CNL(00)24. Le Conseil a convenu de mettre à la disposition du Groupe de liaison les comptes rendus des première et seconde Réunion spéciales de liaison.

(c) Renvois réalisés dans le cadre de la Résolution d'Oslo

Le Secrétaire a présenté le rapport, CNL(00)25 (annexe 16), sur les renvois réalisés conformément à l'article 5 de la Résolution d'Oslo. Le Conseil a décidé qu'il ne désirait désormais être informé que des nouvelles mesures prises et a prié le Secrétaire d'en faire part aux Parties au moment où il rassemblerait les données pour 2001.

(d) Liaison avec l'industrie salmonicole

Le Président, M. Andrew Thomson (UE), a présenté le compte rendu CNL(00)26 (annexe 17) de la réunion du Groupe de liaison OCSAN/éleveurs de l'Atlantique Nord tenue à Londres du 10 au 11 février 2000. Le Conseil a accueilli favorablement cette coopération plus étroite avec l'industrie salmonicole ainsi que l'engagement à oeuvrer ensemble sur des questions d'intérêt mutuel. Le Conseil a convenu :

- que la constitution du Groupe de liaison était acceptable à l'OCSAN ;
- que le Président du Groupe de liaison (s'il émanait de l'industrie aquacole) soit invité à participer aux réunions futures de l'OCSAN ;
- des sujets de discussion et aires de coopération pour ses réunions futures, tels que décrits dans le compte rendu. En outre, il a été convenu que le Groupe de liaison inclue le travail de l'OCSAN sur l'approche préventive à son ordre du jour de façon à ce que cet aspect soit pris en considération dans sa mission ;
- de tenir une deuxième réunion du Groupe de liaison en février 2001 en Amérique du Nord.

En ce qui concernait la Déclaration définissant les principes de coopération entre l'OCSAN et l'industrie salmonicole dans l'Atlantique Nord, le Conseil a été d'avis que ceci devrait être envisagé comme « Principes guides » ou « Déclaration d'objectifs » plutôt que simplement comme « Déclaration ». Le Conseil a par ailleurs exprimé l'opinion que le texte actuel était partial, surtout au niveau du paragraphe 2.9. Bien que l'on y fasse mention des bénéfices de l'aquaculture, aucune référence n'a été faite des effets potentiellement nuisibles sur les stocks sauvages. Or, le danger de tels effets nuisibles

constituait la raison pour laquelle l'OCSAN avait pris l'initiative de former un Groupe de liaison. Il fallait donc, selon le Conseil, redresser ce déséquilibre. De plus, le document se réfèrait au secteur de l'élevage du saumon Nord Atlantique sous le sigle de NASFI. Or cet organisme n'existait pas. Cette question était donc également à régler. Un nouvel examen dudit document lors de la prochaine réunion du groupe de liaison en février 2001, était par conséquent amplement justifié.

(e) Elaboration d'orientations sur le confinement physique et les pratiques d'élevage du saumon

Le Conseil a étudié un compte rendu de la réunion du Groupe de travail établi pour élaborer des orientations sur le confinement du saumon d'élevage, CNL(00)27 (annexe 18). La déclaration du Président du Groupe de travail, le Dr. John Webster, de l'organisme des producteurs de saumons d'Ecosse, a été lue. Dans cette déclaration, le Dr. Webster soulignait combien les opinions divergeaient au sein du Groupe de travail, une situation qui avait affecté le contenu final des orientations au point où certains ne les envisageaient maintenant que comme normes minimales. Selon le Dr. Webster, le secteur aquacole en Ecosse, comme ailleurs, tendrait à introduire des normes de confinement beaucoup plus sûres que ce qui résulterait de l'application des mesures suggérées par les orientations.

Le Conseil a accueilli favorablement l'élaboration de l'avant projet d'orientations, mais a accepté qu'un travail supplémentaire était nécessaire pour garantir que ces orientations aboutissent à un niveau plus sûr de confinement. Dans leur forme actuelle, elles ne pouvaient qu'être envisagées comme normes minimales. Il importait d'inclure des éléments portant sur la surveillance, le contrôle et la mise en application et d'exiger l'adoption des technologies modernes au fur et à mesure où celles-ci devenait disponibles. Le Conseil a demandé que ces points soient soulevés au cours des prochaines réunions du Groupe de liaison et du Groupe de travail chargé d'élaborer des orientations sur le confinement du saumon d'élevage.

(f) Saumon transgénique

Lors de sa Quatorzième réunion annuelle, le Conseil avait exprimé ses préoccupations quant aux risques posés par le saumon transgénique et avait adopté les orientations de l'OCSAN recommandant l'application de mesures concernant le saumon transgénique, conçues pour éviter les effets nuisibles sur les stocks sauvages. Selon ces orientations, les Parties avaient convenu d'informer le Conseil de toute proposition qui permettrait l'élevage de salmonidés transgéniques, donnant les détails de la méthode de confinement prévue et des autres mesures prises pour protéger les stocks sauvages. Le Secrétaire a signalé, CNL(00)33 (annexe 19), que le Canada l'avait informé qu'une société implantée à l'Est du Canada produisait actuellement des stocks de reproducteurs de saumons et truites arc-en-ciel transgéniques dans des installations sur terre sûres. Le Ministère des Pêches et des Océans du Canada n'avait cependant pas reçu de proposition formelle d'élevage commercial. Si toutefois une proposition leur parvenait, elle serait examinée en détail et une

analyse des risques serait faite conformément aux lois du Canada régissant les pêcheries et la Protection de l'environnement. Le représentant des Etats-Unis a informé le Conseil des discussions préliminaires ayant eu lieu entre une société et l'Administration américaine de l'Alimentation et de l'industrie pharmaceutique (US Food and Drug Administration). Il a expliqué que le processus d'autorisation comprenait une analyse des effets sur l'environnement. Il a déclaré que les Etats-Unis tiendraient l'OCSAN au courant du résultat du processus d'autorisation.

Le Conseil a reconnu que, même si les saumons transgéniques ne sont pas actuellement produits à l'échelle commerciale, il importait d'étudier cette question de très près dans le cadre de l'approche préventive. Le Conseil a par conséquent demandé que le Comité permanent chargé de l'approche préventive étudie comment l'approche préventive s'appliquerait au saumon transgénique, lors de son étude de la question des introductions et transferts.

6.8 **Questions concernant l'habitat du saumon atlantique**

(a) Compte rendu de la réunion spéciale tenue en 1999

Le Conseil a pris acte d'un compte rendu de la réunion spéciale tenue en 1999 qui portait sur les questions d'habitat, CNL(00)28.

(b) Les questions d'habitat et le rôle de l'OCSAN à l'avenir

Le Conseil a examiné une synthèse des questions émanant de la Séance spéciale portant sur les questions d'habitat et du rôle de l'OCSAN à l'avenir, CNL(00)39 (annexe 20). Le Conseil a demandé que ce document soit pris en considération par le Comité permanent chargé de l'approche préventive au cours de son étude de l'application de ce type d'approche à la question d'habitat.

6.9 **Mortalité liée aux prédateurs**

Le représentant du Canada a fait un exposé et a présenté le document CNL(00)48 traitant des effets des prédateurs du saumon atlantique. Le Conseil a pris note du fait que la recherche dans ce domaine était continue et que l'on avait désormais une meilleure compréhension de la mortalité liée aux prédateurs.

6.10 **Pêcheries au saumon de St Pierre et Miquelon**

L'année dernière, à la demande de la Commission Nord Américaine, le Conseil avait prié le Secrétaire d'écrire aux autorités françaises pour exprimer l'inquiétude que suscitait l'augmentation du niveau de captures de saumons à St. Pierre et Miquelon en 1998. Le Secrétaire a rendu compte de ces consultations, CNL(00)29 (annexe 21). Le Conseil a adopté une Résolution concernant St. Pierre et Miquelon, CNL(00)59 (annexe 22). Conformément à cette dernière, le Président utilisera les voies diplomatiques appropriées pour exprimer les inquiétudes de l'OCSAN à propos du niveau de la récolte de saumons à St. Pierre et Miquelon en 1998 et 1999, pour inciter vivement la France (pour St. Pierre et Miquelon) à fixer immédiatement des limites de

récolte pour la pêcherie au saumon de l'an 2000 aussi basses que possible – en accord avec les recommandations fournies par le CIEM – et pour enfin demander que les informations sur les mesures prises soient mises à la disposition de l'OCSAN au cours de sa Réunion annuelle de 2001.

Le Conseil a convenu que le Président transmettrait ladite Résolution à la France (pour St. Pierre et Miquelon). Celle-ci serait alors invitée à participer à la prochaine réunion annuelle de l'OCSAN en tant qu'observateur, afin de rendre compte des mesures prises. La question de savoir si la France (pour St. Pierre et Miquelon) devrait être invitée à devenir une Partie signataire de l'OCSAN sera examinée par le Conseil lors de sa prochaine réunion annuelle.

6.11 **Comptes rendus sur les initiatives de conservation prises par les trois Commissions régionales**

Le Président de chacune des trois Commissions régionales a soumis au Conseil un compte rendu de leurs activités.

7. Divers

7.1 Aucune autre question n'a été traitée.

8. Date et lieu de la prochaine réunion

8.1 Le Conseil a accepté l'invitation de tenir sa Dix-huitième réunion annuelle en Galice en Espagne, du 4 au 8 juin 2001.

8.2 Le Conseil a convenu de tenir sa Dix-neuvième réunion annuelle du 3 au 7 juin 2002, à Edimbourg ou à tout autre endroit qui soit, à l'invitation de l'une des Parties.

9. Compte rendu préliminaire de la réunion

9.1 Le Conseil a adopté le compte rendu préliminaire de la réunion, CNL(00)37.

10. Communiqué de presse préliminaire

10.1 Le Conseil a approuvé le communiqué de presse, CNL(00)56 (annexe 23).

ANNEX 1

Opening Statement made by the President

Ladies and Gentlemen,

First I want to welcome you all to our Annual Meeting here by this beautiful river, the Miramichi. As you know, we have adopted a policy of trying to meet as close as possible to the salmon. I doubt that we will ever find it possible to be quite as close as we are here, and I want to express, on behalf of the Organization, our sincere thanks to our Canadian hosts for the arrangements made. I would also like to thank you in advance for the hospitality you have arranged for us, which is very much appreciated. We are really looking forward to the next few days.

Let me just mention some of the issues that we have to tackle here. First, of course, we have already held a Special Liaison Meeting yesterday on Measures to Minimise Impacts of Aquaculture on Wild Stocks. Our colleagues from the European Union gave us an excellent summary of what is going on. We will, of course, come back to the issue of impacts of aquaculture in the Council this week when we consider how to handle the Report of the Liaison Group Meeting between NASCO and the North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry. We need to consider the proposal for a cooperative agreement and whether we feel that it meets our needs. We also need to consider the other outcome of the Liaison Meeting, a draft code of containment, and whether that is also adequate to meet our concerns.

One of the central issues from the last couple of meetings has been how we can adopt the use of the Precautionary Approach in our work. Last year we agreed a very useful Action Plan and this year we can see the first fruits of that plan in the shape of the report of our Standing Committee, which makes recommendations on how the Precautionary Approach might be applied to management of salmon fisheries. This Committee also looked further at the interpretation of the guiding principles of the Precautionary Approach. We will need to consider this report very carefully and decide if, and how, we can implement and carry forward its findings. I would, of course, remind you that the Precautionary Approach applies both to the work of NASCO and to that of its Contracting Parties. But this is only the first step in implementation. We have two or three more topics on our Precautionary Approach production line. One is Introductions, Transfers and Aquaculture. Another is Socio-economics. And another is Habitat. These will all be complex and this week we will need to put into place the next steps to get one or more of these topics on the move.

There are many other subjects on our agenda: our scientific advice, regulatory measures, unreported catches, relations with our observer organizations, by-catch, predator-related mortality and habitat. What is more, this is my last meeting as President and we must elect a new President and Vice-President.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I believe that we have a full and interesting few days ahead of us. We are in a situation of very low abundance for salmon stocks and, in spite of all the sacrifices we have made, the salmon do not seem to be responding. It would not be an exaggeration to describe the present situation as a crisis for the wild stocks. We may also, without intending to, be changing the genetic structure and diversity of the stocks. In this situation our work, particularly on the Precautionary Approach and on our relations with salmon aquaculture, is of vital importance to the future of the species.

I would now like to give the floor to the Parties for Opening Remarks and, as last year I started at the end of the alphabet, I will start this year at the beginning with our hosts, Canada.

ANNEX 2

Opening Statements made by the Parties

Opening Statement made by Canada

Mr. President, distinguished Delegates, Observers, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Mes amis, bienvenue à Miramichi! Welcome to Miramichi! For the first time in seventeen years, NASCO is having its annual meeting in Canada. I think that it is particularly inspiring to meet here on the banks of the Miramichi River. Indeed, as we embark on our work to fulfil NASCO's mission of "promoting the conservation, restoration, enhancement, and rational management of salmon stocks in the North Atlantic Ocean through international cooperation", we should all pause at some point during the week and take a good look at the Miramichi River in order to remind ourselves that, in the end, this is where our deeds are felt, in rivers like Miramichi all around the North Atlantic.

For me, the Miramichi meeting is sort of a coming home. I was stationed very near here at the Chatham Military Base close to 30 years ago at the beginning of my career at her Majesty's service! And it is here in Miramichi that my civil service comes to a close or full circle, I should, perhaps, say. I will be retiring right after the NASCO meeting. While I welcome the opportunity to add a little leisure to my life in the form of golfing, and skiing, my new challenges will include commercial flying and land developing in Prince Edward Island. I will make the precautionary approach my motto! I am confident that you will provide my successor, Mr. David Bevan, with the same congenial and steady support that you have provided me as head of the Canadian delegation.

How is the Atlantic salmon doing here in Canada? In truth, the status of Atlantic salmon continues to be of concern throughout Atlantic Canada. While we are pleased to see some rivers exceed their spawning requirements other are weak for a number of reasons, some of which are easily defined. For example, the production of salmon from Nova Scotia rivers is still severely impacted by acid rain. In other cases, low survival at sea, for reasons unknown, accounts for the poor adult returns. Generally, juvenile levels in the rivers, and smolt migration out of the rivers, remain at healthy levels; it is their survival at sea that has declined in recent years. Why is that? This is a question that NASCO and all Contracting Parties must come to grips with, and sooner rather than later.

What options do fisheries managers have to respond efficiently when faced with all this uncertainty as regards salmon stocks? In Canada, we have tried to tailor our actions to the specifics of a given area. In sum, we have tried to be flexible while striving for an overall precautionary approach.

Indeed, in Quebec, a multi-year plan (2000-2005) is being implemented and the last commercial salmon fishery was closed following the 1999 season. In what we refer to as the Scotia/Fundy area, a recovery plan is being developed for the Inner Bay of Fundy. As well, we are continuing in our application of the precautionary approach to management and developing a multi-year plan that will come into effect during 2001-2005 for the Scotia Fundy area. In the New Brunswick portion of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, we are adjusting measures (prior to and in-season) to reflect river-specific conservation risks in keeping with a precautionary approach. We are entering the second year of a three-year plan in Newfoundland and Labrador which features a river classification system for insular Newfoundland that is responsive to rivers with healthy populations, while addressing conservation concerns on other rivers. Similarly, the commercial fisheries remain closed and similar strict conservation measures to 1998 are in effect.

For Canada, a precautionary approach is paramount to salmon management at both domestic and international levels. And NASCO is to be commended for its leadership in tackling this difficult concept almost from the moment of its emergence on the international fisheries management scene. Last year, NASCO Parties adopted the *Action Plan for Implementation of a Precautionary Approach to Salmon Management* and, as you know, the first subject to be tackled by the Standing Committee was the application of the precautionary approach to salmon fisheries management at an inter-sessional meeting held in March 2000. This was not an easy task but participants proceeded methodically, for example, clarifying the roles of managers and scientists, and discussing the interplay between biological factors and socio-economic factors. In the end, the Standing Committee agreed on a *Decision Structure,* successfully moving from "theory to practice". The Canadian delegation will enthusiastically support the finalization of the report of the Standing Committee.

As well, we will be discussing and agreeing on next areas of focus for the advancement of the Precautionary Approach.

In our desire to increase our knowledge of all causes affecting salmon health, Canada has requested that predation be added to the Council's agenda. NASCO's last session dealing with the issue of predators and prey of Atlantic salmon was held in Goteborg, Sweden, in 1996. Needless to say that four years is an eternity when it comes to science. Perhaps we will be able to identify certain common problems as well as areas where research is needed.

An area where NASCO has made great progress in the past year is the work of the NASCO/North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry Liaison Group. I attended the London meeting of the Liaison Group in February. As with every new structure, the first steps were hesitant, but by the end of the meeting it had been replaced by the fresh air of mutual trust and respect. I am confident that this spirit of cooperation between NASCO and the farmed salmon industry is just the beginning. In fact, the Working Group, tasked by the Liaison Group to develop Guidelines on containment, met in Brussels in early April and a progress report will be reviewed at this session. Let's continue to work together to ensure progress in areas such as containment.

Our agenda for the week is full. Let us not forget the social events complementing the meeting. In this regard, I would like to thank Mr. David Dunn and his team, as well as the many partners associated with the various events. I hope that many of you will be able to do the Salmon Study Tour at the end of the week. You will have the opportunity to hear the Canadian Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Mr. Herb Dhaliwal, at the banquet on Wednesday night. I hope the week's activities surpass your expectations.

Let us try to be proactive, practical and, above all, global in our approach to the work that lies ahead. Let us be faithful to NASCO's mission of "promoting the conservation, restoration, enhancement, and rational management of salmon stocks in the North Atlantic Ocean through international cooperation."

Thank you.

Opening Statement made by Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Mr. President, Distinguished Delegates, Observers, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a great pleasure to be here in Miramichi for the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of NASCO.

It is always a pleasure to be here in Canada, a country with which we have a long tradition of fisheries co-operation.

The people of the Faroe Islands and Greenland are heavily dependent upon the living resources of the ocean. Thus the socio-economic impact from fisheries management decisions is considerable. Also the salmon fisheries are important to our people.

Hopefully, this Seventeenth Annual Meeting of NASCO will bring us a step forward in strengthening regional co-operation in the North Atlantic on the management of our common salmon resources. Among the issues before us are the impact of aquaculture upon wild salmon stocks, and the implementation of the Precautionary Approach.

When Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and later also for Greenland) ratified the NASCO Convention, these two fishing communities had for many years been harvesting the salmon resources present in their waters. The decision to join NASCO was taken because we saw it as a framework for co-operation with other countries with salmon interests to our mutual benefit. The first sacrifice we made as far as the Faroes is concerned was the acceptance of the ban on fishing outside of 200 nautical miles – a step which made the fishery less flexible and therefore less economic. On the other hand the Salmon Convention explicitly recognises the right of the Faroese and the Greenlanders to fish for salmon in their respective fisheries jurisdictions, in order to collect their rightful 'grazing fee' for the salmon feeding in their waters. Since the early eighties the Faroese salmon quota has been reduced by approximately 70 percent, and the Greenland quota by even more. In practice these two fisheries have been negligible during the last decade, in the Faroese case partly due to compensation for non-utilisation of allocated quotas. During the last decade these two NASCO-regulated fisheries combined have been reduced from 10% to less than 1% last year of the total catches of all NASCO members.

Those who professed to believe that the problem for the salmon in the homewater rivers was the ocean fisheries in the Faroes and Greenland should be satisfied by now. They would have expected a considerable improvement in the state of the stocks. As we can see from the ICES reports, real life is not that simple. In fact it is impossible to detect any significant effect upon the stocks from the sacrifices we have made. The picture varies, not least due to the vast amount of unreported catches, on average amounting to 32% and in extreme cases reaching up to 70% of the total estimated national catch. Most, if not all, relevant salmon stocks are today in a less healthy shape than when we founded NASCO and embarked upon the successive reductions in the Faroese and Greenlandic salmon catches.

So now we can safely conclude that the main reason for the recent decline of salmon stocks was <u>not</u> the oceanic fisheries. It will have to be found somewhere else. And if NASCO is to live up to its objective of promoting the conservation, restoration, enhancement and rational management of salmon stocks in the North Atlantic, it will have to adopt a more sophisticated approach than just harassing the oceanic fishermen. Now it is timely for NASCO to address

the serious problems affecting salmon in homewaters and for other NASCO members to make binding commitments for the benefit of the salmon stocks.

We all know a number of factors which have a negative impact upon the salmon stocks, such as pollution, habitat damage, potential by-catches, but also insufficiently regulated homewater fisheries, many of which are mixed stock fisheries. A recent and growing problem is the impact of contamination caused by salmon farming.

One of the problems, which makes it difficult to reach correct management decisions, is the lack of scientific knowledge of the salmon, notably in its oceanic state. A research fishery has been recognised as of major importance to the scientific programme and such a program was recommended by ICES. This is an issue which we find important. Considerable hydrographic changes have occurred in West Greenland waters. In the North-East Atlantic a large herring stock, together with mackerel and blue whiting, might affect the role of the salmon in the ecosystem. There is an urgent need to study this important life stage of the salmon.

We are looking forward to discussing issues of relevance to the rational management and utilisation of North Atlantic salmon throughout its entire distributional range. NASCO must concentrate upon the problems affecting the salmon stocks wherever these problems occur.

Opening Statement made by the European Union

Mr. President, Distinguished Delegates and Observers:

I am delighted that we have reached the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of NASCO and that I find myself in Miramichi in Canada. My first impressions are of a place of great character with a beautiful setting by the riverside. It certainly contrasts with my office in Brussels.

I am reminded that as the largest Contracting Party to NASCO, the European Union's role remains as important as ever. We live side by side with our partners in the North Atlantic and must deal with many common interests including those of the wild salmon. These must be dealt with appropriately.

The challenges ahead of us at this week's annual meeting are numerous and important. Of fundamental importance is the need to ensure that we take the proper decisions to safeguard the future of the wild salmon stocks in the North Atlantic. Salmon are swimming only a short distance away from this very meeting room. They are our common heritage. I know that everybody I meet this week will be fully committed to the sound management of these fishery resources based on the best possible scientific information available.

Last year, we adopted the Action Plan for the application of the Precautionary Approach to fisheries management specifically as it applies to salmon. As a result, we established a Standing Committee on the Precautionary Approach. In Miami in March this year, we developed a recommendation for a clear but flexible management-decision structure for NASCO. We should address this matter during this week and I hope that we will be able to adopt the recommendation from that committee. The Precautionary Approach is a reality and is still under examination by a number of different Regional Fisheries Organisations. Our task this year will be to see where we in NASCO go next.

Yesterday, we had a Special Liaison Meeting, which reviewed the measures taken in the European Union to minimise the impacts of aquaculture on the wild salmon stocks. This meeting resulted from several years of work on the follow-up to the Oslo Resolution. It also demonstrably formed part of the evolution of the Precautionary Approach. The Precautionary Approach in NASCO is closely tied to salmon aquaculture. It is a fundamental part of the future work of this Organization and will be appropriate wherever sound management principles are relevant to NASCO.

We have no doubt that all delegates have read the long report of the ICES Working Group on North Atlantic Salmon. It is with great appreciation that, this year, we have been able to digest this report earlier than usual. I recommend that you read the ACFM report; it is shorter and delivers the same message given in the Working Group Report. I find the message ever more depressing. It is a simple message which must be heeded. We, the Contracting Parties to NASCO, must take action in order for the wild salmon to survive. We are now producing one tonne of salmon in aquaculture for every single wild salmon caught in the North Atlantic. We hope that we can take our responsibilities seriously, but it means demonstrating both co-operation and consideration. It means working together with everyone who has an interest in salmon, whether or not it be in the wild or the farmed salmon. We are embarking on a new century and we must face up to our choices - either rationally preserve the wild salmon or risk losing it forever.

Mr. President, at this week's meeting, we also have to deal with the future relationship of the NGO observers to NASCO. I have recently been disturbed by the tactics used by one particular NGO observer in channelling a series of several hundred e-mails from its members to the primary representatives at NASCO. Whilst I have nothing against the free expression of opinions by any of the NGOs at NASCO, whether it be in the form of a letter or petition, I can assure you that this sort of behaviour merely causes irritation and is not helpful in any way. I think we must now consider whether we need to make amendments and improvements to the existing rules for our observers, so that this sort of behaviour cannot re-occur in the future.

Mr. President, it is with great delight that I am here in Canada with my delegation. I would like to take this opportunity to thank our hosts for their warm hospitality and the arrangements made for our comfort. I very much look forward to the remainder of my stay.

Mr. President, Distinguished Delegates and Observers, my delegation would like to wish everyone here the very best for the week ahead. I look forward to working with all of you in a constructive manner so that we can fulfil all our objectives for the wild salmon. May we have a successful meeting.

Thank you.

Opening Statement made by Iceland

Mr. President, Distinguished Delegates, Observers, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It gives us great pleasure to visit the historic town of Miramichi, especially on this Millennium anniversary of the discovery of North America by Leifur Eiríksson. A number of Icelandic scholars actually claim that the name "Vinland" mentioned in the Sagas refers to areas close to the Miramichi estuary, where the vikings were astonished to find unusually large salmon and wild grape-vines.

Grapes, wild and cultured, are probably still plentiful in North America, but once more ICES scientists warn us that North Atlantic salmon stocks both in North America and Europe are decreasing in abundance and this is in particular true for two-sea-winter salmon. This means that we cannot harvest the two-sea-winter component in mixed stock fisheries, neither in home-waters nor in distant feeding areas. All quotas fixed by NASCO must thus be severely reduced and similarly the countries of origin must also exercise great caution in their coastal fisheries and stay in line with the precautionary approach.

Mr. President, I would indeed like to support what the distinguished delegate of the European Union just said about a certain NGO that has flooded our computers with three or four hundred identical letters in the days before this meeting. Let them be aware that the effect of a letter does not increase three or four hundred-fold by using this method - quite the contrary - one letter is indeed enough.

Iceland is very pleased to see the issue regarding the calculations of contributions of NASCO members according to Article 16 of the Convention on the agenda of the Council. Iceland has for a long time debated this issue within the Finance Committee of NASCO and feels very strongly that the relationship between salmon catches and payments needs to be redefined, especially in the light of the great deductions that have occurred in the catches of most NASCO Member States and the world-wide increase in "catch and release", which is excluded from nominal catches. To stimulate discussion and promote a consensus on this matter Iceland has prepared a paper (CNL(00)34), which emphasizes a new way forward. We realize that this issue will not be resolved at this meeting and will need further consideration by NASCO Delegations and Governments. We, however, emphasize its importance and feel that it is crucial for the evolution and future of NASCO. The circumstances have changed and NASCO must respond to that in order to survive in a changing world.

For the first time in 10 years there is growing interest in salmon aquaculture in Iceland. This is primarily an extension of the current land-based rearing and emphasizes summer-rearing after extensive rearing in a land-based operation. There is also some interest in large-scale Norwegian-type cage rearing on Iceland´s north and east coast. This spark of interest for rearing in relatively cold fjords seems to be related to improved performance of Atlantic salmon aquaculture in marginal areas in Norway, probably as a result of selective breeding and improved salmon feeds.

In the light of this we thus strongly support the initiative of NASCO regarding a liaison with the salmon aquaculture industry. It is very important to minimize the interaction of reared and wild salmon through improved husbandry strategies and it also seems clear that certain aspects of aquaculture can be utilized for the benefit of wild salmon, e.g. through enhancement. This line of communication should thus be encouraged and continued.

Finally, Mr. President, we would like to thank our Canadian hosts for arranging this meeting in such beautiful surroundings and look forward to a productive meeting and fruitful discussions.

Thank you Mr. President

Opening Statement made by Norway

Mr. President, distinguished Delegates, Observers, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Norway is very pleased to participate in this Seventeenth Annual Meeting of NASCO here in Canada, a country with which we have had long-lasting and strong relations. Our host has indeed selected a most impressive location here close to the mighty Miramichi River.

Last year I drew your attention to the proposals from the Norwegian Wild Salmon Committee. The proposals have been given an effective follow-up, and the Norwegian Government has *inter alia* decided to give salmon special priority through strong protective measures in selected rivers and coastal areas. The follow-up also includes a substantial effort to improve fisheries regulations in homewaters. In my opinion we now have a solid political basis for a consistent and improved management regime for our salmon stocks. The implementation of this policy will, however, be a demanding task.

All management of living resources must be based on two major principles: conservation and sustainable use. These principles are also basic to NASCO. The Organization has played an important role to remind the home countries of their responsibility to protect the salmon stocks and their habitats, and provide guidelines to maintain the stocks. NASCO has also made valuable advice on how to keep fisheries sustainable, not least through co-operation with ICES.

Salmon management is indeed challenging and calls for clear and consistent strategies. In this context NASCO has made valuable contributions. Norway particularly appreciates the ongoing work to implement the precautionary approach, starting by applying this approach to fisheries management. In fact we believe that NASCO at this stage should spend even more effort to secure sustainable fisheries. In this context mixed stock fisheries affecting threatened and vulnerable stocks are of particular concern.

I feel confident, Mr President, that if we succeed in developing sustainable fisheries, our credibility when dealing with other important challenges to salmon management, such as aquaculture interactions and habitat loss, will increase.

Let me finally thank the Secretariat and all involved in the organization and preparations for this meeting. We look forward to constructive discussions in these pleasant surroundings, and will assure you, Mr. President, of our full and positive co-operation.

Opening Statement made by the Russian Federation

Mr President, Distinguished Delegates, Observers, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The delegation of the Russian Federation is very delighted to come to Miramichi. We find this city is one of the most picturesque places we have ever been to, and I would now like to express my appreciation to our Canadian colleagues for choosing such a beautiful place for the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of NASCO. I will express the general view of the Russian delegation if I say that our work here should be as productive as the salmon river which flows past outside this conference room.

In Russia, last year was marked by further intense work to implement the Precautionary Approach to management of Atlantic salmon. We carefully reviewed the situation on our salmon rivers on the basis of historic data and more recent information and came to a conclusion that all our efforts must be focused on further reduction and subsequent cessation of the commercial fisheries. The first steps in this direction were taken in 1997 whereas in the previous 5 years the fisheries were conducted on 11-12 rivers and before that on 20-25 rivers, last year the commercial fisheries took place on 5 rivers only. The catch limit for the fishery in the coastal area was also significantly reduced. Simultaneously, the recreational salmon fishery was conducted on more than 70 rivers in north-west Russia. Biological reference points were established for the majority of salmon stocks, and were used as a basis for developing the fisheries strategy. This approach received full support from both federal and local authorities. We therefore hope that the practice of reduction of the commercial fishery will continue.

Here in NASCO we have successfully indicated that since the late 1950's there has been a system of management of Atlantic salmon in Russia which was quite effective until the mid 1990's. In recent years we can see obvious variations of salmon abundance, and an increase in the proportion of grilse. We know that the situation is similar in other parts of the salmon's distribution range. In these circumstances we can characterise the status of wild salmon stocks as critical. Regretfully, despite considerable scientific effort we do not have a precise answer to the question why it develops like this, whether it is associated with overfishing, or impact of aquaculture and enhancement. Or could it be a natural variation of abundance, which has occurred many times before? The future of Atlantic salmon depends on how quickly this question can be resolved.

The state of wild salmon stocks is a vital issue. However, while focusing our attention on it we cannot forget to say that a lot of effective work has been done by NASCO inter-sessionally. First of all, there has been considerable progress in the process of liaison with the aquaculture industry at the meeting of the Liaison Group held in London in February this year. Implementation of the Precautionary Approach for aquaculture is one of the key issues. There is no salmon farming industry in Russia. And we do not anticipate any developments in this field in the next 10 years. However, we are increasingly concerned about interactions between farmed and wild salmon as these can adversely affect our salmon stocks. For example, Norwegian farm escapees were reported recaptured in Russian rivers. Therefore we will do our utmost to support efforts by NASCO to resolve this.

Of paramount importance was the progress made by the Standing Committee on the Precautionary Approach, which considered the application of the Precautionary Approach to salmon fisheries management and developed a very useful tool, a flexible decision structure,

to aid the Council and Commissions of NASCO and relevant authorities at the national level in making management decisions.

We can all see that in recent years the number of issues addressed by NASCO has increased. Many of them are being successfully resolved, which inspires optimism about the future. I would like to emphasise that Russia will always be committed to the objectives and goals which NASCO sets. In each country wild Atlantic salmon is a national asset; however, it can be preserved only through joint international effort. Russia has always been open for such cooperation and willing to make its contribution. We are looking forward to a very productive meeting and to making real progress in addressing the challenges ahead of us, under your wise guidance, Mr President.

Thank you.

Opening Statement made by the United States of America

Mr. President, Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It gives me great pleasure to participate in the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of NASCO here on the banks of the Miramichi River. I would particularly like to thank our Canadian hosts for their hard work in preparation for this meeting and their hospitality during our stay. NASCO has a reputation of conducting serious work in a pleasant environment and this year is no exception. I have the advantage of being the last speaker and can therefore respond to some of the earlier comments of my colleagues.

As I am sure you are aware, the situation for Atlantic salmon in North America is very serious. The United States has proposed to list the Gulf of Maine Distinct Population Segment of Atlantic salmon as endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act. The process for that consideration will be completed this year. The fact that we have proposed these stocks for endangered listing means that we have determined that there is a serious risk our stocks will become extinct. We have observed a continued decline in adult returns and the survival of large parr to smolts is lower than previously estimated. To put the status of our stocks into perspective, I note that there are 18 members of the U.S. delegation this year, which is approximately half the number of salmon that returned last year to the Narraguagus River. Thirty-two adult salmon returned to the Narraguagus River last year which has a conservation limit of approximately 400 spawners.

The U.S. is concerned about continued pressure on stocks from all sources. We cannot and should not keep trying to determine who is at fault or who is most to blame but instead, being mindful of the status of the stocks, we need to be taking all actions without delay. Of particular note in the scientific advice from ICES is the determination that for the first time over 90% of the mixed stock at West Greenland in 1999 was of North American origin. There may be many reasons for this, but one is almost certainly the reduction in abundance of European stocks. I mention this not to say that the status of our stocks is due to the West Greenland fishery or the Faroe Island fishery, but rather to point out that activities throughout the Convention area could be impacting U.S. stocks.

Every potentially returning salmon in the United States is critical. That is why we are particularly concerned with the St. Pierre and Miquelon fishery, which has increased by almost a factor of two in the past three years. Our concern over this fishery is elevated by the fact that it intercepts North American stocks on the last portion of their long journey to home waters.

Mr. President, even though U.S. stocks are in danger of extinction, I believe we can still be hopeful. We must proceed cautiously and wait for substantial recovery before initiating or increasing any fishing effort.

It has been noted that there is uncertainty in the science. While that is true, it must be emphasized that there is no uncertainty in the fact that salmon stocks throughout the Convention area are in trouble. We are facing a grave situation and we must employ cautious management until we observe substantial recovery.

In addition to fishery regulatory measures, there are a number of noteworthy issues before NASCO this week. In regard to unreported catch, I would like to bring your attention to the

FAO International Plan of Action to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing. The issue of illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing is relevant to NASCO and its Contracting Parties and I encourage full participation in this FAO process.

The challenge before us this week is also to move NASCO's consideration of the precautionary approach from theory to practice to ensure that it is applied in a consistent way across all areas of the work of NASCO and its Contracting Parties.

This past year the U.S. was pleased to participate in the NASCO/NASFI Liaison Group. We believe the development of international guidelines on containment are a critical step in minimizing the potential threat posed by aquaculture escapes to wild stocks. This is an area where we can work closely with the aquaculture industry, as there is no disagreement over the goal of keeping commercial fish in their cages.

Finally, Mr. President, other delegates have pointed out the proximity of our meeting location to wild salmon. While wild salmon may be close enough to hear us, they are not listening to our words but will be affected by our actions or inaction. It is the goal of the U.S. to ensure that this is a meeting of action, not just fine words.

Thank you again to our Canadian hosts and to the NASCO Secretariat for providing such a hospitable working environment for us this week. I look forward to a productive meeting.

ANNEX 3

Opening Statement made by the North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission

Mr President, Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen.

On behalf of the North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission (NPAFC) I would like to thank you for the invitation to attend your Seventeenth Annual Meeting in an observer capacity in such a special location. It is the first time I have participated in a NASCO Annual Meeting, but I am glad to see a lot of familiar faces around the table, colleagues with whom I have been working for years in different international fora.

During the past year, NPAFC has increased its profile through close cooperation on high seas enforcement and scientific work on the state of North Pacific salmon stocks.

The cooperative enforcement efforts of the Parties resulted in the detection of twelve vessels conducting illegal fishing operations in or near the Convention Area in 1999. Of those twelve vessels, three were apprehended and prosecuted. Due to the continued threat of high seas fishing for salmon in the Convention Area, all Parties pledged to maintain 2000 enforcement activities at levels similar to those of 1999, as a deterrent to the threat of potential unauthorized fishing activity. As a result of joint enforcement cooperation, a Honduran vessel conducting an illegal fishery for salmon in the Convention area was arrested last month.

The NPAFC scientists are continuing to gather data on climate and salmon runs from around the Pacific Rim. Over 120 scientists, fisheries officials and industry representatives attended our international symposium on "Recent Changes in Ocean Production of Pacific Salmon" which was held last November in Juneau, Alaska. The papers presented provide us with a good idea of the state of knowledge of salmon, and clearly identify priorities. A juvenile salmon workshop will be held together with PICES in October 2000 in Tokyo, which will analyse factors affecting production of juvenile salmon. A presentation reviewing factors affecting production of juvenile Atlantic salmon will be made by ICES and we are inviting NASCO scientists and others who are interested in this subject to participate.

Despite a slight decline during the past four years, the total commercial salmon catch by all NPAFC member countries is still more than eight hundred thousand tons annually.

As you know, Mr President, NPAFC approved NASCO's proposal to hold a joint meeting in 2001 on the common challenges facing Pacific and Atlantic salmon. The possible topics for such meetings might be (1) common sources of marine mortality for salmon; (2) salmon population dynamics in the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans. We could also exchange information on enforcement and other issues. We hope that both the time and possible topics will be acceptable to NASCO, and if so we'll start the preparations for the meeting together.

Mr President, I wish you a successful meeting.

Thank you.

ANNEX 4

Opening Statements made by Non-Government Organizations

Joint Statements made by the Non-Government Organizations

Introductory comments by Chris Poupard

Mr President, distinguished delegates,

I am speaking on behalf of all 14 NGOs present in Miramichi, and it is worth noting that together we now represent more than 10 million members. We are all very pleased to be here in Miramichi, and thank our Canadian hosts for their excellent hospitality.

The NGOs are determined to make a positive contribution to NASCO and we appreciate the assistance received from you, Mr President, and your excellent Secretariat in making this possible. As NGOs our role is to criticise, pressurise, and where possible, praise the Parties, and it is inevitable that from time to time there will be hiccups in that process. Such a hiccup, which has been referred to by the EU and Icelandic delegations, occurred this year, and the organisation responsible will be making a statement. However, the NGOs are committed to working together to improve our co-operation and thus our contribution to NASCO, demonstrated by our statements today. Last year in Westport it was regarded as something of a miracle that the NGOs all agreed on one joint statement. This year, I am pleased to say that we have all agreed on four joint statements. You will be pleased to hear that they are all very succinct.

These statements are supported by:

Association Internationale de Défense du Saumon Atlantique
Association of Salmon Fishery Boards
Atlantic Salmon Federation
Atlantic Salmon Trust
European Anglers Alliance
Federation of Irish Salmon & Sea-Trout Anglers
Institute of Fisheries Management
National Anglers Representative Association
Norwegian Farmers Union
Norwegian River Owners
Salmon & Trout Association
Scottish Anglers National Association
World Wild Fund for Nature (Norway)
World Wildlife Fund (USA)

A Impact of aquaculture

The NGOs express their continuing concern over the impact of salmon aquaculture and the wide variation between the Parties over implementation of the OSLO RESOLUTION and legislation to regulate salmon aquaculture.

The NGOs recognize recent Norwegian legislation which sets new standards for the aquaculture industry and the framework legislation which has been set up in Ireland. The inadequacy of reliance on self-regulation of the industry, evidenced by the failure to prevent the spread of ISA both in Scotland and Canada, is of serious concern and must be rectified.

The record of the industry on escapes is very poor, and the NGOs call for adoption of a robust code of containment, statutory reporting of all escapes, classification of line bred farmed strains as exotic species and development of immediate and effective contingency plans.

In conclusion the NGOs wish to emphasise their appreciation of the contribution that salmon aquaculture can make both for food purposes and for employment in remote rural areas. While we welcome the proposed NASFI/NASCO declaration, we are concerned that the paper, which only refers to the positive aspects of aquaculture, fails to recognize the existing scientifically documented problems. Aquaculture must be conducted in a responsible and sustainable way, with minimal impact on wild salmonids. This is clearly not the case at the present time, and the NGOs call on the Parties to redouble their efforts to address the problems. This can only be achieved by the best codes of practice, backed up by independent inspection and effective measures such as significant fines and withdrawal of licences from persistent offenders.

B Transgenic salmon

The NGOs are extremely concerned over the current research being conducted in Prince Edward Island and elsewhere on genetically modified salmon, and the recent application to the US Food and Drug Administration for commercial licensing of transgenic salmon in North America.

The aquaculture industry, through the International Salmon Farmers' Association, has indicated that it is not in favour of transgenic salmon (CNL(00)33).

Claims from those conducting the research that transgenic salmon will be both sterile and confined provide no re-assurance whatsoever. It is impossible to guarantee 100% sterility using the techniques employed, and the escapes record of the industry is appalling. The potential consequences of a transgenic salmon escape could be devastating.

The NASCO NGOs call on all the Parties for a complete ban on the licensing and introduction of transgenic technology in respect of all salmonids.

C Mixed Stock Fisheries

NGOs draw attention to the importance of the conclusion of the ICES Advisory Committee on Fishery Management (ACFM) that mixed stock salmon fisheries in Southern European waters present particular threats to conservation (paragraph 2.5 of CNL(00)12). NGOs stress the need for speedy action by the Parties to achieve a major reduction in the impact of such fisheries, including those in coastal waters, and with special reference to Irish and UK mixed stock salmon fisheries.

D Post-Smolt Survival

In the light of the continuing problem of high salmon mortality at sea, the NGOs wish to emphasise the need for internationally co-ordinated investigation of all aspects of post-smolt survival. In particular, there should be wider surveillance of the pelagic trawl fisheries targeting herring, mackerel, horse mackerel, blue whiting, shrimp, capelin and squid. Such fisheries operate in waters that include the North American continental shelf, the North-East Atlantic off the United Kingdom and Ireland, and the North Sea, as well as the often-quoted example of the North Norwegian Sea. NGOs support the proposal for a precautionary measure against post-smolt catches in pelagic fisheries, which would require pelagic trawls to be operated with the float line at least 5 metres below the surface, as described in paragraph 2.6.2 of the ACFM report.

Opening Statement made by the Atlantic Salmon Federation

It is my pleasure on behalf of the Atlantic Salmon Federation to welcome you all to NASCO's first meeting in Canada. ASF is honored to be an accredited non-government member of NASCO. My predecessor, Dr Wilfred Carter, recognized the need for an international treaty dedicated to conserving wild Atlantic salmon 20 years ago. He played a lead role in NASCO's ratification under the Convention for the Conservation of Salmon in the North Atlantic Ocean and provided 13 years of dedicated and effective service as a Canadian Commissioner.

It is fitting that we are meeting next to the Miramichi River, which contains the largest, naturally reproducing population of Atlantic salmon in the world. The Miramichi River also reflects the challenges that face the wild Atlantic salmon throughout the North Atlantic. Following a decade of relative abundance, the Miramichi River has not met minimum conservation requirements for the past three years. Since 1992, salmon returns have fallen from 150,000 grilse and 30,000 large salmon to only 24,000 grilse and 13,400 large salmon in 1999. Most Atlantic salmon rivers which empty into the North Atlantic tell the same distressing tale. We are fast losing a valuable species, which in turn reflects the loss of clean rivers, oceans and genetic diversity.

To restore Atlantic salmon populations to abundance, NASCO nations must heed the advice of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES). ICES has concluded that the North American stock complex of non-maturing salmon remains in tenuous condition and recommends a conservative management strategy. More than half of the rivers monitored by Canada's Department of Fisheries and Oceans failed to reach even minimum spawning targets in 1999. And in the United States, only 4% of spawning targets were reached in the handful of rivers that still support wild Atlantic salmon. In ICES own words, "…the steady decline in North American stocks is alarming." The precautionary approach espoused by NASCO should dictate the elimination of all fishing for mixed stocks of North American Atlantic salmon at sea.

Thirty organizations representing more than 11 million people throughout the North Atlantic have signified support for the International Atlantic Salmon Accord launched by accredited non-government organizations (NGOs) at the NASCO meeting held in Edinburgh in 1998. The Accord provides a blueprint for conserving and managing Atlantic salmon throughout their life cycle.

The Accord also serves as a basis to assess the performance of individual governments in their mandate to conserve and responsibly manage our wild Atlantic salmon populations. We must facilitate broad-based community involvement and stewardship in keeping our rivers clean and restoring Atlantic salmon. As our Atlantic salmon transcend fresh to salt water, we must understand the early migration problems and the predator/prey relationships and manage accordingly. In the ocean, we must understand the environmental changes that are affecting both salmon and their food supply. We must eliminate ocean fisheries which intercept salmon as they migrate and feed in the ocean, indiscriminately killing salmon from many rivers. We must eliminate harvesting at the bottom of the food chain, and provide safe havens for salmon on their ocean feeding grounds. When our wild Atlantic salmon return to their rivers, we must make sure they return to clean rivers and are able to reach the spawning beds through effective management protection plans.

Some governments have been more diligent than others in achieving conservation progress. Greenland is to be commended for restriction of its ocean fishery. This is a tremendous sacrifice in the name of conservation. Other nations would do well to follow the Greenlanders' example.

Canada is also to be commended for elimination of its commercial salmon fisheries. The gear and licenses of 10,000 fishermen have been purchased and permanently retired during the past twenty-five years. These buy out programmes cost Canadian taxpayers more than $70 million. Although a conservation imperative, the elimination of ocean gill nets caused social and economic hardship for commercial fishermen. These large investments and huge sacrifices must be protected with continued government commitment to prohibition of ocean fisheries for mixed populations of Atlantic salmon in Canada.

The Atlantic Salmon Federation is doing its part to encourage fair buy outs of commercial salmon fishermen throughout the North Atlantic. We are working with the North Atlantic Salmon Fund and our other European partners to raise money required to permanently buy out the salmon net fisheries of the United Kingdom. We are very pleased to have been able to assist financially in the recent agreement to buy out the commercial drift nets in Wales. While there is a great deal of public support to expand the buyouts to other net fisheries in the U.K., the conservation community must not be expected to shoulder the financial burden on our own. As outlined in the report of Britain's Freshwater Fisheries Review Group, there is a need for government leadership and funding.

All governments have identified the urgent need for more research into the causes of low marine survival of salmon at sea, reaffirmed by the ICES Advisory Committee on Fishery Management, yet none are undertaking even a fraction of the research work needed to address this serious problem. The governments gathered in this room must provide the leadership and funding to coordinate a major research programme to better understand the direct and indirect impacts of the ocean ecosystem on Atlantic salmon. This is a government responsibility and we urge NASCO to give this matter the attention needed during your deliberations. The Atlantic Salmon Federation, with the help of the private sector, has funded innovative advances in acoustic telemetry. For the first time, this allowed tracking of postsmolts many miles in the open ocean. This innovative research holds promise for finding out where and when the as-yet unexplained increased marine mortality occurs. Again, however, it is being left to the conservation community to provide the leadership and funding while governments offer little more than moral support. This must change.

I welcome the large contingent from the Atlantic salmon aquaculture industry at NASCO. NASCO's role is to conserve, restore, enhance and rationally manage wild Atlantic salmon populations. I welcome this cooperation in helping to conserve and restore our wild salmon runs.

I want to be clear that the Atlantic Salmon Federation is a proponent of aquaculture, providing it is conducted in an environmentally responsible manner with a view towards eliminating impacts on wild salmon.

That said, I also want to be clear about the serious concerns we have relating to aquaculture, concerns about genetic, disease and parasite impacts that are substantiated by dozens of peer-reviewed studies conducted on both sides of the Atlantic. Recognition by governments and industry of these negative impacts is the first step towards developing mitigative measures.

We are therefore encouraged that the Report of the Meeting of the North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry and NASCO acknowledges NASCO's concerns about the adverse impacts of aquaculture. We are hopeful that this will provide the foundation required for NASCO, the aquaculture industry, governments and conservation groups to work together towards our common goals of healthy wild salmon runs and a successful, environmentally responsible aquaculture industry.

NASCO has spent a lot of time discussing the Precautionary Approach. NASCO and its Contracting Parties have agreed to adopt and apply a Precautionary Approach to the conservation, management and exploitation of wild Atlantic salmon in order to protect the species and preserve the environments in which it lives. NASCO and its Contracting Parties have acknowledged that they must be more cautious when information is uncertain, unreliable or inadequate. They have also acknowledged that the absence of adequate scientific information should not be used as a reason for postponing or failing to take conservation and management measures.

It is time we move from discussing the Precautionary Approach and begin applying it in all areas of salmon management.

The challenges facing Atlantic salmon conservation grow larger every year. NASCO has a moral and persuasive responsibility to take the steps needed to ensure a better future for the salmon. Its Contracting Parties have a legal responsibility to conserve and protect the wild Atlantic salmon within their territorial waters.

The Atlantic Salmon Federation looks forward to working with you and to making good progress towards our shared conservation goals.

Opening Statement made by the Federation of Irish Salmon and Sea-Trout Anglers

A Chairdhe, Mr President, distinguished delegates and fellow NGOs:

I have begun our statement by greeting you using the native Irish language at our meeting here in Miramichi, the Irish capital of Canada.

In the NASCO meeting held in Westport, Ireland last year, FISSTA (the Federation of Irish Salmon and Sea-Trout Anglers) stated that we had, reluctantly, refrained from mounting a demonstration outside the conference centre, the reason for that being the utter frustration of the anglers at the continuing decline of the wild stocks, due principally to the adverse effects of salmon farms and drift netting. We had intended to remonstrate with the international delegates to bring their powerful influence to bear on the Irish authorities to end the wasteful and destructive practice of drift netting on mixed migratory stocks, which, of course, is of great concern to the international salmonid communities. We then requested that this gesture of restraint, goodwill and good intent on our part would be reciprocated by the relevant fishery authorities by being "spoken with rather than down to".

Since then a new Minister for the Marine, Mr Frank Fahey, has been appointed and has spoken with us and shown a positive willingness to make progress on many matters affecting anglers and the wild stocks.

FISSTA is implacably opposed to drift netting and is alarmed at a proposed new policy of catchment management projects which includes drift net interests who are thereby deeply involved in deciding policies, which includes the number of salmon allowed to enter the rivers for recreational angling and reproduction, while they take the major percentage of the stocks in nets at sea. A national policy on ending drift netting is urgently required and making individual catchment agreements with drift netters will delay the day when this activity is ended, because it puts a "Double Lock" on having it ended. Netsmen can then claim, not alone questionable traditional netting rights but binding agreements within different catchments. One can imagine the legal difficulties that would arise when finally moves are instituted and initiated to bring Ireland into line with the international practice and ethos opposing drift netting for mixed salmon stocks.

FISSTA can well understand the reluctance and annoyance of the Greenlanders and the Faroe Islands people who are confined to minimal quotas, while they see Ireland permitting the slaughter of hundreds of tonnes of salmon, not all Irish fish, but some migrating stocks bound for Wales, France and Spain.

Our Minister has begun the welcome leasing out of usage of a limited number of draft nets in some estuaries and this bodes well for the future. However, we believe that the cart is being put before the horse. Surely drift nets should be the priority and an immediate study made of and a policy adopted for a "just compensationary permanent cessation of drift netting". This should be undertaken and implemented at the earliest time possible.

We look to the Contracting Parties of NASCO to advise and, above all, encourage the Irish authorities to adopt this wise course of action to conserve and thereby enhance stocks of wild Atlantic salmon.

Go Raibh Mile Maith Agaibh
(A hundred thousand thanks to you all).

Opening Statement made by the National Anglers Representative Association

Mr President, Fellow Delegates:

It is my privilege and my pleasure on behalf of NARA to be present at this the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of NASCO in beautiful Miramichi – the "Irish Capital of Canada" twinned with the Irish town Monaghan, itself on the banks of the magnificent River Erne in Ireland, forming a border between Northern and Southern Ireland.

As previously indicated, NARA is in full agreement with the joint statements by NGOs. It is not my intention to delay this important meeting by repeating any of the important points made in the statements so far.

In my opening statement last year in Westport, Ireland, I referred to two initiatives by the Irish Government

- the proposed introduction of tags and quotas
- the proposed establishment of the National Salmon Commission

NARA encouraged these initiatives and I am glad to report some progress.

The National Salmon Commission was established in April of this year and, as a first project is working towards the introduction on January 1, 2001 of a tagging regime for all wild salmon caught by nets, traps or rod and line. The primary purpose of this, in its first year of operation, will be to count fish in conjunction with the use of in-stream fish counters, catch returns and redd counts. Given some space to operate and some encouragement by NASCO and other agencies, this project will work to the benefit of the wild Atlantic salmon.

Thank you, Mr President, for the opportunity to make this statement and I, and NARA, wish this meeting every success.

Go Raibh Mile Maith Agaibh.

Thank you.

Opening Statement made by the Norwegian Farmers Union and Norwegian Salmon Rivers

Mr President, Distinguished Delegates, Observers, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a great pleasure to take part in the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of NASCO here in New Brunswick and we look forward to interesting discussions. Our statement this time will focus on several issues related to wild salmon management.

Economic value

The salmon is an important resource in Norway. The decline of salmon stocks has hurt the economy in many small communities. The annual loss of income in the local community in Laerdal, for instance, amounts to more than 15 million NOK and 8 fulltime jobs. This is an important aspect of the current situation for the salmon as this income also finances local management and decides the level of local motivation and enthusiasm.

Salmon quotas

Although the decline in salmon stocks cannot be blamed on the Faroe Islands or Greenland, harvests must always be within production rates and sustainable. During recent years, the ICES Advisory Committee on Fishery Management has recommended that great caution be exercised in management of mixed stock fisheries. It is therefore a problem when NASCO apparently seems unable to practise sustainable management within its own area of responsibility. How can we expect the Precautionary Approach to be credible under these circumstances?

The Norwegian plan for national salmon rivers and fjords

We are pleased that the Norwegian government, in principle, intends to follow up the proposal from the Norwegian Wild Salmon Committee to establish a system of important salmon rivers and fjords under a national scheme to give them added protection from activities detrimental to the wild salmon. We consider it to be necessary that all 50 rivers and the 9 fjords in the proposal are included in the future scheme.

Salmon farming

We consider the escape of farmed salmon and outbreaks of salmon lice as the most serious environmental problems caused by the fish farming industry in relation to the wild salmon. Support for current regional de-lousing programmes must be strengthened and the minimum lice level before de-lousing is required in the winter and spring must be lowered so that farms do not have sexually mature lice on the fish during this period. In Norway this minimum level for de-lousing in winter and spring is now 0.5 sexually mature females per salmon. Angling is now prohibited in several rivers in the counties of Hordaland and Sogn og Fjordane due to increased salmon mortality in the fjords. 2001 will show if this new minimum level for de-lousing is adequate to save migrating salmonid smolts.

To reduce the escapes from fish farms, a technical approval system should be adopted. The Wild Salmon Committee made a proposal to the Government 2 years ago, but nothing has happened so far. Good statistics of escapes are necessary to combat this problem. Tagging of farmed salmon should also be considered. We also support general disease prevention work.

Obligatory insurance in case of fish farm escapes

It is very difficult for river owners to obtain compensation when escapes from a fish farm affect their river. We would like to draw attention to the question of an obligatory insurance policy for all fish farms.

Dialogue and cooperation with commercial fisheries

It is, in our opinion, not possible to address wild salmon management problems on the high seas in the future without more formal dialogue and cooperation with the organizations of commercial fishermen. We would therefore ask NASCO to consider the creation of a consultative forum which includes the fisheries organizations of the most important nations around the North Atlantic and their central authorities. It is necessary to have a place to meet in order to discuss political issues of importance to the management of the wild salmon.

Research

We would again raise the issue of research on the high seas. The salmon researchers are often dependent on other research expeditions or opportunities in order to carry out important research on smolt migrations to the feeding areas on effects of commercial fisheries on the survival of salmon in the sea and to measure the post-smolt survival, etc. This situation is no longer acceptable. "Our" scientists should be able to plan their own expeditions according to their objectives and it must be done now.

Gene-manipulated farm salmon

We are aware of the development of a gene-manipulated farm salmon and of the possible consequences in the event that these salmon escape to the wild. It is really a paradox that we have an international convention to safeguard the wild Atlantic salmon but we are unable to deal with this development. The situation is absurd and a real challenge to NASCO.

Opening Statement made by the World Wildlife Fund

Thank you Mr. President, Mr Secretary, Commissioners, Delegates and Observers. It is indeed a privilege to appear before you today at the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization. My name is Thomas V. Grasso and I am the Director of the World Wildlife Fund's U.S. Marine Conservation Program. WWF U.S. greatly appreciates being the most recently accredited non-governmental organization. I am also speaking here today on behalf of a number of WWF organizations and our roughly 4 million members in the North Atlantic region alone. They are: WWF Norway, WWF UK, WWF Scotland, WWF Sweden, WWF Denmark, WWF France, WWF Spain, WWF Germany, WWF Belgium, WWF Netherlands, WWF Russia, WWF Switzerland, and of course, WWF Canada.

This collective initiative on behalf of the World Wildlife Fund's international network is an effort to draw public attention to the plight of the wild Atlantic salmon and to constructively engage NASCO and its member nations to protect, conserve and restore the populations of wild salmon. As part of this initiative we have issued and present to you today a CALL TO ACTION that we believe is a necessary outline of recommendations that must be implemented to ensure the survival of wild Atlantic salmon. To summarize briefly, the World Wildlife Fund believes that 1) the ICES scientists' recommendations with respect to mixed stock salmon fisheries should be heeded; 2) standards should be established for salmon aquaculture to protect against adverse impacts to wild salmon stocks; 3) NASCO should address the potential causes of low marine survival of wild salmon; and, 4) NASCO must ensure that transgenic or genetically modified salmon are not permitted in salmon farming.

Mr. President, I have listened carefully to the remarks made this morning. In particular, I have taken note of the concern raised by the EU and Iceland Commissioners with respect to WWF's e-mail petitions to NASCO. We sincerely regret any inconvenience caused by our numerous letters. Once brought to our attention, we remedied the situation, as the distinguished Chair of the Icelandic delegation has suggested, by submitting one petition with all signatures on it.

Mr. President, the World Wildlife Fund thanks you for your leadership during your tenure, in particular your opening remarks this morning which indicated the severe nature of the status of wild salmon in the North Atlantic.

There is an emerging concern among our members and, I believe, among the public at large that the seafood we purchase to eat must be healthy and sustainably caught. I think we would all agree that wild Atlantic salmon has a very long way to go before it could be considered restored and sustainable. Nevertheless, the World Wildlife Fund is committed to working with NASCO and member nations to achieve the ultimate goal of a restored wild Atlantic salmon for future generations. Thank you Mr. President.

ANNEX 5

List of Participants

* Denotes Head of Delegation

CANADA

*Mr Jacque Robichaud	Representative Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa, Ontario
Mr James Gillespie	Representative Quispamsis, New Brunswick
Mr Pierre Tremblay	Representative Sainte-Foy, Quebec
Mr Robert Allain	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Tracadie-Sheila, New Brunswick
Mr George Arsenault	Societé de la Faune et des Parcs de Quebec, Quebec City, Quebec
Mr Yves Bastien	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa, Ontario
Mr David Bevan	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa, Ontario
Mr Glen Brown	New Brunswick Salmon Growers' Association, Grand Manan, New Brunswick
Mr Michael Calcutt	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa, Ontario
Mr Peter Cronin	New Brunswick Department of Natural Resources and Energy, Fredericton, New Brunswick
Mr Ken Curnew	Department of Forest Resources and Agrifoods, St John's, Newfoundland
Mr David Dunn	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Moncton, New Brunswick
Ms Edith Dussault	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa, Ontario
Mr Michael Edwards	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Rothesay, New Brunswick
Ms Nell Halse	New Brunswick Salmon Growers' Association, Letang, New Brunswick
Mr Murray Hill	Department of Fisheries, Pictou, Nova Scotia

Mr Jim Jones	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Moncton, New Brunswick
Mr Marc Kielley	Newfoundland Aquaculture Industry Association, St John's, Newfoundland
Ms Kim Lipsett	Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, Fredericton, New Brunswick
Mr Sandi McGeachy	New Brunswick Agriculture, Fisheries and Aquaculture, Fredericton, New Brunswick
Mr Brian Meaney	Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, St John's, Newfoundland
Mr David Meerburg	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa, Ontario
Mr Rex Porter	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, St John's, Newfoundland
Mr Berkley Slade	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, St John's, Newfoundland
Mr Serge Tremblay	Societé de la Faune et des Parcs du Quebec, Quebec City, Quebec

DENMARK (IN RESPECT OF THE FAROE ISLANDS AND GREENLAND)

*Mr Kaj Mortensen	Representative Ministry of Fisheries, Torshavn
Mr Einar Lemche	President of NASCO Greenland Home Rule, Copenhagen
Ms Rikke Nielsen	Representative Greenland Home Rule, Nuuk
Mr Arni Olaffson	Representative Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen
Dr Jan Arge Jacobsen	Fisheries Laboratory of the Faroes, Torshavn
Mr Per Kanneworff	Greenland Institute for Natural Resources, Copenhagen
Mr Jaspur Kruse	Felagid Laksaskip, Torshavn
Mr Emanuel Rosing	Greenland Home Rule, Nuuk
Mr Hedin Weihe	Faroese Home Government, Torshavn

EUROPEAN UNION

*Mr Ole Tougaard	Representative European Commission, Brussels, Belgium
Mr Andrew Thomson	Representative European Commission, Brussels, Belgium
Mr Jaakko Autio	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Helsinki, Finland
Dr David Clarke	Environment Agency, Bristol, UK
Mr Stefan de Maré	Department of Agriculture, Stockholm, Sweden
Mr David Dunkley	Scottish Executive Rural Affairs Department, Edinburgh, UK
Mr Peter Funegard	National Board of Fisheries, Gothenburg, Sweden
Dr Paddy Gargan	Central Fisheries Board, Dublin, Ireland
Mr Ivor Llewelyn	Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, London, UK
Dr Guy Mawle	Environment Agency, Bristol, UK
Mr Mark McCaughan	Department of Culture, Arts and Leisure, Belfast, Northern Ireland
Mr Maurice Mullen	Department of the Marine and Natural Resources, Dublin, Ireland
Mr Pentti Munne	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Helsinki, Finland
Mr Eero Niemela	Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute, Helsinki, Finland
Mr John O'Connor	Central Fisheries Board, Dublin, Ireland
Dr Niall Ó Maoileidigh	Marine Institute, Dublin, Ireland
Mr Ted Potter	Centre for Environment, Fisheries & Aquaculture Science, Lowestoft, UK
Mr Robin Rosenkranz	Ministry of Agriculture, Stockholm, Sweden
Mrs Susana Salvador	Ministry of Agriculture, Lisbon, Portugal
Mr Lars Erik Svensson	Council of the European Union, Brussels, Belgium

Mr George Thomson	Scottish Executive Rural Affairs Department, Edinburgh, UK
Dr Ken Whelan	Marine Institute, Newport, Ireland
Prof. Noel P. Wilkins	National University of Ireland, Galway, Ireland
Mr Alan Youngson	Scottish Executive Rural Affairs Department, Pitlochry, UK

ICELAND

Mr Eidur Gudnason	Representative Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Iceland, Reykjavik
Mr Arni Isaksson	Representative Directorate of Freshwater Fisheries, Reykjavik

NORWAY

*Mr Steinar Hermansen	Representative The Royal Ministry of Environment, Oslo
Mr Arne Eggereide	Representative Directorate for Nature Management, Trondheim
Ms Eva Espeland	Representative The Royal Ministry of Environment, Oslo
Dr Lars Petter Hansen	Norwegian Institute for Nature Research, Oslo
Ms Bente Wilhelms	Ministry of Agriculture, Oslo

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

* Mr Boris Prischepa	Representative Murmanrybvod, Murmansk
Mr Alexej Grushko	State Committee for Fisheries, Moscow
Ms Svetlana Krylova	Murmanrybvod, Murmansk
Mr Vladimir Moskalenko	PINRO, Murmansk
Ms Elena Samoylova	PINRO, Murmansk
Dr Alexander Zubchenko	PINRO, Murmansk

USA

*Dr Andrew Rosenberg	Representative National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, Maryland
Mr Robert Jones	Representative Connecticut River Salmon Association, S. Windsor, Connecticut
Dr Ray Owen, Jr.	Representative Orono, Maine
Mr Sebastian Belle	Maine Dept of Marine Resources, Augusta, Maine
Ms Kimberly Blankenbeker	National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, Maryland
Dr Russell Brown	National Marine Fisheries Service, Woods Hole, Massachusetts
Ms Mary Colligan	National Marine Fisheries Service, Gloucester, Massachusetts
Dr Jaime Geiger	US Fish and Wildlife Service, Hadley, Massachusetts
Mr Stephen Gephard	Department of Environmental Protection, Fisheries Division, Old Lyme, Connecticut
Mr Andrew Goode	Atlantic Salmon Federation, Brunswick, Maine
Dr Dan Kimball	US Fish and Wildlife Service, Nashua, New Hampshire
Mr Fred Kircheis	Maine Atlantic Salmon Commission, Augusta, Maine
Mr Joseph McGonigle	Maine Aquaculture Association, Brewer, Maine
Ms Mariska Obedzinski	National Marine Fisheries Service, Bar Harbor, Maine
Mr John Phillips	Conservation Law Foundation, Ipswich, Massachusetts
Dr Jean-Pierre Plé	US Department of State, Office of Marine Conservation, Washington, DC
Ms Boyce Thorne-Miller	SeaWeb, Dickerson, Maryland
Ms Martha Wilson	World Wildlife Foundation, Washington, DC

INTER-GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Mr Vladimir Fedorenko	North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission, Vancouver, Canada
Mr Tore Jakobsen	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, Institute of Marine Research, Bergen, Norway (Chairman of ACFM)
Dr Hans Lassen	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, Copenhagen, Denmark

NON-GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Dr Frederic Mazeaud	AIDSA, France
Mr Andrew Wallace	Association of Salmon Fishery Boards, UK
Mr William Taylor	Atlantic Salmon Federation, Canada
Ms Sue Scott	Atlantic Salmon Federation, Canada
Mr Stephen Chase	Atlantic Salmon Federation, USA
Captain Jeremy Read	Atlantic Salmon Trust, UK
Mr Richard Behal	Federation of Irish Salmon and Sea-Trout Anglers, Ireland
Mr John Gregory	Institute of Fisheries Management, UK
Mr Patrick Byrne	National Anglers Representative Association, Ireland
Mr Bjornulf Kristiansen	Norges Bondelag (Norwegian Farmers Union), Norway
Mr Aage Wold	Norskelakseelver (Norwegian Salmon Rivers),
Mr Finn Odegard	Norway
Mr Chris Poupard	European Anglers Alliance, and Salmon and Trout Association, UK
Mrs Fiona Willis	Salmon and Trout Association, UK
Mr Ian Calcott	Scottish Anglers National Association, UK
Mr Henning Roed	World Wide Fund for Nature, Norway
Mr Thomas Grasso	World Wildlife Fund, Washington, DC, USA

SECRETARIAT

Dr Malcolm Windsor	Secretary
Dr Peter Hutchinson	Assistant Secretary
Miss Margaret Nicolson	PA to the Secretary
Mrs Sophie Ross	PA

CANADIAN ASSISTANTS TO THE SECRETARIAT

Ms Rachel Comeau
Ms Marie Daigle
Mr Richard Gallant
Ms Stephanie Hopper
Ms Chantal Lamadeleine
Ms Linda LeBlanc
Ms Bernice Sivret

ANNEX 6

CNL(00)42

Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Council
Rodd Miramichi River Signature Hotel, Miramichi, Canada
5-9 June, 2000

Agenda

1. Opening Session

2. Adoption of Agenda

3. Election of Officers

4. Administrative Issues

4.1 Secretary's Report

4.2 Review of NASCO's Relationship with its Observer Organizations

4.3 Methods of Calculating the Contributions to NASCO

4.4 Report of the Finance and Administration Committee

4.5 Report on the Activities of the Organization

4.6 Announcement of the Tag Return Incentive Scheme Grand Prize

5. Scientific, Technical, Legal and Other Information

5.1 Scientific Advice from ICES

5.2 Report of the Standing Scientific Committee

5.3 Catch Statistics and their Analysis

5.4 Review of International Salmon-Related Literature Published in 1999

6. Conservation, Restoration, Enhancement and Rational Management of Salmon Stocks

6.1 Measures Taken in Accordance with Articles 14 and 15 of the Convention

6.2 The Precautionary Approach to Salmon Management

(a) Report of the Standing Committee on the Precautionary Approach on Application of a Precautionary Approach to Management of Salmon Fisheries
(b) Future Actions in Relation to Application of the Precautionary Approach to Salmon Management

6.3 Unreported Catches

6.4 By-catch of Atlantic Salmon

6.5 Fishing for Salmon in International Waters by Non-Contracting Parties

6.6 Scientific Research Fishing in the Convention Area

6.7 Impacts of Aquaculture on Wild Salmon Stocks

(a) Special Liaison Meeting to Review Measures to Minimise Impacts of Aquaculture on the Wild Stocks
(b) Report of the 1999 Special Liaison Meeting
(c) Returns Made in Accordance with the Oslo Resolution
(d) Liaison with the Salmon Farming Industry
(e) Development of Guidelines on Physical Containment and Husbandry Practices for Salmon Farming
(f) Transgenic Salmon

6.8 Atlantic Salmon Habitat Issues

(a) Report of the Special Session held in 1999
(b) Future Role of NASCO in Relation to Habitat Issues

6.9 Predator-related Mortality

6.10 St Pierre et Miquelon Salmon Fisheries

6.11 Reports on Conservation Measures Taken by the Three Regional Commissions

7. Other Business

8. Date and Place of Next Meeting

9. Draft Report of the Meeting

10. Draft Press Release

ANNEX 7

Council

CNL(00)53

2001 Budget, 2002 Forecast Budget and Schedule of Contributions

North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization
2001 Budget And 2002 Forecast Budget (Pounds Sterling)

SECTION	DESCRIPTION	EXPENDITURE	
		BUDGET 2001	FORECAST 2002
1	STAFF-RELATED COSTS	239,880	247,060
2	TRAVEL AND SUBSISTENCE	33,600	29,350
3	CONTRIBUTION TO ICES	28,030	29,350
4	CONTRIBUTION TO WORKING CAPITAL FUND	0	0
5	MEETINGS	7,500	15,630
6	OFFICE SUPPLIES, PRINTING AND TRANSLATION	27,150	25,680
7	COMMUNICATIONS	13,300	13,680
8	HEADQUARTERS PROPERTY	-25,550	-24,860
9	OFFICE FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT	7,250	7,460
10	AUDIT AND OTHER EXPENSES	8,220	8,460
11	TAG RETURN INCENTIVE SCHEME	4,550	4,550
	TOTAL	343,930	356,360

		REVENUE	
		BUDGET 2001	FORECAST 2002
12	CONTRIBUTIONS - CONTRACTING PARTIES	352,070	363,360
13	MISCELLANEOUS INCOME - INTEREST	10,000	10,000
14	STABILISATION	-21,000	-17,000
15	SURPLUS OR DEFICIT (-) FROM 1999	2,860	0
	TOTAL	343,930	356,360

Adjustments to 2000 contributions (Pounds Sterling) to take into account confirmed 1998 Catch Statistics

Party	1998 Provisional catch	1998 Confirmed catch	2000 Contribution based on provisional catch	2000 Contribution based on confirmed catch	Adjustment to 2000 contribution
Canada	149	157	28,505	29,246	+741
Denmark (Faroe Islands and Greenland)	17	17	15,754	15,750	-3
European Union	1,185	1,183	128,581	128,149	-432
Iceland	164	164	29,954	29,920	-33
Norway	740	740	85,595	85,445	-149
Russian Federation	131	130	26,766	26,643	-123
USA	0	0	14,111	14,111	0
TOTAL	2,386	2,391	329,265	329,265	0

Note: A positive adjustment represents an underpayment in 2000.

NASCO Budget Contributions for 2001 and Forecast Budget Contributions for 2002 (Pounds Sterling)

Party	1999 Provisional catch (tonnes)	Contribution for 2001	Adjustment from 2000	Adjusted contribution for 2001	Forecast contribution for 2002
Canada	143	30,999	+741	31,740	31,993
Denmark (Faroe Islands and Greenland)	19	17,203	-3	17,199	17,754
European Union	995	125,796	-432	125,364	129,830
Iceland	145	31,222	-33	31,189	32,223
Norway	811	105,324	-149	105,174	108,701
Russian Federation	102	26,438	-123	26,315	27,285
USA	0	15,089	0	15,089	15,573
TOTAL	2,215	352,070	0	352,070	363,360

Contributions are based on the Official Catch Returns by the Parties. Column totals can be in error by a few pounds due to rounding.

ANNEX 8

Council

CNL(00)12

Report of the ICES Advisory Committee on Fishery Management

ANNEX 9

Council

CNL(00)60

Request for Scientific Advice from ICES

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.

ANNEX 10

Council

CNL(00)14

Catch Statistics - Returns by the Parties

CNL(00)14

Catch Statistics - Returns by the Parties

1. The Official Catch Statistics, as submitted by the Parties, are tabulated overleaf (Table 1). The figures for 1999 are provisional. These catch statistics, which have been rounded to the nearest tonne, will be used to calculate the contributions to NASCO for 2001 and the adjustment to the 2000 contributions (in the light of the confirmed 1998 catches) unless the Secretary is advised otherwise.

2. Under Article 12 of the Convention, the Secretary shall compile and disseminate statistics and reports concerning the salmon stocks subject to the Convention. Table 2 presents catch statistics for the period 1960-1999 by Party to the NASCO Convention.

3. Tables 1 and 2 are set out in the format for the presentation of catch statistics which was agreed by the Council at its Fifth Annual Meeting. A further, more detailed, record of catch statistics during the period 1960-1999 is provided, for information only, in paper CNL(00)15.

4. For the 1999 catch data there are no discrepancies in the information provided to ICES and that provided to NASCO.

Secretary
Edinburgh
12 May, 2000

Table 1: Official Catch Statistics

	Provisional 1999 Catch (Tonnes)	Provisional 1999 Catch according to Sea Age						Confirmed 1998 Catch (Tonnes)
		1SW		MSW		Total		
		No	Wt	No	Wt	No	Wt	
Canada	143	-	80	-	63	-	143	157
Denmark (in respect of Faroe Islands and Greenland)	19	-	-	-		-		17
				-		-		
Faroe Islands	0	-	-					6
				-	-	-	-	
Greenland	19	-	-					11
				-	-	-	-	
European Union	995	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,183
Iceland*	145	-	-	-	-	-	-	164
Norway	811	164,905 318		89,494	493	254,399	811	740
Russian Federation	102	24,016	66	6,947	36	30,963	102	130
United States Of America	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	0

* The 1999 catch for Iceland includes 26 tonnes of ranched salmon.

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

	Canada	Denmark (Faroe Islands and Greenland)	European Union	Finland	Iceland	Norway	Russian Federation	Sweden	USA
1960	1636	60	2641		100	1576	1100	40	1
1961	1583	127	2276		127	1456	790	27	1
1962	1719	244	3894		125	1838	710	45	1
1963	1861	466	3842		145	1697	480	23	1
1964	2069	1539	4242		135	2040	590	36	1
1965	2116	861	3693		133	1900	590	40	1
1966	2369	1338	3549		106	1823	570	36	1
1967	2863	1600	4492		146	2058	883	25	1
1968	2111	1167	3623		162	1752	827	150	1
1969	2202	2350	4407		133	2083	360	76	1
1970	2323	2354	4069		195	1861	448	52	1
1971	1992	2511	3745		204	1847	417	35	1
1972	1759	2146	4261	32	250	1986	462	38	1
1973	2434	2402	4604	50	156	2126	772	73	3
1974	2539	1945	4432	76	225	1973	709	57	1
1975	2485	2086	4500	76	166	1754	811	56	2
1976	2506	1479	2931	66	225	1530	542	45	1
1977	2545	1652	3025	59	130	1488	497	10	2
1978	1545	1159	3102	37	291	1050	476	10	4
1979	1287	1694	2572	26	225	1831	455	12	3
1980	2680	2052	2640	34	249	1830	664	17	6
1981	2437	2602	2557	44	163	1656	463	26	6
1982	1798	2350	2533	83	147	1348	364	25	6
1983	1424	1433	3532	79	198	1550	507	28	1
1984	1112	997	2308	75	159	1623	593	40	2
1985	1133	1430	3002	49	217	1561	659	45	2
1986	1559	1490	3524	38	330	1597	608	53	2
1987	1784	1539	2593	49	250	1385	559	47	1
1988	1311	1136	2833	34	412	1076	419	40	1
1989	1139	701	2450	52	277	905	359	29	2
1990	912	542	1645	59	426	930	316	33	2
1991	711	533	1139	69	505	877	215	38	1
1992	520	260	1506	77	636	867	166	49	1
1993	373	35	1483	70	656	923	140	56	1
1994	355	18	1919	48	448	996	141	44	0
1995	259	86	1852	-	439	839	130	-	0
1996	290	92	1474	-	358	787	131	-	0
1997	229	59	1179	-	154	630	111	-	0
1998	157	17	1183	-	164	740	130	-	0
1999	143	19	995	-	145	811	102	-	0

NOTES
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. Figures to 1986 are based on data contained in the ICES Working Group Reports.
4. Since 1991 there has only been research fishing for salmon in the Faroese zone (not conducted in all years). The West Greenland fishery was subject to compensation agreements in 1993 and 1994.

ANNEX 11

Council

CNL(00)17

Returns under Articles 14 and 15 of the Convention

CNL(00)17

Returns under Articles 14 and 15 of the Convention

The request for the return of information required under the NASCO Convention and relevant to the period 1 January - 31 December 1999 was circulated on 13 January 2000. All Parties were requested to make a return even if there had been no changes since the last notification. Where changes have been notified under Article 15, and the laws, regulations and programmes concerned have been lodged with the Secretariat, the information will be incorporated into the Laws, Regulations and Programmes database. Copies of the detailed submissions are available from the Secretariat. A summary of the new actions taken under Articles 14 and 15 of the Convention is attached. At the time of preparation of this paper, information has not been received from all EU Member States which have salmon interests. No information is therefore available for Denmark, France, Portugal or Spain.

Secretary
Edinburgh
12 May, 2000

Returns under Article 14 of the Convention

1. Actions Taken To Make Effective The Provisions Of The Convention *(Article 14, Paragraph 1)*

1.1 The prohibition of fishing for salmon beyond 12* nautical miles from the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured. ***(Article 2, paragraph 2)***

* 40 nautical miles at West Greenland
* Area of fisheries jurisdiction of the Faroe Islands

Norway

The Norwegian Coast Guard Squadron North have made 13 surveillance flights over the area of international waters north of N 65° 00' in the period 1 April 1999 - 31 March 2000. During these flights no vessels fishing for salmon have been observed.

No actions reported by the other Parties.

1.2 Inviting the attention of States not party to the Convention to any matter relating to the activities of the vessels of that State which appears to affect adversely the salmon stocks subject to the Convention. ***(Article 2, paragraph 3)***

No actions reported by any Party.

1.3 Measures to minimise the by-catches of salmon originating in the rivers of the other member. ***(Article 7, paragraph 2)*** **[North American Commission members only]**

Canada

The moratorium on commercial salmon fishing remained in effect for the Island of Newfoundland.

USA

No measures reported.

1.4 Alteration in fishing patterns in a manner which results in the initiation of fishing or increase in catches of salmon originating in the rivers of another Party, except with the consent of the latter. ***(Article 7, paragraph 3)*** **[North American Commission members only]**

No actions reported by either Party.

2. Actions Taken To Implement Regulatory Measures Under Article 13 *(Article 14, Paragraph 1)*

No actions reported by any Party.

Returns under Article 15 of the Convention

3. Laws, Regulations And Programmes Adopted Or Repealed Since The Last Notification *(Article 15, Paragraph 5(A))*

Canada

A three-year Atlantic salmon management plan for Newfoundland and Labrador was introduced based on a river classification system which permits varying levels of harvest depending on the health of individual river stocks. Details were previously provided in NAC(99)3.

Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

No changes reported.

Greenland

A new Greenland Home Rule Executive Order (No. 13 of 12 August 1999) on Salmon Fishing has replaced the two Executive Orders from 1998. The new Executive Order unites the regulations of the two previous Executive Orders and covers both commercial fishing and recreational fishing for both residents and non-residents/tourists. All three types of fishery start on a date set by the Home Rule Government and must close when the quota has been caught or at the latest 12 weeks after the fishery started. Commercial fishing for salmon is conditional on a licence. Recreational fishing for salmon is allowed for all residents of Greenland. Non-residents/tourists must buy a licence to fish.

Gear Restrictions:
- Hooks and fixed nets 140mm diamond on square. Drift nets maximum 20 lengths.
- Recreational fishing: angling, one fixed net or one drift net.
- Non-residents/tourists: angling.
- Nets must be checked every 24 hours.

All commercial catches of salmon must be reported to the Greenland Fishing Licence Control Authority (GFLK) by the fisherman on a daily basis. Catches from the recreational fishery must be reported the day after the fishery or for non-residents/tourists as soon as possible.

Only persons licensed for the commercial salmon fishery can sell their catches. The catches from the commercial salmon fishery can only be sold at local markets and local shops, to hotels, restaurants, schools, hospitals and other public eating places. Catches may not be exported outside of Greenland.

European Union

Finland

No changes reported.

Ireland

Conservation bye-laws introduced in 1997 have been retained for 1999. The measures in these bye-laws include:

Restriction to season;
Restriction to number of gear units;
Night time fishing using commercial drift nets is illegal;
Fishing outside 6 mile limit is illegal.

Sweden

No changes reported.

United Kingdom

A major new package of regulatory measures (Environment Agency national byelaws) was introduced in England and Wales in 1999 in order to provide additional protection for early-running 'spring' salmon. These national measures prevent:

- The killing of, and in most cases fishing for, salmon by netsmen before 1 June; there are derogations which allow fishing in some areas where netting is predominantly for sea trout, on the basis that any salmon caught are returned alive.
- The killing of salmon by anglers before 16 June. Anglers are allowed to fish provided they practice catch-and-release.
- The use by anglers of anything other than artificial flies or lures for the capture of salmon prior to 16 June.

These measures came into force on 15 April 1999. There was thus some early season netting and angling for salmon in 1999 prior to this date.

In addition, a number of regional byelaws and net limitation orders were introduced in England and Wales. A number of net limitation orders were repealed.

In Scotland regulations were introduced restricting the use of certain baits and lures in specified Salmon Fishery Districts (Rivers Tay, Don and Forth). Designation Orders were introduced which had the effect of amalgamating smaller fishery districts into larger management units (Lochaber, Conon and North and West Salmon Fishery Districts). The District Salmon Fishery Boards Order was also introduced in 1999, which changed the rules concerning membership of the District Salmon Fishery Boards so as to facilitate changes to larger management units. An order defining the estuary limits of the River Tay was also introduced.

For Northern Ireland the Foyle Area (Control of Fishing) Regulations 1999 amend and replace earlier Regulations. The 1999 Regulations came into operation for the 2000 angling and commercial fishery seasons. They provide more flexible powers than the previous regulations for the closure of the Foyle Catchment fishery for periods of 24 or 48 hours when fish are running if certain escapement targets have not been achieved. This is part of the Foyle Fisheries catchment management system. A new Regulation has been introduced which restricts the number of drift net licences issued to a specified number.

Iceland

A regulatory measure (No: 105/2000) concerning transport and release of salmonids has been revised.

Norway

A statewide project (1996-99) to provide a basis for sustainable local management models based on local management plans, for wildlife and fisheries management in a broad sense, was concluded by the end of 1999. As a part of this project the process of improving the organization of river and salmon stock management proceeded in 1999. A further NOK 4 million (both inland fish and salmon management) were invested in these local efforts in cooperation with the authorities for agriculture. By the end of 1999 local planning had commenced in about 150 rivers. Salmon River Councils were established in 42 rivers and Regional Salmon Management Councils in about 10 areas.

In 1999 the total cost of supervision in territorial sea areas and watercourses was NOK 6.5 million.

Russian Federation

No changes reported.

USA

On November 17, 1999, the National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service issued a proposed rule to list a distinct population segment of Atlantic salmon as endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act. A final decision on this proposal is due no later than November 2000.

4. Other New Commitments Relating To The Conservation, Restoration, Enhancement And Rational Management Of Salmon Stocks Subject To The Convention *(Article 15, paragraph 5(b))*

Canada

No new commitments reported.

Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

No new commitments reported.

Greenland

Canada and Denmark for Greenland have undertaken to complete a research programme for 1999 and 2000 to improve scientific sampling of salmon in Greenland.

European Union

Finland

No new commitments reported.

Ireland

Publication of: 'Report of the salmon management Working Group', Department of the Marine and Natural Resources, to outline the methodology for carcass tagging and fishermen's logbooks as a means of managing salmon stocks.

Sweden

A new regulation (FIFS 1999:10) was introduced to improve protection from *Gyrodactylus salaris*. The regulation is complementary to FIFS 1993:29 regarding aquaculture, stocking and transfer of fish. According to the new regulation, salmonid fish are only allowed to be stocked into rivers if the stocked fish have been proven to be free from infection by *Gyrodactylus.* The same regulation applies for stocking of fish to fish-farms within the neighbouring area of the salmon river.

United Kingdom

A number of net fisheries in England and Wales are being phased out because they exploit salmon returning to several rivers (i.e. mixed stock fisheries). Licence numbers are reduced as fishermen retire from the fishery. Progress with these phase-outs in 1999 has been as follows: -

- North East Coast Fishery: the number of drift net licences issued fell to 72, a 49% reduction since the initiation of the phase-out in 1993;
- Anglian Coastal Fishery: the number of nets fell to 50, a 15% reduction since 1996. This fishery takes mainly sea trout;
- River Usk: there was no reduction in the number of drift net licences (8) issued in 1999;
- River Dwyfawr: the number of seine net licences fell from 1 to 0;
- North Menai Straight (River Ogwen): there was no reduction in the number of seine net licences (2) issued in 1999.

Arrangements have also been made to reduce netting effort in the following fisheries by compensating netsmen not to fish for the periods shown:

- River Tavy seine nets (1 July – 7 August);
- River Tamar seine nets (8 August – 31 August);
- River Lynher seine nets (8 August – 31 August);
- River Fowey seine nets (until 15 June - for salmon only);
- Cumbrian coast, three of the four drift net licensees (complete season);
- River Avon, fishermen compensated for the release of captured fish.

The introduction of the new national measures to safeguard spring salmon introduced restrictions on anglers in relation to the killing of salmon prior to 16 June. However, this did not impose any compulsory restriction on the allowable fishing effort; no other restrictions were imposed on rod fisheries in 1999. Voluntary restrictions are known to be imposed by fishery owners and angling associations, but there is no national record of these, and so no information is available on any new measures introduced in 1999.

Iceland

No new commitments reported.

Norway

Liming

In 1999 20 Atlantic salmon rivers were limed in Norway at a cost of NOK 45 million. The total catch of Atlantic salmon in these rivers was 22 tons in 1999. We have estimated that the total catches could be about 80 tons when the rivers are (re)stocked. Liming has been carried out over the last 2 to 5 years in most of the rivers, but it will still take some years before the salmon stocks rebuild. There are liming projects in three large watercourses in southern-most Norway: Tovdalselva, Mandalselva and Bjerkreimselva. In Tovdalselva and Mandalselva the natural Atlantic salmon stocks are extinct due to acidification. Before acidification catches of salmon were as high as 30 tons per year at the end of the last century. In both rivers a restocking program is being carried out in connection with the liming program. Bjerkreimselva had a small population of its natural salmon stock before liming. 1999 was the second year with high catches in Bjerkreimselva, almost 9 tons. The catches of 10 tons in 1998,

the first year after liming, were the highest catches ever recorded according to official statistics. A new liming project in Lyseelva was established in 1999.

Gyrodactylus salaris

The fatal parasite *Gyrodactylus salaris* has been recorded in 40 watercourses in Norway and has affected several of the most important salmon stocks. Stocks are highly threatened or wiped out wherever the parasite has been recorded. Rotenone treatment of 25 infected watercourses has reduced the incidence of the parasite. The parasite has been eradicated in 16 rotenone-treated watercourses. Three watercourses have been treated and are under supervision and evaluation for a clean bill of health. Unfortunately, in 6 of the treated rivers, the parasite has survived the rotenone treatment. As a direct consequence, a Committee was appointed in order to improve and refine the treatment procedure. The remit of the Committee has been to reduce the probability of rotenone treatment failure, so as to ensure that all specimens of *G. salaris* are eliminated after chemical treatment. The Committee has concluded that there is a considerable potential for improvement of the rotenone treatment methodology.

The future work associated with *G. salaris* will involve active efforts to combat the parasite using fish screens and rotenone treatment as set forth in the action plan of the Directorate for Nature Management and the Norwegian Animal Health Authority.

Gene-bank and milt-bank

By the end of 1999 milt from a total of about 6,200 wild salmon from 172 stocks had been frozen in the Norwegian Gene Bank to provide the possibility of protecting stocks from extinction. In 1999 milt from 200 individuals, from 27 different stocks was frozen. 33 characteristic and valuable stocks have been taken into the "living gene banks". Norway today operates 3 living gene banks, one in the northern part of Norway, one in the middle part and one in the south-western part.

International research programmes

Cooperation between Norway and Russia on environmental issues on research and management of Atlantic salmon has continued. Cooperation between Norway, Finland and Karelia in Russia has commenced in connection with research and monitoring of *Gyrodactylus salaris.*

Russian Federation

No new commitments reported.

USA

In response to continued low returns, the directed catch and release fishery for Atlantic salmon in Maine is closed as of December 1999.

5. Other Factors Which May Significantly Affect The Abundance Of Salmon Stocks Subject To The Convention *(Article 15, Paragraph 5(c))*

Canada

No factors reported.

Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)

No factors reported.

European Union

Finland

No factors reported.

Ireland

No factors reported.

Sweden

No factors reported.

United Kingdom

A Salmon Management Plan has been drawn up for all catchments in Northern Ireland, except the Foyle (which has its own plan). Provisional conservation limits have been established for all rivers based on the River Bush conservation limit. At present, these targets are indicative only. Further work to refine these conservation limits using river-specific habitat data is in progress. The aim of the Management Plan will be to ensure that, in most rivers in most years, adult salmon are spawning to ensure compliance with the conservation limits. As part of this plan, between 6 to 8 fish counters (depending on funding) have been, or will be, installed in river catchments throughout Northern Ireland to obtain data on target compliance. This approach is consistent with the NASCO Precautionary Approach to Salmon Management.

Discussions have taken place between the fishery authorities in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland about the introduction of an all-Ireland Salmon Tagging Scheme. Agreement in principle has been reached and the regulatory framework and practical arrangements are being pursued.

The Salmonid Enhancement Programme in Northern Ireland, partly funded from the EU Peace Programme, approved £1.7 million of grant aid during 1999 to angling clubs, the majority of which was targeted at river improvements.

Iceland

No factors reported.

Norway

No factors reported.

Russian Federation

No factors reported.

USA

The river-specific stocking program and efforts to protect riverine habitat continued and intensified in 1999**.**

ANNEX 12

Council

CNL(00)18

Report of the Standing Committee on the Precautionary Approach – Application of a Precautionary Approach to Management of Salmon Fisheries

CNL(00)18

Report of the Standing Committee on the Precautionary Approach - Application of a Precautionary Approach to Management of Salmon Fisheries

1. Last year the Council agreed an Action Plan for Application of the Precautionary Approach. The Action Plan covers application of a Precautionary Approach to: management of North Atlantic salmon fisheries; socio-economic issues; unreported catches; scientific advice and research requirements; stock rebuilding programmes; introductions and transfers, aquaculture and transgenics; habitat issues and by-catch. Under this Action Plan a Standing Committee on the Precautionary Approach (SCPA) was established comprising Heads of Delegations plus additional experts as appropriate. The SCPA meets as directed by the Council with the objectives of:

   - coordinating the implementation of the Action Plan;
   - ensuring coordination and consistency in implementing the Precautionary Approach in each regional Commission;
   - reporting to the Council on: progress in implementing the Action Plan, the need for additional actions and the activities of other organizations in relation to the Precautionary Approach.

2. The first meeting of the SCPA on management of North Atlantic salmon fisheries was held in Miami, Florida, during 21-23 March 2000 under the chairmanship of Dr Andy Rosenberg (USA). The report of the meeting is attached. As this was the first meeting of the SCPA, and given the Committee's objectives of ensuring coordination and consistency in implementing the Precautionary Approach, the Committee agreed that it would be appropriate to consider further the interpretation of the guiding principles which apply to all aspects of application of a Precautionary Approach before proceeding to the specific terms of reference which related only to the management of North Atlantic salmon fisheries. It is unlikely that these principles would be reviewed at subsequent meetings of the SCPA as it goes on to consider each element of the Action Plan. The Committee therefore developed some general comments on interpretation of these guiding principles which are contained in Section 5 of the attached report. The Committee also developed a decision structure for use by the Council and Commissions of NASCO and by the relevant authorities in the management of single and mixed stock salmon fisheries. This decision structure is contained in Annex 4 of the attached report.

3. The Council is asked to consider the recommendations of the SCPA and decide on future action in the light of this report.

Secretary
Edinburgh
17 April 2000

Report of the First Meeting of the Standing Committee on the Precautionary Approach

Application of a Precautionary Approach to Salmon Fisheries Management

Doubletree Hotel, Coconut Grove, Miami
21 - 23 March 2000

1. Opening of the Meeting

1.1 The Chairman, Dr Andy Rosenberg (USA), opened the meeting and welcomed participants to Miami for the first meeting of NASCO's Standing Committee on the Precautionary Approach (SCPA). He referred to the importance of the meeting not only to NASCO and its Contracting Parties but potentially also for fisheries management internationally. He noted that while many international organizations are working on implementation of the Precautionary Approach, NASCO has made real progress in developing a comprehensive Action Plan. While there has been extensive discussion and scientific consideration of the Precautionary Approach in a number of regional and international fisheries fora, there has been less progress in incorporating the Precautionary Approach into management decisions. He indicated that there was a need to develop a clear but flexible management decision structure for use by NASCO and its Contracting Parties and that this would be the focus of the meeting and the challenge for the SCPA.

1.2 A list of participants is contained in Annex 1.

2. Nomination of a Rapporteur

2.1 The Committee appointed Dr Peter Hutchinson as rapporteur for the meeting.

3. Adoption of the Agenda

3.1 The Committee adopted its agenda, SCPA(00)8 (Annex 2) after agreeing that item 6(c) should read "Development of guidelines for pre-agreed management actions for homewater fisheries". The Committee also agreed that there was a need to clarify the meaning of the term "conservation" during the progress of the meeting.

4. Consideration of the Terms of Reference in the context of the overall Action Plan

4.1 The Committee considered the Terms of Reference for the meeting, SCPA(00)2. The Chairman indicated that clarification of the meaning of the term "conservation" would be appropriate under the first of these terms of reference.

5. Consideration of the Guiding Principles of the Precautionary Approach

5.1 The SCPA's objectives include co-ordinating the implementation of the Action Plan and ensuring consistency in implementing the Precautionary Approach. As this was the first meeting of the SCPA since the Council had adopted the guiding principles of the Precautionary Approach, the Committee agreed that it was important that there

was consistency in their interpretation. It is unlikely that the Committee will review these principles at each subsequent meeting as it goes on to address each element of the Action Plan. The Committee therefore reviewed the guiding principles of the Precautionary Approach with a view to offering general comments on their interpretation.

(a) *"The need to be more cautious when information is uncertain, unreliable or inadequate."*

Given the complex biology of the Atlantic salmon and its wide-ranging environmental needs, work on all aspects of salmon management, conservation and exploitation will always involve uncertain, unreliable or inadequate information. There will therefore always be a need for caution. The greater the uncertainty the greater will be the need for caution. The Committee agreed that in all circumstances a Precautionary Approach is appropriate. Adoption of a Precautionary Approach does not mean that there is a decreased need for scientific information but rather that it should be a priority, recognising potential financial constraints, to obtain more information on which to base management decisions. Where uncertainty is identified steps should be taken to reduce it.

(b) *"The absence of adequate scientific information should not be used as a reason for postponing or failing to take conservation and management measures."*

Managers should not wait for full certainty before taking action. There would have to be reasonable grounds for taking cautious conservation and management measures, which should be proportionate to the perceived risks. The question of risk is difficult as it can be perceived differently from different viewpoints. Nevertheless it has to be taken into account in a transparent manner. There is a need to take into account the complexity of salmon stocks but it can never be argued that there is not enough information to apply a Precautionary Approach. For many, if not all, salmon rivers there is some information on the salmon stocks and their habitat. Under a Precautionary Approach, however, there is a requirement to gather additional information so as to reduce uncertainty.

(c) *"Consideration of the needs of future generations and avoidance of changes that are not potentially reversible."*

There could be no doubt that future generations have a right to the resource, and that it is the present generation that has to safeguard that right. The loss of salmon stocks, and the subsequent negative impacts on communities dependent on salmon, will compromise the needs of future generations. There is a need to avoid irreversible changes, i.e. changes that are not reversible within a reasonable time period; in practice the timescale would be related to generation times of salmon populations. There is a need to clearly state the likely impact of measures in the short, medium and long term.

(d) *"Prior identification of undesirable outcomes and of measures that will avoid them or correct them."*

The Committee agreed that undesirable outcomes should be identified whenever possible. They may be related to ecological and biological factors as well as socio-economic factors. They are mostly self-evident such as irreversible change, collapse of wild stocks and loss of communities dependent on salmon fisheries. In relation to management of salmon fisheries, failure to achieve conservation limits is a clear undesirable outcome. In dealing with other issues relating to salmon conservation and management, such as by-catch or habitat issues, different undesirable outcomes will exist. The interplay between all these undesirable outcomes will be complex and may involve conflicts with management regimes for other species and other activities.

(e) *"Initiation of corrective measures without delay and that these should achieve their purpose promptly."*

Pre-agreed procedures for implementing appropriate measures are essential. Under the Precautionary Approach the measures should be commensurate with the risk to the resource and designed to have a demonstrable effect within an agreed timescale. It was recognised that there could be no guarantee that the measures would achieve their purpose promptly because of factors beyond the control of managers. Nevertheless, the higher the risk to the stock the greater is the need for measures which are designed to achieve their purpose promptly. There is a need to monitor these corrective measures so as to evaluate their effectiveness and take appropriate action.

(f) *"Priority to be given to conserving the productive capacity of the resource where the likely impact of resource use is uncertain."*

The productive capacity of the resource is governed by two components: 1) the productive capacity of the accessible habitat, and 2) the ability of the stock to fully utilise that capacity. Measures to protect the productive capacity of the resource should be required even in the absence of full scientific proof of their need. The standard of proof of the need to take such measures should be commensurate with the potential risks to the resource. The higher the risks to the resource the lower the standard of proof required to take measures. The timeliness of the measures is a very important consideration.

(g) *"Appropriate placement of the burden of proof by adhering to the above requirements."*

It is often not possible to assess in advance what the impact of resource or habitat use will be. Where there are reasonable grounds for believing that such use may adversely affect salmon stocks, those proposing the use should, in principle, carry the burden of providing proof that their actions do not affect the productive capacity of the resource or lead to irreversible changes. All resource use should be subject to a management regime.

5.2 The Committee also discussed the following three general issues (the roles of scientific advisers and managers, socio-economic factors and diversity and abundance) related to application of the Precautionary Approach.

The roles of scientific advisers and managers

5.3 The Committee affirmed that it is not for the scientific advisers to take on the burden of being precautionary but to provide the advice needed for the managers to implement a Precautionary Approach. The Committee recognised the desirability of a continuous process of dialogue between scientists and managers.

5.4 The Committee agreed that the role of scientific advisers includes to:

- advise on the status of the stocks;
- advise on the appropriate biological reference points needed to meet the management objectives;
- monitor the various management regimes and advise on their effectiveness;
- advise on areas of uncertainty and how they might be reduced;
- advise on the research required in support of the Precautionary Approach;
- advise on potential impacts and effectiveness of proposed management measures.

5.5 The Committee agreed that the role of managers includes to:

- set clear objectives for what they want to achieve in salmon management;
- indicate what level of risks they are prepared to accept of not achieving their objectives;
- decide on management targets;
- specify the appropriate timescales for their objectives;
- develop and implement pre-agreed management actions and stock rebuilding programmes;
- develop and implement other appropriate management strategies;
- implement monitoring and evaluation programmes for management measures.

5.6 It was recognised that under a Precautionary Approach there will be a need for managers to state clearly, when they propose and agree on measures, how the measures satisfy the principles of the Precautionary Approach as laid down by the Council.

Socio-economic factors

5.7 The Committee discussed the interplay between biological factors and socio-economic factors in relation to the Precautionary Approach. Allowing socio-economic factors to dominate could undermine the effectiveness of the Precautionary Approach and it is, therefore, necessary to give proper emphasis to biological factors. However, the Committee recognised that in particular circumstances it may be necessary to address biological concerns over a sufficient timescale so as to allow socio-economic aspects to be taken into account in order to balance the risks to the salmon stocks with the risks to the fishing communities. Application of a Precautionary Approach involves assessment of these risks. The issue of how the relevant short-term and long-term socio-economic factors are included in the Precautionary Approach will be the subject of a subsequent meeting of the SCPA.

Diversity and abundance

5.8 The Agreement on the Adoption of a Precautionary Approach states that an objective for the management of salmon fisheries is to promote the diversity and abundance of salmon stocks. The Committee interpreted this as being to maintain both the productive capacity and diversity of salmon stocks.

6. Application of the Precautionary Approach to management of salmon fisheries - Structures for Decision-making

6.1 A communication from the European Commission on the Precautionary Principle was tabled, SCPA(00)9. A document containing the salmon resolutions of the IBSFC was made available to the Committee for information, SCPA(00)10.

Definitions

6.2 The Committee agreed a number of definitions in relation to application of the Precautionary Approach, SCPA(00)11 (Annex 3).

Risk levels for establishing management targets

6.3 The NASCO Agreement on Adoption of a Precautionary Approach states that stocks should be "maintained above the conservation limits by the use of management targets." The view was expressed that there might be the possibility of having two conservation limits so as to take into account both abundance and diversity. Alternatively, one limit but a different level of risk might be used. The Committee recognised that it is necessary to consider both abundance and diversity. The Committee agreed that the conservation limit currently used by NASCO, i.e. the spawning stock level that produces maximum sustainable yield, was precautionary in nature. However, the desirability of ensuring that the spawning stock does not fall below this level, through the establishment of a management target at a higher level so as to take into account uncertainty in the status of the stocks, in the biological reference points and in fishery management capabilities, was recognised. The Committee, therefore, recommended that managers set management objectives and appropriate risk levels so that ICES can advise on management targets for all rivers for which conservation limits have been established.

6.4 The NASCO Agreement states that conservation limits and management targets should be set for each river and combined as appropriate for the management of different stock groupings defined by managers. The Committee recognised the desirability of having as small groupings as possible and that these groupings should be based on geographical proximity, biological information and, in some situations, socio-economic information. The need for scientific advice in establishing appropriate groupings by managers was recognised.

6.5 The Council has stressed the importance of progress in establishing conservation limits on rivers in the North-East Atlantic area. In this regard the Committee welcomed the European Commission funded programme of concerted action on the development of a scientific basis for the management of wild Atlantic salmon in the North-East Atlantic, a summary of which was presented, SCPA(00)12. The

objectives of this programme include *inter alia* evaluating progress towards setting river-specific or regional conservation limits and evaluating alternative management approaches.

Pre-agreed management actions

6.6 The NASCO Agreement on Adoption of a Precautionary Approach states that the management procedure for all salmon fisheries could include the following elements:

(a) definition of target spawning stock levels in the relevant rivers;

(b) definition of pre-fishery abundance of individual salmon stocks or groups of stocks occurring in the relevant fishery;

(c) utilisation only of the surplus according to (a) and (b) above;

(d) socio-economic factors.

6.7 The Agreement further states that the Precautionary Approach requires "the formulation of pre-agreed management actions in the form of procedures to be applied over a range of stock conditions". If an individual stock or group of stocks fail pre-agreed compliance criteria, the pre-agreed measures should be implemented so as to maintain stocks above conservation limits as required by the Agreement.

6.8 The Committee agreed that procedures for developing pre-agreed management actions for distant water fisheries and guidelines for the development of pre-agreed management actions for homewater fisheries should follow the same decision structure (see paragraph 6.13 and Annex 4) and tests for compatibility with the Precautionary Approach.

Stock rebuilding programmes (SRPs)

6.9 The NASCO Agreement on Adoption of a Precautionary Approach requires that "stock rebuilding programmes (including, as appropriate, habitat improvement, stock enhancement and fishery management actions), be developed for stocks that are below their conservation limits."

Circumstances under which SRPs required

6.10 The Committee discussed the circumstances under which stock rebuilding programmes might be required. There are no hard and fast rules because there should be a continuum between existing management programmes and stock rebuilding programmes.

Procedures for disseminating information on SRPs

6.11 The Committee recognised that where stock rebuilding programmes are initiated there could be benefits from an exchange of information and experiences between NASCO Parties. This information might include details of the nature of the problem(s) and of the measures being used to rebuild the stock, the anticipated duration of the

programme and its costs, progress in rebuilding the stock and the criteria being used to assess the effectiveness of the programme. However, provision of this information on an annual basis to either ICES or NASCO could be a considerable administrative burden. It might be very useful to have a Special Session at NASCO's annual meetings dedicated to reviewing the Parties' stock rebuilding programmes, along the lines of those held to review measures taken in relation to minimising impacts of aquaculture. This could consider successes and failures in stock rebuilding programmes. With regard to the North-East Atlantic Commission, ICES has been requested to advise on the effectiveness of management measures in homewaters.

Procedures for assessing effectiveness of SRPs

6.12 An important element of the Precautionary Approach is that the effectiveness of management measures, including stock rebuilding programmes, should be evaluated. The Committee agreed that a stock rebuilding programme could be considered to have achieved its objective when the conservation limit had been exceeded and other diversity criteria had been met.

Structures for decision-making

6.13 The Committee developed a decision structure to aid the Council and Commissions of NASCO and the relevant authorities in implementing the Precautionary Approach to Atlantic salmon management, SCPA(00)13 (Annex 4). This decision structure has been drafted broadly to facilitate wide and flexible application. It is recommended by the Committee that the decision structure be used in developing pre-agreed and other management actions for distant water fisheries and as guidance for the preparation of such management actions for homewater fisheries. It is recommended that the Commissions and the relevant authorities, when making management decisions, would explicitly address each point in the decision structure. It is also recommended that the relevant authorities have in place effective mechanisms for fisheries monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement to ensure compliance with the management measures. In applying this structure, it is understood that management decisions will be made in accordance with the assessment of risk such that, in the face of uncertainty, the risks to abundance and diversity of the stock(s) are low and the probability of achieving management goals is high. The decision structure is intended to be used iteratively such that the effect of actions will be monitored and evaluated and decisions reconsidered to ensure that they are consistent with the Precautionary Approach.

6.14 The Committee noted that in particular circumstances society may impose limitations on the strict adherence to the Precautionary Approach.

6.15 A number of case studies using this decision structure were considered by the Committee, SCPA(00)14 (Annex 5).

7. Date and Place of Next Meeting

7.1 The Committee agreed that there would not be an opportunity for a further meeting before the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of NASCO, at which the Council will

consider arrangements and terms of reference for the next meeting of the SCPA, in accordance with the Action Plan for Application of the Precautionary Approach.

8. Any Other Business

8.1 The Committee would like to stress that it sees the outcome of this first meeting as subject to review and modification in the light of experience in applying the recommendations proposed here. In this regard, the Committee would recommend to the Council that the Commissions of NASCO and the Contracting Parties report back on the practical aspects and on any difficulties encountered in applying the recommendations, including the decision structure, made by the Committee.

8.2 There was no other business.

9. Consideration of the Draft Report of the Meeting

9.1 The Committee agreed a report of the meeting.

10. Close of Meeting

10.1 The Chairman closed the meeting and thanked all participants for their contributions to a productive first meeting of the Committee.

Miami
23 March 2000

List of Participants

Canada

Mr Michael Calcutt	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa
Ms Edith Dussault	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa
Mr David Meerburg	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa
Mr Jacque Robichaud	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa

Denmark (Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Mr Jan Arge Jacobsen	Faroes Fishery Laboratory, Torshavn, Faroe Islands
Mr Mogens Holm Pedersen	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark
Mr Hedin Weihe	Faroese Home Government, Torshavn, Faroe Islands

European Union

Dr Walter Crozier	Dept. of Agriculture & Rural Development for Northern Ireland, Bushmills, Northern Ireland, UK
Mr David Dunkley	SERAD, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK
Mr Curt Insulander	Swedish Salmon Research Institute, Alvkarleby, Sweden
Mr Ivor Llewelyn	MAFF, London, England, UK
Mr Pentti Munne	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Helsinki, Finland
Mr Ted Potter	CEFAS, Lowestoft, England, UK
Mr George Thomson	SERAD, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK
Mr Andrew Thomson	European Commission, Brussels, Belgium
Mr Ole Tougaard	European Commission, Brussels, Belgium
Dr Ken Whelan	Marine Institute, Newport, Ireland

Iceland

Mr Arni Isaksson	Directorate of Freshwater Fisheries, Reykjavik

Norway

Mr Dagfinn Gausen	Directorate for Nature Management, Trondheim
Dr Lars Petter Hansen	Norwegian Institute for Nature Research, Oslo

Russian Federation

Ms Svetlana Krylova	Murmanrybvod, Murmansk
Mr Vladimir Moskalenko	PINRO, Murmansk
Mr Boris F Prischepa	Murmanrybvod, Murmansk
Ms Elena Samoylova	PINRO, Murmansk
Dr Alexander Zubchenko	PINRO, Murmansk

USA

Ms Kimberly Blankenbeker	National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring
Ms Mary Colligan	National Marine Fisheries Service, Gloucester
Ms Boyce Thorne Miller	Seaweb, Washington DC
Dr Andrew Rosenberg (Chairman)	National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring

Observers

Dr Walter Ranke	International Baltic Sea Fishery Commission, Warsaw, Poland

Secretariat

Dr Peter Hutchinson
Dr Malcolm Windsor

Agenda

1. Opening of the Meeting

2. Nomination of a Rapporteur

3. Adoption of the Agenda

4. Consideration of the Terms of Reference in the Context of the Overall Action Plan

5. Consideration of the Guiding Principles of the Precautionary Approach

6. Application of the Precautionary Approach to Management of Salmon Fisheries - Structures for Decision-making

    (a) Risk levels for establishing management targets

    (b) Pre-agreed management actions for distant water fisheries

    (c) Development of guidelines for pre-agreed management actions for homewater fisheries

    (d) Stock rebuilding programmes

        (i) Circumstances under which required

        (ii) Procedures for disseminating information

        (iii) Procedures for assessing effectiveness

7. Date and Place of Next Meeting (if agreed)

8. Any Other Business

9. Consideration of the Draft Report of the Meeting

10. Close of Meeting

Guiding Definitions of Terms Used in Salmon Fisheries Management

Distant water fisheries: Fisheries in areas outside the jurisdiction of the country of origin. With respect to the NASCO Convention this specifically refers to fisheries under the jurisdiction of the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

Homewater fisheries: Fisheries within the jurisdiction of the countries of origin (within 12 miles).

Population: A group of salmon, members of which breed freely with each other, but not with others outside the group. The smallest group that can be usefully managed.

Stock: A management unit comprising one or more salmon populations. This would be established by managers, in part, for the purpose of regulating fisheries. (The term may be used to describe those salmon either originating from or occurring in a particular area. Thus, for example, salmon from separate rivers are referred to as "river stocks" and salmon occurring at West Greenland may be referred to as the "West Greenland stock").

Mixed stock fishery: A fishery exploiting a significant number of salmon from two or more river stocks.

Conservation: The process of ensuring that the abundance of salmon in a stock is maintained at or above a satisfactory level (i.e. above the conservation limit with an agreed probability) and that natural diversity is maintained.

Conservation Limits (CL): CLs demarcate the undesirable spawning stock level at which recruitment would begin to decline significantly. The level cannot be used in management without also defining the acceptable probability (e.g. proportion of years) when the stock may be permitted to fall below the CL.

Currently NASCO and ICES define the CL as the spawning stock level that produces maximum sustainable yield. Formerly referred to as Minimum Biologically Acceptable Level (MBAL) or a Spawning Target.

Management Target (MT): The MT is the stock level employed by managers/scientists to aim at in order to achieve the objective of exceeding the CL for the desired proportion of years and for achieving other management objectives. The MT will therefore be greater than the CL with the margin between them at least reflecting the risks, decided by managers, of stocks falling below the CL.

Stock Rebuilding Programme (SRP): An SRP is an array of management measures, including possibly habitat improvement, exploitation control and stocking, designed to restore a stock above its conservation limit. An SRP could be a part of setting routine management plans.

Decision Structure to Aid the Council and Commissions of NASCO and the Relevant Authorities in Implementing the Precautionary Approach to Management of North Atlantic Salmon Fisheries

Does the fishery exploit salmon from more than one river?

If no, see A.
If yes, see B.

A. Single Stock

1. Is the stock threatened by external factors (e.g. acidification, disease)?

If yes, take special management action as appropriate (e.g. establish gene bank).

If no, go to A2.

2. Assess status of the stock (abundance and diversity)

(a) Have age-specific conservation limits been set?

(i) If yes, is the conservation limit being exceeded according to agreed compliance criteria (e.g. 3 out of 4 years)?

(ii) If no, assess other measures of abundance.

(b) Is the stock meeting other diversity criteria?

3. If either abundance or diversity are unsatisfactory, then seek to identify the reasons

(a) Immediately implement pre-agreed procedures to introduce appropriate measures to address reasons for failure (including stock rebuilding programmes).

(b) Monitor the effect of the measures and take the results into account in future management and assessment; include identification of information gaps, process and timeframe for resolution.

4. If both abundance and diversity are satisfactory:

(a) Implement pre-agreed management actions to permit harvest of the surplus taking into account uncertainty (where appropriate use management targets to establish the exploitable surplus).

(b) Monitor the effect of the measures and take the results into account in future management and assessment; include identification of information gaps, process and timeframe for resolution.

B. Mixed Stock

1. Identify river stocks that are available to the fishery

2. Identify stock components that are exploited by the fishery

3. Assess abundance and diversity of individual stocks contributing to the fishery (see A above)

4. Is abundance and diversity satisfactory (consider the % of stocks that are unsatisfactory and the extent of failure for each stock)?

(a) If yes, go to 5.

(b) If no, consider closing the fishery (taking into account socio-economic factors). If the decision is made not to close the fishery, then continue to 5.

5. Is the combined conservation limit(s) for all stocks subject to the fishery being exceeded?

(a) If yes, implement pre-agreed procedures for the management of the fishery based on effort or quota control:

- Quota control
  - define management target based on an assessment of risk of failing conservation limits
  - predict pre-fishery abundance
  - determine exploitable surplus
  - apply pre-agreed rules on setting quotas
- Effort control (and quota control in the absence of management targets and/or prediction of pre-fishery abundance)
  - evaluate effectiveness of previous effort control measures and apply appropriate changes.

(b) If no, consider closing the fishery taking into account socio-economic factors. If the decision is made not to close the fishery, apply pre-agreed reserve measures to minimize exploitation.

6. Monitor the effect of the measures and take the results into account in future management and assessment; include identification of information gaps, process and timeframe for resolution

Case Studies Using the Decision Structure for Implementing the Precautionary Approach to Management of Atlantic Salmon Fisheries

Note: The following four case studies are for illustrative purposes only and should not be used for management.

Example 1: Margaree River, Cape Breton for 2000

2000 forecast of return estimated to be 3000 MSW salmon (90% confidence limit 1200 - 4860) and 950 1SW salmon (90% confidence limit 300 - 1630)

Conservation limit = 1250 MSW salmon and 660 1SW salmon

Management target = conservation limit plus 20% = 1500 MSW salmon and 792 1SW salmon

** Note that the management target used is hypothetical and would have to be set by managers but would likely be less risk averse than that for Greenland mixed stock fishery*

In recent years there has been a native food fishery (both MSW and 1SW harvests) and angling (1SW harvest and hook-and-release for MSW salmon) only.

Does the fishery exploit salmon from more than one river?

If no, see A.

No, single stock fishery (at least just one river); returns have both early run (summer) and late run (fall) components. Therefore the decision structure for a single stock fishery is appropriate.

If yes, see B.

Not applicable.

A. Single Stock

1. Is the stock threatened by external factors (e.g. acidification, disease)?

If yes, take special management action (e.g. establish gene bank).

Not applicable.

If no, go to A2.

No.

2. Assess status of the stock (abundance and diversity)

(a) Have age-specific conservation limits been set?

Yes.

(i) If yes, is the conservation limit being exceeded according to agreed compliance criteria (e.g. 3 out of 4 years)?

Yes, returns above conservation limit and management target in 1999 (returns were 2060 MSW and 820 1SW salmon).

Egg deposition primarily from MSW salmon and spawning levels have exceeded conservation limits for large salmon in 15 of the past 15 years.

Juvenile abundance is high and stable.

5-10% of returns originate in hatchery on river.

Wild adult abundance has been high and stable while hatchery origin adult abundance has been low and stable.

(ii) If no, assess other measures of abundance.

Not applicable.

(b) Is the stock meeting other diversity criteria?

Yes.

3. If either abundance or diversity are unsatisfactory, then seek to identify the reasons

(a) Immediately implement pre-agreed procedures to introduce appropriate measures to address reasons for failure (including stock rebuilding programmes).

Not applicable.

(b) Monitor the effect of the measures and take the results into account in future management and assessment; include identification of information gaps, process and timeframe for resolution.

Not applicable.

4. If both abundance and diversity are satisfactory:

(a) Implement pre-agreed management actions to permit harvest of the surplus taking into account uncertainty (where appropriate use management targets to establish the exploitable surplus).

Harvest available is 3000-1500 = 1500 MSW salmon and 950-792 = 158 1SW salmon.

Harvests in 1999 were 927 MSW salmon and 376 1SW salmon.

(b) Monitor the effect of the measures and take the results into account in future management and assessment; include identification of information gaps, process and timeframe for resolution.

Some by-catch exists but a more important concern is unreported catch, mainly poaching in coastal waters and in the river.

Example 2: Greenland Low Abundance

Forecast 1999 pre-fishery abundance (PFA) at 50% level was 79,450 1SW North American origin salmon

Conservation limit = 183,852

Management target = conservation limit plus 30% = 239,008

* Note that the management target would have to be agreed by the West Greenland Commission

Does the fishery exploit salmon from more than one river?

If no, see A.

Not applicable.

If yes, see B.

Yes. Therefore the decision structure for a mixed stock fishery is appropriate.

B. Mixed Stock

1. Identify river stocks that are available to the fishery

The fishery exploits salmon destined to be MSW returns of both European and North American origin; most of the contribution from North America comes from southern North America and from southern Europe for European stocks.

2. Identify stock components that are exploited by the fishery

Approximately 75% of harvest in recent years has been from North American stocks.

3. Assess abundance and diversity of individual stocks contributing to the fishery (see A above)

Conservation limits have been set for all rivers in North America and some, but not all, in Europe; fishery has been managed in recent years based on North American stocks only.

4. Is abundance and diversity satisfactory (consider the % of stocks that are unsatisfactory and the extent of failure for each stock)?

(a) If yes, go to 5.

Not applicable.

(b) If no, consider closing the fishery (taking into account socio-economic factors). If the decision is made to not close the fishery, then continue to 5.

No. Egg depositions in 1998 exceeded or equalled river-specific conservation limits in 21 of 71 assessed rivers in Canada and in none of 18 assessed rivers in USA. Egg depositions were less than 50% of conservation limits in 24 rivers in Canada (34% of those assessed).

5. Is the combined conservation limit(s) for all stocks subject to the fishery being exceeded?

(a) If yes, implement pre-agreed procedures for the management of the fishery based on effort or quota control:

- Quota control
  - define management target based on an assessment of risk of failing conservation limits
  - predict pre-fishery abundance
  - determine exploitable surplus
  - apply pre-agreed rules on setting quotas
- Effort control (and quota control in the absence of management targets and/or prediction of pre-fishery abundance)
  - evaluate effectiveness of previous effort control measures and apply appropriate changes.

Not applicable.

(b) If no, consider closing the fishery taking into account socio-economic factors. If the decision is made not to close the fishery, apply pre-agreed reserve measures to minimize exploitation.

No. Far below conservation limit for North American stocks; close mixed stock fisheries in Greenland and North America and harvest only in-river where individual river stocks are above conservation limit. A reserve measure minimizing exploitation was implemented at West Greenland accounting for socio-economic concerns.

6. Monitor the effect of the measures and feedback to management/assessment; include identification of information gaps, process and timeframe for resolution

Almost all mixed stock fisheries in West Greenland and North America have been closed and commercial licences have been permanently retired in Canada; many rivers have been closed to all exploitation, others remain open to hook-and-release only for angling and on some rivers where stocks are healthy, normal harvests continue.

Stocks in USA and parts of Bay of Fundy (Outer Bay) are extremely low and being considered for listing under USA and Canadian processes.

Some by-catch exists but a more important concern is unreported catch, mainly poaching in coastal waters and in rivers of North America. In Europe there are concerns about the level of unreported catch and possible by-catch in fisheries for pelagic species.

Example 3: Greenland Higher Abundance as in 1986

Forecast of 1986 pre-fishery abundance (PFA) at 50% level to be 505,066 1SW North American origin salmon

Conservation limit = 183,852

Management target = conservation limit plus 30% = 239,008

* Note: The management target would have to be agreed by the West Greenland Commission

In this example, recent biological characteristics have been used rather than going back to 1986 data.

Does the fishery exploit salmon from more than one river?

If no, see A**.**

Not applicable.

If yes, see B.

Yes. Therefore the decision structure for a mixed stock fishery is appropriate.

B. Mixed Stock

1. Identify river stocks that are available to the fishery

The fishery exploits salmon destined to be MSW returns of both European and North American origin; most of the contribution from North America comes from southern North America and from southern Europe for European stocks.

2. Identify stock components that are exploited by the fishery

Approximately 60% of the harvest in recent years has been for North American stocks.

3. Assess abundance and diversity of individual stocks contributing to the fishery (see A above)

Conservation limits have been set for all rivers in North America and some, but not all, in Europe; fishery has been managed in recent years based on North American stocks only.

4. Is abundance and diversity satisfactory (consider the % of stocks that are unsatisfactory and the extent of failure for each stock)?

(a) If yes, go to 5.

Yes. Commentary would be added here to describe stock status in home rivers in previous year.

(b) If no, consider closing the fishery (taking into account socio-economic factors). If the decision is made to not close the fishery, then continue to 5.

Not applicable.

5. Is the combined conservation limit(s) for all stocks subject to the fishery being exceeded?

(a) If yes, implement pre-agreed procedures for the management of the fishery based on effort or quota control:

- Quota control
  - define management target based on an assessment of risk of failing conservation limits
  - predict pre-fishery abundance
  - determine exploitable surplus
  - apply pre-agreed rules on setting quotas

- Effort control (and quota control in the absence of management targets and/or prediction of pre-fishery abundance)

    - evaluate effectiveness of previous effort control measures and apply appropriate changes.

Yes, abundance above conservation limit and management target. After retaining spawning reserve (266,800: reserve is management target accounting for natural mortality), surplus available for harvest is 505,066 - 266,800 = 238,266 North American origin salmon.

*Quota at Greenland = [(0.40 * 238,266*2.62) + (0.40*238,266/.584 - 0.4*238,266 * 2.74)]/1.14 = 496 tonnes.*

(b) If no, consider closing the fishery taking into account socio-economic factors. If the decision is made not to close the fishery, apply pre-agreed reserve measures to minimize exploitation.

Not applicable.

6. Monitor the effect of the measures and feedback to management/assessment; include identification of information gaps, process and timeframe for resolution

Commentary would be added here on monitoring effect of the measure.

Example 4: River Bush (UK, N. Ireland), for 1998

Does the fishery exploit salmon from more than one river?

If no, see A

No. Therefore the decision structure for a single stock fishery is appropriate.

If yes, see B

Not applicable.

A. Single Stock

1. Is the stock threatened by external factors (e.g. acidification, disease)?

If yes, take special management action (e.g. establish gene bank).

Not applicable.

If no, go to A2.

No (but see section 4, below).

2. Assess status of stock (abundance and diversity)

(a) Have age-specific conservation limits been set?

Yes. A conservation limit of 2.3 million eggs (the Minimum Biologically Acceptable Level) has been set for the river, based on a river-specific stock-recruitment study. As the population comprises mainly 1SW fish (average 88%), the conservation limit has been set with respect to this age component only.

(i) If yes, is the conservation limit being exceeded according to agreed compliance criteria (e.g. 3 out of 4 years)?

The egg deposition in year 1998 was 3.07 million eggs, and the conservation limit has been exceeded in this river in 6 out of the last 10 years (compliance criterion requires deposition to be above conservation limit in >50% of years).

(ii) If no, assess other measures of abundance.

Not applicable.

(b) Is the stock meeting other diversity criteria?

Yes. Periodic genetic monitoring of the river stock has indicated the presence of a single population, which is maintaining acceptable levels of intra-populational genetic diversity (heterozygosity). Phenotypic diversity is also being maintained, as the proportion of MSW fish has not altered significantly over a 25 year period. A hatchery strain maintained for ranching experiments on this river is separate from the wild population, as hatchery-origin fish are all removed at a trap in the lower river.

3. If either abundance or diversity are unsatisfactory, then seek to identify the reasons

While abundance and diversity are judged satisfactory, there are concerns about the long-term effects of a trend for reduction in survival during the freshwater phase of the life cycle. Contributory reasons have been identified as habitat degradation, in particular siltation of spawning gravels, as well as significant avian predation (cormorants).

(a) Immediately implement pre-agreed procedures to introduce appropriate measures to address reasons for failure (including stock rebuilding programmes).

Studies are in progress to identify the extent of the habitat degradation and remedial measures are being tried out on a pilot scale at present.

A programme of controlled culling of cormorants under licence is ongoing.

(b) Monitor the effect of the measures and take the results into account in future management and assessment; include identification of information gaps, process and timeframe for resolution.

The habitat remedial measures are being monitored for effectiveness, by means of habitat and fishery surveys. However, the effectiveness of the predator control programme is not being assessed due to resource limitations. Further information is required on other sources of predation, such as otters, which are believed to be taking wild fish in considerable numbers.

4. If both abundance and diversity are satisfactory:

(a) Implement pre-agreed management actions to permit harvest of the surplus, taking into account uncertainty (where appropriate, use management targets to establish exploitable surplus).

Pre-agreed management actions comprise effort limitation, via restrictions on numbers of nets licensed together with seasonal and weekly close periods. Rod fisheries on the river are also regulated via effort control. A management target is not yet available for this stock.

Monitoring of marine survival (via microtagging of wild migrating smolts) carried out for the last 12 years has indicated a reduction in natural marine survival of fish returning in 1998. Survival to homewaters of the 1997 wild smolt cohort fell to 19%, which is well below the previous 10 year range of 25%-35%. Discussions have been held with managers in order to decide pre-agreed measures to reduce fishing effort, in the event that the reduction in marine survival persists.

(b) Monitor the effect of the measures and take the results into account in future management and assessment; include identification of information gaps, process and timeframe for resolution.

The effect of existing management measures is being continuously monitored via the scientific project on this stock, which yields information on adult and juvenile abundance, return rates and marine and freshwater exploitation. Any future management measures will be similarly evaluated.

Attachment 1

Statement by Norway

Norway expresses concern about the use of the procedures detailed in paragraph 6.6 in relation to high seas fisheries as Norway has serious problems seeing how high seas fisheries can be operated in compliance with the Precautionary Approach. Norway suggests that NASCO should explore new possibilities of reaching a solution to this problem that can be accepted by all Parties.

Attachment 2

Statement by Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)

In accordance with the NASCO Convention, the Faroe Islands and Greenland are entitled to fish for salmon under regulatory measures agreed within NASCO. Such fisheries are in compliance with the Precautionary Approach.

ANNEX 13

Council

CNL(00)58

Terms of Reference for the Standing Committee on the Precautionary Approach - Application of a Precautionary Approach to Habitat Protection and Restoration

1. Devise principles for ensuring that the Precautionary Approach is taken into account in decisions or activities that may have adverse impacts for salmon habitats.

2. Advise on possible decision structures for identifying factors limiting salmon production (other than exploitation) and for taking steps to remedy these (including stock rebuilding programmes);

3. Advise on the possible utility of an inventory of salmon habitats and/or habitat problems, to assist in the application of the Precautionary Approach to habitat issues.

Council

CNL(00)19

Unreported Catches

CNL(00)19

Unreported Catches

Introduction

1. At its 1998 meeting the Council agreed that the Parties should be requested to provide, on an annual basis, the following information:

   i) a description of its management control and reporting systems by country;
   ii) an explanation of how it arrives at the figure for unreported catch;
   iii) the extent of catch and release fishing;
   iv) the measures taken to further minimise the level of unreported catch.

2. The first returns by the Parties of the information detailed above was presented to the Council last year. These returns indicated that all Parties make considerable efforts to obtain detailed and accurate catch statistics, but despite this, catches may be unreported for a number of reasons. Illegal fishing appears to be a particular problem for a number of Parties. The Council had recognised a number of discrepancies in the returns by the Parties. It was agreed that in future the Parties would also be asked to provide an estimate of unreported catch for each country, and that this estimate should be broken down to show the different categories of the unreported catch, indicating whether they result from legal or illegal activities. The Secretary was asked to amend the format for return of information to include these additional questions.

3. In accordance with this decision, the information was requested from the Contracting Parties using the revised format on 13 January 2000. The responses received from the Parties are attached. Where Parties have indicated that there has been no change, we have included the text from last year's return. At the time of preparation of this paper, information has not been received from all EU Member States which have salmon interests. No information is, therefore, available for Denmark, France, Portugal or Spain.

4. It is clear from the information provided by the Parties that a substantial proportion of the total catch goes unreported. In 1999 between 917-1160 tonnes were estimated to be unreported compared to a total reported catch of 2218 tonnes, i.e the estimate of unreported catch was between 41-52% of the reported catch. While a breakdown of unreported catch into legal and illegal components was not available for all countries, it is clear from the information provided that the illegal component may be in the region of 50% of the total estimate of unreported catch, and may be higher than this, although illegal fishing does not appear to be a problem for all countries. A number of measures to further minimise the level of unreported catches have been reported by some countries, but it is clear that this difficult problem remains. One technique which has been used to address the problem of illegal harvests of salmon in some countries is carcase tagging. There is presently increased interest in this technique in a number of countries. The pros and cons of carcase tagging were reviewed by the Council at its meeting in 1992 and if the Council thought it would be useful the Secretariat might be asked to update this review for consideration at the Eighteenth Annual Meeting.

5. The returns also indicate that the extent of catch and release fishing in Europe is increasing, although this management practice is not used in all countries. Catch and release has been used in some areas of North America since the mid 1980's.

6. The Council is asked to consider what, if any, additional actions it wishes to take in relation to unreported catches. The Secretary will continue to request the information on unreported catches, referred to in paragraph 1 and 2 above, on an annual basis.

Secretary
Edinburgh
10 May, 2000

1. Description of management control and reporting systems by country

Canada

Within Quebec, all legally harvested commercial and recreational salmon have to be registered. In the rest of Atlantic Canada, recreational fisheries are estimated by licence stub return systems and surveys. Aboriginal Food Fisheries are either reported by the Native People themselves or estimated by local enforcement staff. This means that all legal fisheries have reporting systems and unreported catches arise mainly from those harvests which are illegal. Unreported catches are generally estimated by local enforcement or scientific staff based on local assessment of illegal activity.

Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

No commercial or research fishery took place in Faroese waters during 1999.

Greenland

All commercial catches of salmon must be reported to the Greenland Fishing Licence Control Authority (GFLK) by the fishermen on a daily basis. Catches from the recreational fishery and the fishery for non-residents/tourists must be reported to the GFLK by the fishermen as soon as possible. Only persons licensed for the commercial salmon fishery can sell their catches. The catches from the commercial salmon fishery can only be sold at local markets and local shops, to hotels, schools, hospitals and other public eating places.

European Union

Finland

Recreational fishing catch statistics are well reported (angler response rate was 75%). The total salmon catch is estimated. Local salmon catches (set nets, drift nets, weirs and rod and reel fishing) are requested after the fishing season ends. Fishermen are asked to complete a catch report or answer personally to interviews (out of a total of 800 fishermen, 50-65% report their catch). Reported salmon catches are underestimated by about 20-30%.

Ireland

The Department of the Marine and Natural Resources is charged with the enactment and enforcement of fisheries legislation. Authorised officers in seven regional fisheries areas carry out enforcement and fisheries protection. Commercial catch statistics are reported from licensed salmon dealers' registers in all regions except one where an estimate is made based on sample fishermen's catches. Angling catch returns are not collected systematically and best estimates are made in most regions.

Sweden

The level of unreported catches is assumed to be between 5 to 25% of the total catch. The level has been estimated based on the official catch figures collected yearly by the National Board of Fisheries through the mandatory log-books and sales notes regarding the licensed professional fishing, and the county administrations regarding all salmon catches in the coastal area and in the rivers. The county administrations issue fishing licences to fishermen, a condition of which is the submission of a yearly report of all catches. Sport fishing organisations and fisheries management areas managing the salmon fishing through the sale of one-day fishing licences for smaller areas in the rivers are also obliged to report all catches of salmon including specification of individual length, weight, sex and date of the catch. Even the place of the catch and fishing method used are commonly reported. The information is compiled yearly at the respective county administration's fishing unit and submitted to the Board of Fisheries. The information regarding sport fishing with rod and line and professional fishing with fixed gears is estimated to be quite complete but the catch by the public because of their right to fish with a limited number of nets is assumed to be the major part of the Swedish unreported catch.

UK - England and Wales

All net, fixed engine and rod fishing is subject to licence. All licensees are required to submit a mandatory catch return. The proportion of netsmen submitting returns is usually at, or very close to, 100%, with active follow-up of non-respondents. A lower proportion of rod licensees respond; a postal reminder system operates. Declared catches are adjusted for under-reporting.

UK - Northern Ireland

Returns from netsmen as a licence condition.

UK - Scotland

Wild resources are policed by the District Salmon Board's bailiff force. Catch return forms are sent to owner/occupiers of the salmon fishery. A reminders system is in place to maximise returns. A return rate of 95% or greater is received annually.

Iceland

Detailed catch statistics for angling.
Reliable catch statistic for net fishing in rivers.
No legal sea fisheries for salmon.

Norway

The main responsibility for collection and administration of the catch reports lies with the County Governors. The County Governors collect reports at the end of the year from land owners on the rivers. A report from each county is sent to the official bureau "Statistics Norway". Sea-fishermen are registered by the County Governor

before the fishing season starts. Catch reports from sea fishing are sent directly from each fisherman to Statistics Norway.

Russian Federation

For all types of fishing a licence is issued by the Fishery Protection authorities. For commercial fishing for salmon, and fishing based on "catch and release", a special seasonal day-book is available in which the daily catch statistics are registered. During "catch and retain" fishing the catch statistics are entered on a licence to further submit to the Fishery Protection authorities. Reporting on commercial fishing is practised on a decade basis and that on licensed recreational fishing - after the termination of the season. When the catch statistics are not reported the fishing licence is cancelled.

USA

There is no legal harvest of Atlantic salmon in the United States with the exception of the fishery on the Merrimack River on reconditioned broodstock. Fishermen on the Merrimack River are required to purchase a separate licence and fill out a log book.

Commercial fishermen in state and federal waters are required to report catch, including by-catch. This data is entered into a database that can be searched by species, area, gear, etc.

2. Estimate of unreported catch by country, broken down by category and indicating whether the unreported catch is the result of legal or illegal activities

Canada

Unreported catch estimates were 133 tonnes in 1999. No breakdown of this figure was provided nor whether it was the result of legal or illegal activities but unreported catch is attributed principally to illegal fishing (see paragraph 3.5).

Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

0

Greenland

Unreported catches are estimated at approximately 10 – 15 tonnes. It is not possible to indicate whether the unreported catch is the result of legal or illegal activities.

European Union

Finland

Unreported catch in river fisheries 6 tonnes.

Ireland

122 t. Predominantly illegal catch by commercial fishing engines.

Sweden

Approximately 10% (i.e. 1.3 tonnes in 1999). The unreported catch is mainly the result of insufficient reporting because of the national legislation which permits non-professional fishing with a limited number of nets with no mandatory obligation to report the catches. Hence the Swedish unreported catch is mainly the result of legal activities.

UK - England and Wales

35 tonnes. No breakdown of estimate between legal and illegal activities.

UK - Northern Ireland

5 tonnes. No breakdown of estimate between legal and illegal activities. The total unreported catch is estimated from intelligence reports of fishery officers on the ground and catch figures given to scientists by individual netsmen on a confidential basis.

UK - Scotland

46 tonnes. No breakdown of estimate between legal and illegal activities.

Iceland

Unreported catch estimated to be 2 tonnes (legal fisheries by-catch).

Norway

Total catch:	1241 tonnes *
Reported catch:	811 tonnes
Unreported catch:	430 tonnes *

* uncertainty ± 110 tonnes

Estimated breakdown of unreported catches:

Illegal catch in the sea:	110 tonnes
By-catch by commercial sea fishing:	15 tonnes
Legal catch in sea by bag-net and bend net:	90 tonnes

Legal catch in sea by angling: 90 tonnes
Illegal catch in rivers: 15 tonnes
Legal catch in rivers, mainly by angling: 110 tonnes

Russian Federation

Total unreported catch 237-255 tonnes
Legal coastal fishery – 20-30 tonnes
Illegal coastal fishery – 5-10 tonnes
Legal in-river fishery – 12-15 tonnes
Illegal in-river fishery – 200 tonnes (including 160 tonnes of Pechora salmon)

USA

0

3. Explanation of how the figure for unreported catch is arrived at

3.1 Absence of a requirement for catch statistics to be collected

Canada

_____

Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

There is no unreported catch (see sections 1 and 2).

Greenland

All catches are landed to local markets, sold privately or kept for home consumption. Due to the scattered nature of the fishery, recordings of the landings are considered incomplete.

European Union

Denmark

_____

Finland

The reporting is voluntary and fishermen underestimate their catch.

Ireland

No.

Sweden

No.

UK - England and Wales

Not applicable.

UK - Northern Ireland

Not applicable.

UK - Scotland

Not applicable.

Iceland

No.

Norway

See attached document, "Description of methods currently used for estimating unreported salmon catches in Norway".

Russian Federation

There is a requirement for catch statistics to be collected from all salmon fisheries.

USA

Commercial fishermen are required to report catches, including by-catch. No Atlantic salmon were reported in records submitted in 1999.

3.2 Suppression of information thought to be unfavourable

Canada

———

Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

———

Greenland

Not available.

European Union

Finland

———

Ireland

No

Sweden

To some limited degree because of minor catches which are believed not to be reported for tax reasons.

UK - England and Wales

No separate estimate.

UK - Northern Ireland

No separate estimate.

UK - Scotland

A separate estimate is made from intelligence obtained from a number of sources.

Iceland

Yes.

Norway

See attached document "Description of methods currently used for estimating unreported salmon catches in Norway".

Russian Federation

To cut taxes the catch statistics are reduced by salmon fishermen fishing in the coastal zone. To estimate the size of unreported catch by the methods suggested is impossible. According to the estimate from experts, this figure annually constitutes 25-40 t.

USA

———

3.3 Local sale or consumption

Canada

———

Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

———

Greenland

It has been established that salmon have been sold by persons with no licence in the towns of Nuuk, Qaqortoq, Maniitsoq and Narsaq. Catches for home consumption seem to be heavily under-reported.

European Union

Finland

———

Ireland

An unknown proportion of the unreported catch.

Sweden

Less than 30% of the total unreported catches.

UK - England and Wales

No separate estimate.

UK - Northern Ireland

No separate estimate.

UK - Scotland

A separate estimate is made from intelligence obtained from a number of sources.

Iceland

Yes.

Norway

This is not believed to be a source of unreported catch in Norway.

Russian Federation

This is not believed to be a source of unreported catch.

USA

———

3.4 Innocent inaccuracy in making returns

Canada

———

Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

———

Greenland

Not available.

European Union

Finland

50-70% of fishermen inform their catch.

Ireland

No.

Sweden

Approximately 25% of the unreported caches are caught by non-professional fishermen with no legal obligation to report their catches because they fish within their own waters.

UK - England and Wales

Rod fisheries - 10%: The Environment Agency has estimated that declared salmon rod catches in England and Wales should be increased by 10% to allow for under-reporting of the legal rod catch. This has been based on a study of catch returns made following reminders. Exceptions to this apply for a number of rivers for which the fishery owners' returns are regarded as more accurate.

Net fisheries - 8%: For net fisheries in England and Wales, the rate of reporting is generally considered to be high in most Regions and this has been supported by the findings of two studies. On the basis of these and opinions on the level of under-reporting in regional net fisheries, collected from Environment Agency fisheries personnel, a figure of 8% has been used for estimating the level of under-reporting of the national net catch. It has been suggested that over-reporting of catches may be occurring in some fisheries, and the north-east coast fishery in particular, in response to continuing rumours about potential future buy-outs (and the perception that compensation will be based on declared catches).

UK - Northern Ireland

No separate estimate.

UK - Scotland

No separate estimate.

Iceland

No.

Norway

See attached document "Description of methods currently used for estimating unreported salmon catches in Norway".

Russian Federation

This is not believed to be a source of unreported catch.

USA

———

3.5 Illegal fishing

Canada

Unreported catch is attributed principally to illegal fishing.

Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

———

Greenland

Not available.

European Union

Finland

Some illegal fishing with drift nets late in season. Illegal gill net fishing in small tributaries.

Ireland

Comprises most of the unreported catch.

Sweden

Probably to some extent but at an insignificant level compared with the total level of unreported catches.

UK - England and Wales

All methods - 12%: Recent estimates of illegal catches, expressed as a percentage of the declared catch, have ranged from 5% to 18% for different Regions. A figure of 12% has been used to estimate the total illegal catch.

UK - Northern Ireland

No separate estimate.

UK - Scotland

Estimates illegal catch from intelligence obtained from a number of sources.

Iceland

Yes.

Norway

See attached document "Description of methods currently used for estimating unreported salmon catches in Norway".

Russian Federation

No new information. According to expert opinion, illegal fishing annually makes up from 50 to 100% of the commercial catch. Calculations based on the assessment of spawners (parent stock) and fry (offspring) indicate that in 1997 illegal fishing on the Tuloma river constituted about 50% of the fish released for spawning.

USA

_____

4. The extent of catch and release fishing

Canada

23,210 small salmon
20,574 large salmon

Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

None.

Greenland

None.

European Union

Finland

There is no catch and release fishing.

Ireland

Catch and release is not carried out extensively in Ireland.

Sweden

Catch and release fishing is only practised in a very few rivers in order to improve the protection of females during their most important spawning period. No statistics exist regarding the number of fish that are released.

UK - England and Wales

Provisional estimate - 44% released (5,223 fish). This includes both voluntary and compulsory catch and release.

UK - Northern Ireland

No figure available, but incidence increasing, according to observation.

UK - Scotland

Provisional estimate - 29% of all fish caught by rod licensees.

Iceland

3051 salmon (10% of angling).

Norway

The extent of catch and release fishing is sporadic and accidental.

Russian Federation

11,239 salmon, which was 95.9% of the total catch by rod.

USA

The number of salmon caught and released in Maine in 1999 was 212. The only other sport fishery for Atlantic salmon in the United States is in the Merrimack River. Under this program, 3,275 surplus broodstock were released in 1999 from the hatchery to provide angling opportunities. This fishery resulted in the catch of 2,707 fish.

5. Any measures taken to further minimise the level of unreported catches

Canada

No measures reported.

Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Faroe Islands

There is no unreported catch.

Greenland

Official game keepers and inspectors from the GFLK make random checks at local markets in towns and settlements along the west coast. The GFLK have made random checks at hotels, restaurants, butchers' shops, hospitals and schools in various towns in order to compare purchases of salmon with reported catches.

European Union

Finland

In the new fishing agreements for the rivers Teno and Näätamo some stronger measures will be introduced.

Ireland

The recent legalisation (1996) of monofilament netting has reduced the unreported catch in many regions.

Sweden

According to FIFS 1995:23, a mandatory monthly reporting system has been implemented since 1 January 1999, for professional salmon fishing by fishing boats below 10 metres in length. The reporting will hopefully be able to cover the main part of the present unreported catches but any estimation of the catches during 1999 has still not been carried out. In addition the county administrations have increased their efforts to improve the level of reporting from sport fishing.

UK - England and Wales

The Environment Agency continues to issue multiple reminders to rod fishermen who fail to submit returns, and actively pursues missing returns from net licensees who fail to respond.

UK - Northern Ireland

The Salmon Tagging Scheme, when introduced, will provide accurate catch statistics of angling and commercial fishing exploitation.

UK - Scotland

Continuous updating of register of fishery owners.

Iceland

Increased enforcement and educational activities.

Norway

See attached document "Description of methods currently used for estimating unreported salmon catches in Norway".

Russian Federation

No new measures. To minimise the level of unreported catches it has been suggested that commercial fishing conducted in the White Sea coastal areas should be prohibited. However, this suggestion is not supported by the local authorities since it is a traditional fishery for the population of coastal settlements.

USA

Additional wardens were assigned to patrol Atlantic salmon rivers in 1999. In addition, signs were posted to help fishermen distinguish between Atlantic salmon parr and trout.

DESCRIPTION OF METHODS CURRENTLY USED FOR ESTIMATING UNREPORTED SALMON CATCHES IN NORWAY

Main approach

The main approach to estimate unreported catch is to divide total unreported catch into components and then establish estimates for each component in relation to reported catches. Detected trends on the extent of the fishery or catches from one year to another are also taken into account. Total unreported catch is divided into the following components:

- Illegal catches in sea;
- By-catch in marine commercial fisheries;
- Legal catches in sea bag net and bend net;
- Legal catches in sea by angling;
- Illegal catches in rivers;
- Legal catches in rivers, mainly by angling.

Illegal catches in sea

In 1996 a study on illegal fishing in Norway was conducted (ØF-Rapport nr. 23/1996). In the report the extent of illegal fishing in sea and illegal catches are estimated. Information on annual numbers of confiscations of fishing gear and reports of illegal activity, derived from surveillance activities, are used to estimate trends in levels of illegal fishing and illegal catches. Current estimates are based upon this study and detected trends from reports on surveillance activities.

By-catch in marine commercial fisheries

A system for reporting by-catch of salmon in marine commercial fisheries is not established, and the knowledge on by-catches from different types of these fisheries is limited. However, by-catches by marine commercial fisheries in home water are in general not considered to be a major contributor to the total figure of unreported catches. Test fishing by mackerel gill nets, which are considered to be the main problem, has given information about by-catches of salmon in this type of fishery. The current estimate is based upon these studies, reports on the increase or decrease of this fishery and an overall consideration of potential by-catches in other commercial fisheries.

Legal catches in sea by bag net and bend net

The reporting system for legal takes by bag net and bend net has been improved by introduction of catch journals mailed directly to Statistics Norway from the fishermen themselves. The return of catch journals was about 95 per cent for the years 1993-1999 (93 per cent in 1999). A study by Mørkved & Krokan conducted in 1996 entitled “An analysis of Norwegian bag and bend net fishermen” indicates that catches are slightly under-reported. However this study was not specifically designed to explore the potential extent of under-reporting of catches. Current estimates are based on this study and more “common knowledge” of the fisheries, which still gives reason to believe that catches are under-reported.

Legal catches in sea by angling

Although every fisherman has an obligation to "somehow" report salmon catches in the sea by angling to Statistics Norway, there is no system to report these catches. The lack of a system is mainly due to the fact that no licence is necessary to participate. Some trial surveys on the extent of legal takes in the sea by angling have been carried out for some rather limited geographical areas such as fjords. In order to try to get an overview of the extent of and catches by this fishery a nationwide study (ØF-rapport nr.7/1997) was conducted in 1996 in co-operation with Statistics Norway. Current estimates are based on these studies.

Illegal catches in rivers

Information derived from reports on surveillance activities is used to estimate trends in levels of illegal fishing and illegal catches in rivers. There is also reason to believe that surveillance activities in rivers by fishing right holders have increased over the last few years due to substantial efforts for better organization and local management of salmon rivers. Illegal catches in rivers are in general not considered to be a major contributor to the total figure of unreported catches. Current estimates are based on these reports and detected trends.

Legal catches in rivers, mainly by angling

The reporting system for legal catches in rivers by angling has been improved due to better organization of fishing right holders and local management of salmon rivers. Several studies conducted in different rivers show that with a catch report return-rate of 30-50%, which is common in Norway, about 60%-75% of the total catch is reported. In many rivers a deposit on fishing licences has been introduced, which is refunded when catch reports are returned. In these rivers catch-reports are improved and the return-rate of catch reports has risen to 85-95%. However there is still reason to believe that legal takes in rivers are under-reported and current estimates are based on an overall consideration of the facts presented.

ANNEX 15

Council

CNL(00)43

Atlantic Salmon in the Sea - Draft Proposal to Establish an International Co-operative Research Programme

(Tabled by Norway)

CNL(00)43

Atlantic Salmon in the Sea - Draft Proposal to Establish an International Co-operative Research Programme

The general decline in the abundance of wild Atlantic salmon in the North Atlantic during the last 20 years is a matter of great concern to all NASCO Parties. According to ICES, the decline has occurred over large areas of the salmon's distribution range, and is most severe in North America and southern Europe. During the same period there have been significant changes in the sea age composition of salmon, i.e. the abundance of MSW salmon has decreased at a higher rate than that of 1SW salmon. There could be many reasons for this decline, natural as well as man-made. The problems can be located to single rivers as well as in the sea (fjords, coast, ocean). It should also be noted that changes in the freshwater environment may affect performance of salmon in the sea.

Although there have been some studies of salmon in the marine phase in recent years, the marine life-history of this species is yet very little understood. It is well documented that the marine mortality of Atlantic salmon has increased considerably in many areas, and analysis of some time series has suggested that mortality is linked to reduced surface temperatures in the post-smolt habitat. It is, however, unlikely that temperature as a single factor is responsible for the increased mortality. Atlantic salmon are one of the many components of the marine ecosystem and will respond to changes (biotic as well as abiotic) in this. The crucial question is, therefore, to improve understanding of the response of the salmon to changes in the marine ecosystem.

It is our impression that all NASCO Parties are concerned about what is happening to salmon at sea. There is some on-going research on salmon in the marine phase in different countries, but because marine research is very expensive it is difficult to expect any major breakthroughs that may help us to identify the problems salmon have to face in the marine environment. On the other hand, if research resources were spent on international co-operative research, more resources would be available, and the different problems could be directed to areas where the opportunities and facilities were most favourable. This would also give better value for the resources spent.

Norway would, therefore, propose that an international co-operative research programme is carried out. The main aims should be:

1. To identify and explain the causes for the increased marine mortality of Atlantic salmon
2. To examine the possibilities to counteract the increased mortality

The research program should continue for 5 years and be funded by the Parties, and the results of the final report should then give guidelines for future management of salmon.

Norway proposes that a small group of scientists and managers is appointed. The task will be to outline a detailed research programme addressing the main aims stated above, and report back to NASCO prior to next year's Council meeting. Norway is willing to help organise this work.

ANNEX 16

Council

CNL(00)25

Returns Made Under the Oslo Resolution

CNL(00)25

Returns Made Under the Oslo Resolution

1. The Resolution by the Parties to the Convention for the Conservation of Salmon in the North Atlantic Ocean to Minimise Impacts from Salmon Aquaculture on the Wild Salmon Stocks (the "Oslo Resolution") was adopted by the Council in 1994. Under Article 5 of the Resolution each Party is required to provide to the Organization, on an annual basis, information of a scope to be determined by the Council concerning measures adopted under Article 2 (measures to minimise genetic and other biological interactions), Article 3 (measures to minimise the risk of transmission of diseases and parasites to the wild stocks of salmon) and on research and development (Article 4).

2. In 1998 the Council adopted a revised, more detailed format for the returns by the Parties under the Oslo Resolution so as to ensure that the Organization has available to it comprehensive information concerning the measures in force when deciding if additional measures to those contained in the Oslo Resolution may be necessary. The request for the return of information was circulated on 13 January 2000. The returns as provided by the Parties are attached.

3. Last year the Council asked that the format for returns under the Oslo Resolution be reviewed so as to identify any ambiguity and to make any necessary improvements. This we attempted to do by incorporating some guidance notes on completion of the form. For example, where previously reported measures still apply we had proposed that there was no need to repeat the information but that the return should indicate that this was the case. However, there are still some inconsistencies in the returns since some Parties have provided details only of new measures which have been introduced since the last return while others have included previously reported measures together with new measures.

4. The Council might, therefore, wish to consider whether in subsequent returns it wishes only to be advised of new measures. If so, the return form could be amended to make this clear and a considerably shorter report presented to the Council. Information returned to the Organization in all earlier returns has been incorporated in a database and the information is now available to the Parties if requested.

Secretary
Edinburgh
12 May 2000

Additional Information
Provided by Norway

Norwegian Document p1

Norwegian Document p2

ANNEX 17

Council

CNL(00)26

Report of the Liaison Meeting with the Salmon Farming Industry

CNL(00)26

Report of the Liaison Meeting with the Salmon Farming Industry

1. Last year the Council agreed that it wished to revise the process of liaison with the aquaculture industry in order to develop closer, more open and broader cooperation so that the industry throughout the North Atlantic could participate. The aim was to organise a new liaison meeting early in the year 2000 to focus on the development of Guidelines on Physical Containment and other relevant issues. Following a meeting between the Secretary and representatives of the International Salmon Farmers' Association (ISFA) in Norway in August last year, arrangements for a 'fresh start' Liaison Group meeting were made. This meeting was held in London on 10 and 11 February 2000. The report of the meeting is attached.

2. The meeting was well attended both by representatives of the North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry (NASFI) and NASCO Parties and there was a good spirit of cooperation and a commitment to work together on issues of mutual concern. Progress was made in agreeing a Constitution for the Liaison Group (contained in Annex 4 of the report) and guiding principles in the form of a Declaration to serve as a basis for future cooperation between the salmon farming industry and the authorities dealing with wild salmon interests (contained in Annex 6 of the report). The Liaison Group decided that there was a need for consideration of the technical aspects of guidelines on containment by a smaller Working Group with technical expertise and Terms of Reference for this Group were agreed (contained in Annex 7 of the report). This group met in Brussels on April 6 and 7 and has been requested by the Liaison Group to produce a progress report by 20 May. This report will be tabled separately as document CNL(00)27 for consideration by the Council.

3. The Council is asked to consider the report of the Liaison Group and decide if it can accept the report and, in particular, if it can accept:

   i) the Declaration detailing principles for cooperation between NASCO and NASFI;
   ii) the Constitution for the Liaison Group;
   iii) the proposal that the Liaison Group provides a better forum for cooperation between NASCO and the salmon farming industry than NGO status but that one or two representatives of the Liaison Group be invited to attend future NASCO meetings;
   iv) the proposals for future areas for discussion and cooperation:
      - how the salmon farming industry might assist with restoration and enhancement of wild salmon stocks (it was proposed that NASCO might hold a Special Session on this subject);
      - fish health interactions;
      - overfishing of the salmon's prey;
      - mechanisms to support research of interest to the Liaison Group;
   v) the proposal to hold a second meeting of the Liaison Group in North America in February 2001.

Secretary
Edinburgh
17 April 2000

Report of the Meeting of the North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry and NASCO Liaison Group

Thistle Kensington Park Hotel, de Vere Street, London 10 and 11 February 2000

1. Introduction

1.1 Dr Malcolm Windsor, Secretary of NASCO, opened the meeting and welcomed delegates to London. He made an opening statement on behalf of the North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization (NASCO). This statement is contained in Annex 1.

1.2 An opening statement was made by Mr Trond Williksen on behalf of the North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry (NASFI). This statement is contained in Annex 2.

1.3 A list of participants is contained in Annex 3.

2. Adoption of a Constitution

2.1 The Liaison Group adopted a Constitution to guide its work, SLG(00)6 (Annex 4).

3. Election of a Chairman and a Rapporteur

3.1 The Liaison Group elected Mr Andrew Thomson as its Chairman and Mr Richie Flynn as its Rapporteur, both to serve for a period of two years.

4. Adoption of the Agenda

4.1 The Liaison Group adopted its agenda, SLG(00)7 (Annex 5), after including a new agenda item 2, Adoption of a Constitution.

5. Summary of the Work of NASCO

5.1 Dr Malcolm Windsor made a brief presentation summarising the work of NASCO, covering the following aspects: harvest restrictions; scientific advice; fishing for salmon in international waters; by-catch; catch statistics; habitat issues; predators and prey; the precautionary approach; and impacts of aquaculture. He stressed that NASCO does not believe that all the problems facing the wild salmon stocks are caused by aquaculture, and that such a belief would be ridiculous. Equally, however, he stated that NASCO does not believe that there are or can be no adverse genetic, disease and parasite and other impacts from aquaculture. That would be equally ridiculous. He stressed that the NASCO Parties have obligations under an international Convention to conserve wild salmon stocks and they therefore have no choice but to do everything possible to achieve this. Almost every NASCO Party

with wild salmon interests also has a salmon farming industry and he concluded that the challenge is to find ways that these two great endeavours can live together.

6. Mechanisms for Future Cooperation between NASCO and the North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry

6.1 The Liaison Group considered document SLG(00)3 which reviewed some possible mechanisms for future cooperation between NASCO and the North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry. The Group recognised the need for improved communication between the salmon farming industry and the authorities concerned with the wild stocks and agreed that the Liaison Group provided a better forum for cooperation on issues of mutual interest than Non-Government Observer status to NASCO. Representatives of the salmon farming industry can attend NASCO's Special Liaison Meetings and it was recognised that some delegations now include salmon farming industry representatives. The Group agreed to recommend to the Council of NASCO that one or two representatives of the Liaison Group should be invited to attend future NASCO meetings.

6.2 The Liaison Group adopted a Declaration detailing the principles for cooperation between NASCO and its Contracting Parties and the North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry, SLG(00)8 (Annex 6).

7. Development of Internationally Agreed Guidelines on Containment

7.1 The Liaison Group considered draft Guidelines on Containment, SLG(00)5, which had been prepared by the NASCO Secretariat, based on three existing Codes (the Federation of European Aquaculture Producers' Code of Conduct for European Aquaculture, a Code of Practice for the Responsible Containment of Farmed Atlantic Salmon in Maine Waters, and a Code of Containment of Farmed Fish in Scotland) and which also took into account NASCO's concerns and its agreements. The Liaison Group agreed that the draft guidelines contained in SLG(00)5 provided an excellent basis for the development of internationally agreed standards but that there was a need for further consideration of the technical aspects by a smaller Working Group.

7.2 The Liaison Group agreed Terms of Reference, SLG(00)9 (Annex 7), for a Working Group to Develop Guidelines on Containment, based on document SLG(00)5, other existing codes of containment and other relevant information. The Working Group would meet in Brussels on 6 and 7 April 2000. The Working Group should also advise on future needs for research and development to update the guidelines in future.

7.3 The guidelines on containment, when accepted by the Council of NASCO and the industry, will represent an internationally agreed standard for use throughout the North Atlantic area. The Liaison Group agreed that the countries should each draw up a national action plan, or regional plans, based on these guidelines and should advise the Liaison Group of its plan or plans, of the means of enforcement and of the reporting procedures. The plan or plans will be based on cooperation between industry and the relevant authorities and should include the allocation of responsibilities under the plan or plans and a timetable for implementation. The Liaison Group recognised that in some countries action plans are already under

development so the international and national or regional initiatives can take place simultaneously.

8. Future Areas for Discussion and Cooperation

8.1 The Liaison Group discussed possible areas for future discussion and cooperation between NASFI and NASCO. There was support for consideration of how the salmon farming industry might assist with the restoration and enhancement of wild salmon stocks. The Liaison Group recognised that the salmon farming industry has considerable experience in hatchery techniques and in reducing costs associated with rearing salmon. Furthermore, there is considerable genetic experience in the industry but, to date, there has been little communication between geneticists working in the salmon faming industry and those working with the wild stocks. The industry also has some experience with triploid salmon which would be of interest to those involved with management of wild stocks. The Group recognised that, while there were already cooperative initiatives underway involving the industry and those concerned with restoration and enhancement of wild stocks, there would be benefits from enhanced dialogue in the future, and that the Liaison Group would be an appropriate forum for this dialogue. There was also support within the Group for a Special Session within NASCO on the restoration and enhancement of wild salmon. The Canadian Commissioner for Aquaculture Development indicated his willingness to consider funding such a session.

8.2 The Liaison Group also agreed that fish health interactions would be a good topic for discussion at a subsequent meeting given that evidence is increasing that the mechanisms of transmission of diseases and parasites between farmed and wild salmon are more complex than originally thought. The view was also expressed that there is concern that some pelagic fish species, which may be the food of salmon, are being overfished and that this issue should be discussed by the Group.

8.3 The Liaison Group also agreed to discuss at a subsequent meeting possible funding mechanisms in order to support research which may be of interest to the Group but which may not otherwise be able to attract funding.

8.4 The Chairman proposed that background papers on these topics be submitted to the NASCO Secretariat so that they could be distributed before the next meeting of the Group.

9. Any Other Business

9.1 The Liaison Group agreed that development of a Press Release would be premature due to the need for approval by the Council of NASCO and by industry. However, where there was informal media contact, the message from the meeting could be positive, highlighting the progress made in agreeing guiding principles for future cooperation between the salmon farming industry and the authorities dealing with wild salmon interests and in developing Terms of Reference for a Working Group to further develop internationally agreed guidelines on containment.

10. Date and Place of Next Meeting

10.1 The Liaison Group agreed to hold its next meeting in February 2001, in the USA or Canada. The NASCO Secretariat was asked to liaise with the North American members of the Group to confirm details of venue and dates for the meeting.

11. Report of the Liaison Group Meeting

11.1 The Liaison Group decided to agree a report of the meeting by correspondence, well in advance of the meeting of the Working Group scheduled for 6-7 April 2000, and referred to in section 7 above.

11.2 It was agreed that the list of participants which will be annexed to the report should include details of e-mail addresses.

Opening Statement by Dr Malcolm Windsor on behalf of the North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization (NASCO)

First, a warm welcome to this Liaison Meeting to our colleagues in the North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry. We were very pleased to be able to invite you to participate in what we see as a fresh start in the process of finding ways that salmon farming interests and wild salmon stock interests in the North Atlantic can live happily together. We thank you sincerely for coming to this meeting and for focusing with us on matters of mutual concern.

If I can refer briefly to a little history. A Wild and Farmed Salmon Liaison Group was set up in 1997. It involved NASCO and the International Salmon Farmers' Association (ISFA). It held its first meeting two years ago in March 1998. It agreed its Constitution and it held a very useful exchange of views both then and at a second meeting in December 1998. However, it has to be said that, for various reasons, it made little or no progress on substantive issues. Moreover there was little representation from North America, so today is a fresh start to the process of cooperation between us.

As our colleagues in the salmon farming industry will know, NASCO and all of its member Governments are very keen that salmon farming and wild salmon stocks should prosper together and, as an initial measure, we held a special session on aquaculture as part of our Annual Meeting in Westport, Ireland, last June. This was an opportunity for Canada and Norway to explain what measures they had in place to minimize impacts between aquaculture and wild stocks and to consider what additional measures may be necessary. Although sometimes it must seem so to you, in industry, we do not just focus exclusively on salmon farming. We are well aware and openly accept that there are many factors that may be adversely influencing wild salmon populations, such as marine conditions, acid rain, habitat damage, climatic changes and predators. Those from the industry who attended our Annual Meeting will be aware that NASCO is addressing a wide range of issues concerning conservation of the wild salmon stocks. These include the establishment of regulatory measures, measures to reduce unreported catches, the possible by-catch of Atlantic salmon in pelagic fisheries, elimination of fishing for salmon in international waters and protection and restoration of freshwater habitat. We are, therefore, considering many pressures on the resource and are taking action on many fronts to safeguard the wild stocks. I will come back to this later.

NASCO is emphatically not anti-salmon-farming, but we do have real concerns about impacts on the wild stocks. We cannot stand by and risk genetic, disease and parasite damage to wild stocks and, as a matter of fact, we do not think it is in the aquaculture industry's interest either for this to happen. What we are seeking is a win-win situation, where the wild stocks are maintained at healthy levels in their genetically diverse form and the salmon farming industry is sustainable and seen as environmentally friendly so that it will have a competitive advantage over other foods.

Last year the NASCO President, Mr Einar Lemche, and I were invited to Norway to spend some time with the industry on a boat in the Norwegian Fjords. Our President was unable to go but I went and I must say our meetings were in a very positive and friendly atmosphere which I very much appreciated. We want to continue this atmosphere in our meeting here in London.

Last year NASCO Council agreed that it would seek a fresh start to the liaison process and that it would like to widen the representation to ensure that all North Atlantic salmon farming industries are involved. The North American industry was, therefore, invited specifically and we are delighted to see them represented here today.

It is fair to say that the concerns about impacts have become more urgent and the publicity more strident. We in NASCO would prefer to see a closer liaison which will build trust and enable the main issues and problems to be solved in a mutually agreeable way rather than to see a divisive and confrontational approach. This meeting is a two-way process and we are very eager to listen to your concerns. We want this meeting to be friendly, free and open and we want to emerge with the basis for further cooperation on an international agreement on containment. That will, of course, not be fixed for all time but will evolve. If we are successful there may well be other areas that we can profitably tackle. I can assure you of our good will and commitment to cooperation. We do hope that we can all achieve this. What is more, we believe that international agreement on these issues will be more acceptable to the industry. There will be a level playing field in what is a very competitive industry.

Having said that, of course the situation for the wild stocks and for the industry is different in each country and there will clearly still be national agreements and legislation to take care of that. What we can do internationally is to produce some generally acceptable guidelines, discuss standards and determine next steps as regards the development of codes of practice. The fact that these are internationally agreed should help us all.

So we start with these aims. If this goes well there is no reason why we should not continue a fruitful dialogue on other issues that cause both sides concern.

Opening Statement by Mr Trond Williksen on behalf of the North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry (NASFI)

Ladies and Gentlemen: On behalf of the North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry I would like to express our gratitude to NASCO for the arrangements made for this meeting, which the salmon farming industry regards as a new start to the process of cooperation which we started in 1997. The North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry believes that there are significant areas of common interest for the salmon farming industry and NASCO. The industry is committed to the principles of environmental sustainability and environmental stewardship in order to protect the environment, on which we depend. This includes the preservation of wild salmon stocks. In view of this common interest, the industry recognises the need for a continuing and positive dialogue on issues of mutual concern.

With regard to our agenda for the meeting, it will be important to develop a sound basis for future cooperation and a lasting dialogue built on mutual trust. Our aim should be to establish the basis for a partnership with the objective of protecting the wild salmon stocks while allowing for the development of a responsible, sustainable salmon farming industry. If we achieve that during our meeting here in London we will indeed have made progress.

The other issue on our agenda is containment so as to minimise escapes. This is an important issue for the industry which needs to be addressed, but it is complex in an international context, since very different local conditions need to be taken into account. This meeting of nearly forty people is not, perhaps, the best forum for detailed discussions on the issue of containment but it is important that, over the next two days, we discuss the principles and a framework for guidelines to reduce escapes.

Mr Chairman, this meeting is a good opportunity for NASFI and NASCO to have an open-minded discussion which we in the industry hope will be fruitful.

North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry and NASCO Liaison Group

List of Participants

Ms Helen Ainsworth	Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, London, UK h.ainsworth@fish.maff.gsi.gov.uk
Mr Yves Bastien	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa, Canada bastieny@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Mr Sebastian Belle	Maine Dept of Marine Resources, Augusta, USA sebastian.belle@state.me.us
Mr Michael Calcutt	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa, Canada calcuttm@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Ms Mary Colligan	National Marine Fisheries Service, Gloucester, USA mary.a.colligan@noaa.gov
Mr William Crowe	Scottish Salmon Producers Organization, Perth, UK wcrowe@scottishsalmon.co.uk
Mr David Dunkley	Scottish Executive Rural Affairs Department, Edinburgh, UK david.dunkley@scotland.gov.uk
Mr Michael Edwards	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Rothesay, NB, Canada edwardsmi@dfo-mpo.gc.ca medwards@acoa-apeca.gc.ca
Ms Eva Espeland	The Royal Ministry of Environment, Oslo, Norway ee@md.dep.no
Mr Richard Flynn	Irish Salmon Growers Association, Dublin, Ireland richie@ifa.ie
Dr James Geiger	US Fish and Wildlife Service, Hadley, USA jaime_geiger@fws.gov
Ms Nell Halse	New Brunswick Salmon Growers Association, St George, Canada nbsganh@nb.aibn.com
Mr Steinar Hermansen	The Royal Ministry of Environment, Oslo, Norway sh@md.dep.no

Mr Knut A Hjelt	Norwegian Fish Farmers Association, Trondheim, Norway knuta.hjelt@nho.no
Dr Peter Hutchinson	NASCO Secretariat, Edinburgh, UK hq@nasco.org.uk
Mr Arni Isaksson	Directorate of Freshwater Fisheries, Reykjavik, Iceland arni@veidimalastjori.is
Dr Vigfus Johannsson	Icelandic Fish Farmers and Sea Ranchers Association, Reykjavik, Iceland vigfus@itm.is
Mr Marc Kielley	Newfoundland Aquaculture Industry Association, St John's, NF, Canada mkielley@naia.nf.net
Dr Dan C Kimball	US Fish and Wildlife Service, Nashua, USA kimballfws@aol.com
Mr Ivor Llewelyn	Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, London, UK i.llewelyn - official@fish.maff.gov.uk
Mr Joseph McGonigle	Maine Aquaculture Association, Brewer, USA jmcgonig@mstf.org
Ms Anne McMullin	Canadian Aquaculture Industry Alliance, Vancouver, Canada mcmullin@salmonfarmers.org
Mr Brian Meaney	Dept of Fisheries & Aquaculture, St John's, NF, Canada bmeaney@mail.gov.nf.ca
Mr Angus Morgan	Scottish Salmon Producers Organization, Perth, UK margo@scottishsalmon.co.uk
Mr Pentti Munne	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Helsinki, Finland pentti.munne@mmm.fi
Mr Alessandro Piccioli	European Commission, Brussels, Belgium Alessandro.Piccioli@cec.eu.int
Ms Iola Price	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa, Canada pricei@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Mr Jacque Robichaud	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa, Canada robichaj@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

Mr James Ryan	Irish Salmon Growers Association, Renvyle, Ireland ksc@anu.ie
Ms Elena Samoilova	PINRO, Murmansk, Russia inter@pinro.murmansk.ru
Mr Andrew Thomson	European Commission, Brussels, Belgium Andrew.Thomson@cec.eu.int
Mr George Thomson	Scottish Executive Rural Affairs Department, Edinburgh, UK george.thomson@scotland.gov.uk
Dr John Webster	Scottish Salmon Producers Organization, Perth, UK jwebster@scottishsalmon.co.uk
Mr Hedin Weihe	Faroese Home Government, Torshavn, Faroe Islands hedinw@fisk.fl.fo
Dr Ken Whelan	Marine Institute, Newport, Ireland kwhelan@iol.ie
Mr Trond Williksen	Norwegian Fish Farmers Association, Trondheim, Norway trond.williksen@nho.no
Dr Malcolm Windsor	NASCO Secretariat, Edinburgh, UK hq@nasco.org.uk
Dr Alexander Zubchenko	PINRO, Murmansk, Russia inter@pinro.murmansk.ru

North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry and NASCO Liaison Group

Constitution

The North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry and NASCO Liaison Group (the "Liaison Group") is an advisory group established to provide an international forum for liaison between the salmon farming industry in the North Atlantic and the relevant authorities responsible for the wild Atlantic salmon stocks and aquaculture on issues of mutual interest, and to make recommendations for action. The Group will work by consensus.

The Liaison Group shall comprise industry members from each North Atlantic country and representatives from each member Party of the North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization (NASCO).

The Liaison Group will meet on an annual basis, or at more or less frequent intervals if it so decides.

The Liaison Group shall appoint from among its members a Chairman and a Rapporteur who shall serve for a period of two years.

The office of Chairman and of Rapporteur shall be held alternately by representatives of NASCO and the North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry.

The Secretariat of NASCO and designated representatives of the North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry shall, following consultation, make the arrangements for the meetings of the Group and shall share the administrative responsibilities.

North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry and NASCO Liaison Group

Thistle Kensington Park Hotel, de Vere Street, London

10 and 11 February 2000

Agenda

1. Introduction

   - Opening remarks by the North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry
   - Opening remarks by NASCO

2. Adoption of a Constitution

3. Election of a Chairman and a Rapporteur

4. Adoption of the Agenda

5. Summary of the Work of NASCO

6. Mechanisms for Future Cooperation between NASCO and the North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry

7. Development of Internationally Agreed Guidelines on Containment

8. Future Areas for Discussion and Cooperation

9. Any Other Business

10. Date and Place of Next Meeting

11. Report of the Liaison Group Meeting

Mechanism for Cooperation between NASCO and its Contracting Parties and the North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry (hereinafter referred to as "the Parties")

Declaration

1. Statement of principle and objective

The North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry (NASFI) and the North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organisation (NASCO), recognizing the importance of conserving and enhancing wild salmon stocks and of supporting a sustainable salmon farming industry, have agreed to the establishment of guiding principles for cooperation. The objective is to establish mutually beneficial working arrangements in order to make recommendations on wild salmon conservation and sustainable salmon farming practices.

2. Principles for cooperation between NASCO and its Contracting Parties and the North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry

2.1 The Parties are committed to working in cooperation and to establishing a better mutual understanding;

2.2 The Parties recognise the importance of environmental sustainability and environmental stewardship;

2.3 Salmon farming and wild stock management both require a risk management approach;

2.4 Decisions respecting salmon management and salmon farming should be based on the best available science and the Parties recognise the need to improve information for decision making in relation to wild salmon stocks and salmon aquaculture;

2.5 The Parties agree to work cooperatively when consideration is given to the application of the Precautionary Approach to salmon aquaculture;

2.6 Social, economic, and environmental costs and benefits should be integral to decision making whenever possible;

2.7 A number of environmental factors and human activities can have an adverse affect on wild salmon abundance;

2.8 The Parties are committed to reversing wild salmon declines;

2.9 Salmon farming has the potential to be complementary and beneficial to wild salmon conservation.

Terms of Reference for a Working Group to Develop Guidelines on Containment

1. The Liaison Group decides to establish a Working Group to produce draft guidelines on containment to apply throughout the area covered by the NASCO Convention. These guidelines should have as their objective the prevention of escapes of farm salmon in the marine and freshwater environments. In carrying out this task the Working Group should:

   (a) make appropriate use of document SLG(00)5
   (b) make appropriate use of other codes of containment
   (c) use such other relevant information available to it
   (d) advise on future needs for research and development to update the guidelines in future.

2. The Working Group shall consist of members from industry representing salmon farming interests and members from NASCO Parties representing the relevant authorities. This group should communicate and consult widely and could invite other participants as appropriate. The members of the Working Group shall be appointed by 1 March 2000 and notified to the NASCO Secretariat who will inform the Liaison Group. The Working Group shall hold its first meeting during 6-7 April 2000 in Brussels, Belgium. The NASCO Secretariat shall provide the necessary coordination and administrative and other support. The Working Group shall appoint its Chairman.

3. The Working Group shall make a progress report to the Liaison Group before 20 May 2000 so that there is an opportunity for comment before the report is considered by the Council of NASCO at its Seventeenth Annual Meeting during 5-9 June 2000. The report will also be considered by the appropriate national industry organizations. The Working Group's full report should be available by 31 October 2000 so that it can be considered at the next meeting of the Liaison Group.

ANNEX 18

Council

CNL(00)27

Report of the Working Group to Develop Guidelines on Containment of Farmed Salmon

CNL(00)27

Report of the Working Group to Develop Guidelines on Containment of Farmed Salmon

1. At its meeting in London, in February this year, the NASFI/NASCO Liaison Group agreed Terms of Reference for a Working Group to Develop Guidelines on Containment. This Working Group met in Brussels on 6 and 7 April 2000 and its report is attached. It has been distributed to all members of the Liaison Group. The draft guidelines on containment are in Annex 4 of this report. While the Liaison Group had asked for a progress report by 20 May and a full report by 31 October, the Working Group was able to complete its work at the meeting on 6-7 April, so the report is, in fact, a full report.

2. The Liaison Group agreed that the guidelines on containment, when accepted by the Council of NASCO and the industry, will represent an internationally agreed standard for use throughout the North Atlantic area. Once agreed, the countries would each draw up a national action plan, or regional plans, based on the guidelines and should advise the Liaison Group of its plan or plans, of the means of enforcement and of the reporting procedures. In some countries, action plans are already under development so the international and national or regional initiatives will take place simultaneously.

3. The Council is asked to consider the Working Group's report and to decide:

   (a) if it can accept the draft Guidelines as they stand; or

   (b) if it wishes to see further work on the guidelines under the auspices of the Liaison Group; and

   (c) if it can accept the recommendations on research and development.

Secretary
Edinburgh
12 May, 2000

Report of the Meeting of the NASCO/NASFI Working Group to Develop Guidelines on Containment

Directorate General for Fisheries, European Commission, Brussels 6-7 April 2000

1. Opening of the Meeting

1.1 Dr Peter Hutchinson, Assistant Secretary of NASCO, opened the meeting and welcomed participants to Brussels. He thanked the Directorate General for Fisheries of the European Commission for hosting the meeting and for the arrangements made. He referred to the fact that at the Liaison Group meeting in London there had been initial discussions on guidelines on containment, but the Liaison Group had recognised the need for further consideration of the technical aspects by a smaller Working Group. He noted that the task before the Working Group was to develop internationally agreed standards on containment, acceptable both to the North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry (NASFI) and to the North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization (NASCO), which would be implemented through national or regional actions plans developed through cooperation between industry and the relevant authorities. The Working Group on Containment represented the first collaborative venture under the new NASFI/NASCO Declaration and it was important that the Group was able to make progress on this important issue, which could lead to mutual benefits. He wished all participants an enjoyable and productive meeting and a pleasant stay in Brussels.

1.2 A list of participants is contained in Annex 1.

2. Appointment of a Chairman and Rapporteur

2.1 The Working Group appointed Dr John Webster as Chairman. Dr Peter Hutchinson was appointed as Rapporteur.

3. Adoption of the Agenda

3.1 The Working Group adopted its agenda, SLG(00)15 (Annex 2), after including a new item 6, "Recommendations for Research and Development".

4. Consideration of the Terms of Reference

4.1 The Working Group considered its Terms of Reference, SLG(00)9 (Annex 3).

5. Development of Draft Guidelines on Containment

5.1 The Terms of Reference developed by the Liaison Group at its meeting in London on 10 and 11 February state that in developing draft guidelines on containment the Working Group should make appropriate use of document SLG(00)5, other codes of containment and other relevant information available to it. The Canadian Aquaculture

Industry Alliance tabled a proposal for containment guidelines, SLG(00)16. A document entitled "A Code of Practice on the Containment of Farmed Fish, Official Notification following the Escape of Fish, and Possible Measures to be Employed to Attempt Recapture", SLG(00)17, was tabled by the representative of the Scottish Executive.

5.2 Some members of the Working Group indicated that they were willing to work from document SLG(00)5 and to develop the technical details which had not been resolved in the preparation of that document by the NASCO Secretariat. This approach, they believed, would be consistent with the guidance given in paragraph 7.1 of the agreed report of the Liaison Group meeting, which states that "SLG(00)5 provided an excellent basis for the development of internationally agreed standards, but that there was a need for further consideration of the technical aspects by a smaller Working Group". However, other members of the Group indicated that document SLG(00)5 was too prescriptive, that they favoured the format of document SLG(00)16 and that they believed that this approach would be consistent with the Terms of Reference for the meeting. The Chairman proposed that, in order to make progress, the Working Group should work from the three documents referred to in paragraph 5.1 above, first developing general headings and then, where there was consensus within the Working Group, incorporating more detailed guidance on containment measures. The Working Group agreed to follow this proposed method of working.

5.3 The draft guidelines on containment developed by the Working Group, SLG(00)14, are attached as Annex 4.

5.4 The agreed report of the Liaison Group meeting states that, if and when accepted by the Council of NASCO and the industry, the guidelines on containment will represent an internationally agreed standard for use throughout the North Atlantic area. The Liaison Group had agreed "that the countries should each draw up a national action plan, or regional plans, based on these guidelines and should advise the Liaison Group of its plan or plans, of the means of enforcement and of the reporting procedures. The plan or plans will be based on cooperation between industry and the relevant authorities and should include the allocation of responsibilities under the plan or plans and a timetable for implementation". The Liaison Group had recognised that in some countries action plans are already under development so the international and national or regional initiatives can take place simultaneously.

5.5 The Working Group discussed at considerable length the various interpretations of the term "action plan" as referred to in the report of the Liaison Group meeting. The representative of the Canadian Aquaculture Industry Alliance stated that, although he had not personally attended the London meeting, he understood that the remit of the Working Group was to develop guidelines on containment which could be used in the development of a Code of Practice by the salmon farming industry, rather than for use in developing regulations to apply to the industry. The Working Group recognised that several different interpretations of the term "action plan" had emerged since the London meeting, and it was agreed that there was a need for clarification. In this connection, it was recommended that the matter be referred back to the Liaison Group for consideration at its next meeting, scheduled to take place in February 2001. In advance of further discussion within the Liaison Group and clarification of the meaning of the term "action plan", the Working Group agreed that, for the purpose of

developing the guidelines on containment, "action plan" would be taken to mean the processes through which internationally agreed guidelines on containment would be implemented at national or regional level through existing or new voluntary codes of practice, regulations, or a combination of both. In this regard, different regions or countries could adopt different approaches to the prevention of escapes, with all approaches being based on the common standards developed by the Working Group.

5.6 The representative of the Maine Aquaculture Association proposed that once the containment guidelines had been approved by NASCO and the salmon farming industry, the North American Commission's Protocols on Introductions and Transfers, other NASCO agreements and relevant national regulations would be obsolete and their continuing necessity should be reviewed. While some members of the Working Group were able to support this proposal, others stressed that the question of amendments to or revocation of NASCO agreements and national regulations was beyond the Working Group's remit, and probably also that of the Liaison Group. Changes to NASCO's documents would require the unanimous approval of the Council or relevant Commission of NASCO. Furthermore, review of these agreements or regulations would only be appropriate after the provisions of the guidelines had been implemented through national or regional action plans and their effectiveness confirmed. It was suggested that the representative of the Maine Aquaculture Association might wish to raise this issue with the Head of the US Delegation to NASCO. The Working Group agreed that this proposal should be referred to the Liaison Group at its next meeting, scheduled for February 2001.

5.7 The representative of the Canadian Aquaculture Industry Alliance pointed out that the activities of other users of the marine and freshwater environments, e.g. fishermen, recreational boaters, etc., could cause damage to fish farm equipment and structures which could result in escapes, and that the Working Group should consider making recommendations on this issue. In Norway, there is legislation which restricts public access to salmon farming sites, but this is not the case in other countries. The Working Group recognised that the issue of access rights was beyond its competence but agreed to draw to the attention of the Liaison Group the fact that there are activities which could result in escapes which are beyond the control of fish farmers, and which are not, therefore, addressed by the draft guidelines on containment.

5.8 The representative of the Norwegian Fish Farmers Association noted that, in Norway, there is concern about the increased risks associated with the use of larger farming units capable of holding very high numbers of salmon. The use of these units raises concerns about escapes and fish health. While the Working Group recognised that the probability of an escape from such units may be lower than for smaller units because of their technical specifications, in the event of a catastrophic incident there could be a very large escape to the wild. This development would, therefore, need to be kept under review.

5.9 The representative of the Canadian Aquaculture Industry Alliance indicated that his industry did not accept that escapes from salmon farming posed a threat to the wild stocks, that there was no scientific proof to support such a view, and that the reason for developing containment guidelines was to ensure that the industry was efficient, cost-effective and sustainable. Other members of the Working Group did not agree with this statement, indicating that, equally, it could not be proved that escapes of

farm salmon do not pose a threat, and that development of guidelines on containment was consistent with the Precautionary Approach recently adopted by NASCO and its Contracting Parties. The question arose as to an appropriate definition of the term "wild salmon". The terms "native", "wild", "naturalized", "stocked" and "escaped" salmon have been defined by ICES based on the parental origin and the amount of their life-cycle spent in the wild. It was agreed that these definitions, developed and agreed by the international scientific community within ICES, should be made available to the Liaison Group at a future meeting.

6. Recommendations for Research and Development

6.1 Because of time constraints during the meeting the Working Group agreed to develop its recommendations for research and development by correspondence. The following topics for further research and development were identified:

(i) Measures to minimise potential interactions between escaped farm salmon and wild stocks, in addition to those concerned with physical containment, and which might be used to complement the guidelines on containment, should be investigated further. These measures might include the costs and benefits associated with the use of sterile salmon and local broodstocks, and methods to recapture farm salmon following escape incidents.

(ii) In order to assist the fish farming industry in more accurately assessing fish numbers and biomass and to facilitate more reliable estimates of losses, including escapes, there is a need to identify and collate the results of research and development programmes on: methods of counting farm salmon and for estimating biomass; improved protocols for delivery of smolts to marine cage on-growing facilities; methods for estimating losses due to predation; methods for estimating smolt mortality during their first months at sea; and methods to estimate losses by monitoring biomass.

(iii) There is a need to develop and improve systems for notifying escapes to the appropriate authorities.

(iv) The guidelines on containment should be kept under review in the light of developments with transgenic salmonids. Additional containment measures would be needed if transgenic salmonids were to be used by the farming industry.

(v) Methods which would allow farm salmon to be tagged in a cost-effective manner, and which would address the industry's concerns about welfare of the fish and food safety aspects, and which would facilitate better identification of farm salmon in the wild, should be considered further.

(vi) Research and development with the objective of providing cost-effective systems offering improved containment should be encouraged, for example on net weights, and secure methods for attaching nets to cage collars. There is a need to conduct risk analyses for different farm operations which could lead to escapes so that measures to improve containment can be targeted in order to minimize escapes.

6.2 The Working Group recognised that progress on research and development in relation to containment will require adequate funding and noted that the issue of funding mechanisms in order to support research of interest to the Liaison Group, but which might not otherwise be able to attract funding, had been identified by the Liaison Group as an area for discussion at a future meeting.

7. Any Other Business

7.1 The representative of the Scottish Executive stated that during the Working Group's meeting a Parliamentary Question had been asked in the Scottish Parliament concerning the measures being taken to prevent escapes from salmon farms. He indicated that the issue of containment is, therefore, topical and there will be considerable interest in the Working Group's deliberations.

8. Date and Place of Next Meeting (if required)

8.1 The Working Group agreed to complete its business by correspondence and that a further meeting would not, therefore, be required. The Working Group would be willing to continue to work by correspondence in order to develop a template for a model action plan based on the containment guidelines if the Liaison Group considered that this would be a useful initiative.

9. Report of the Meeting

9.1 The Working Group agreed a report of the meeting.

9.2 In closing the meeting, the Chairman thanked participants for their contributions. The representative of the Canadian Aquaculture Industry Alliance apologised to the Chair for the position he had needed to take on certain issues during the meeting, but indicated that this was because there had been insufficient time to be properly briefed before the meeting.

9.3 The Working Group thanked the Chairman and Rapporteur for their work, and Mr Piccioli for his contribution and for the arrangements made.

Working Group to Develop Guidelines on Containment
European Commission, Brussels, 6-7 April 2000

List of Participants

Mr Sebastian Belle	Maine Dept of Marine Resources, Augusta, USA sebastian.belle@state.me.us
Ms Mary Colligan	National Marine Fisheries Service, Gloucester, USA mary.a.colligan@noaa.gov
Mr David Dunkley	Scottish Executive Rural Affairs Department, Edinburgh, UK david.dunkley@scotland.gov.uk
Mr Michael Edwards	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Rothesay, NB, Canada edwardsmi@dfo-mpo.gc.ca medwards@acoa-apeca.gc.ca
Ms Eva Espeland	The Royal Ministry of Environment, Oslo, Norway ee@md.dep.no
Mr Knut A Hjelt	Norwegian Fish Farmers Association, Trondheim, Norway knuta.hjelt@nho.no
Dr Peter Hutchinson (Rapporteur)	NASCO Secretariat, Edinburgh, UK hq@nasco.org.uk
Mr Regin Jacobsen	Føroya Arbeidgevarafelag, Torshavn, Faroe Islands bakkarj@post.olivant.fo
Mr Joseph McGonigle	Maine Aquaculture Association, Brewer, USA jmcgonig@mstf.org
Mr Brian Meaney	Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, St John's, NF, Canada bmeaney@mail.gov.nf.ca
Mr Alessandro Piccioli	European Commission, Brussels, Belgium Alessandro.Piccioli@cec.eu.int
Mr David Rideout	Canadian Aquaculture Industry Alliance, Ottawa, Canada rideoutcaia@aquaculture.ca

Mr James Ryan	Irish Salmon Growers Association, Renvyle, Ireland ksc@anu.ie
Dr John Webster (Chairman)	Scottish Salmon Producers Organization, Perth, UK jwebster@scottishsalmon.co.uk

Working Group to Develop Guidelines on Containment

Agenda

1. Opening of the Meeting
2. Appointment of a Chairman and Rapporteur
3. Adoption of the Agenda
4. Consideration of the Terms of Reference
5. Development of Draft Guidelines on Containment
6. Recommendations for Research and Development
7. Any Other Business
8. Date and Place of Next Meeting (if required)
9. Report of the Meeting

Terms of Reference for a Working Group to Develop Guidelines on Containment

1. The Liaison Group decides to establish a Working Group to produce draft guidelines on containment to apply throughout the area covered by the NASCO Convention. These guidelines should have as their objective the prevention of escapes of farm salmon in the marine and freshwater environments. In carrying out this task the Working Group should:

   (a) make appropriate use of document SLG(00)5
   (b) make appropriate use of other codes of containment
   (c) use such other relevant information available to it
   (d) advise on future needs for research and development to update the guidelines in future.

2. The Working Group shall consist of members from industry representing salmon farming interests and members from NASCO Parties representing the relevant authorities. This group should communicate and consult widely and could invite other participants as appropriate. The members of the Working Group shall be appointed by 1 March 2000 and notified to the NASCO Secretariat who will inform the Liaison Group. The Working Group shall hold its first meeting during 6-7 April 2000 in Brussels, Belgium. The NASCO Secretariat shall provide the necessary coordination and administrative and other support. The Working Group shall appoint its Chairman.

3. The Working Group shall make a progress report to the Liaison Group before 20 May 2000 so that there is an opportunity for comment before the report is considered by the Council of NASCO at its Seventeenth Annual Meeting during 5-9 June 2000. The report will also be considered by the appropriate national industry organizations. The Working Group's full report should be available by 31 October 2000 so that it can be considered at the next meeting of the Liaison Group.

Draft Guidelines on Containment of Farm Salmon

Section 1: Introduction

1.1 The North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry (NASFI) and the North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization (NASCO) established a Liaison Group which met in London on 10 – 11 February, 2000. This Liaison Group recognised the importance of conserving and enhancing wild salmon stocks and of supporting a sustainable salmon farming industry and is seeking to establish mutually beneficial working arrangements in order to make recommendations on wild salmon conservation and sustainable farming practices. To this end the Liaison Group has developed guidelines on containment to apply throughout the NASCO Convention area.

Section 2: Objectives

2.1 these guidelines are intended to result in the prevention of escapes of farmed salmon in the freshwater and marine environments.

Section 3: Site Selection

3.1 sites shall be selected having regard to the capability of the equipment to withstand the weather and other environmental conditions likely to be experienced at that site;

3.2 in the interest of avoiding collision damage, equipment shall comply with the relevant national and international regulations regarding navigation and marking;

3.3 careful consideration shall be given to the siting of land-based facilities, so as to minimise the risk of escapes from these facilities.

Section 4: Equipment & Structures

4.1 nets, cages and moorings systems shall be designed, constructed and deployed to prevent escapes having proper regard to the prevailing conditions at the site. Moorings systems should have a significant in-built safety margin;

4.2 nets and cages should be marked with an identification number; adequate records of each net and cage in use should be maintained in order to assess its fitness for purpose;

4.3 nets shall be: compatible with the cages with which they will be used; secured to the cage collar so that the collar alone bears the strain; and adequately UV-protected. Net weights shall be installed in such a way as to prevent damage to the nets;

4.4 tank systems shall be designed to contain fish effectively and to minimise the chances of fish escaping. Where the outflow from tanks passes into a settling pond, the

outflow from the settling pond should incorporate a screen of suitable size and construction to minimise the chances of fish escaping;

4.5 effective predator deterrence methods shall be implemented as appropriate; these should be up-graded as improved, cost-effective systems of proven efficacy become available; records of predator attacks that may have caused escapes should be maintained for audit.

Section 5: Management System Operations

5.1 farm management procedures shall ensure supervision by appropriately trained, qualified or experienced personnel. There is a need for constant vigilance during operations that could result in escapes;

5.2 procedures shall be adopted to ensure that escapes are prevented during movement and handling of stocks (e.g. during stocking, counting, grading, transport, transfers, treatment and harvesting of fish), and during net changes and cleaning;

5.3 regular preventative maintenance, inspection and repair procedures shall be adopted in order to prevent escapes;

5.4 stress testing of all nets in use shall be conducted on a regular basis and testing protocols, minimum breaking strengths and thresholds for net replacement should be specified in action plans. Records of the results of the tests shall be retained throughout the period the net is in use;

5.5 when it is necessary to tow cages, great care shall be taken to avoid damage to the nets;

5.6 storm preparation procedures shall be developed to minimise the risk of damage from storms and the actions to be taken to ensure that the site is made ready; after each storm all nets, cages and mooring systems shall be inspected for damage;

5.7 vessels shall be operated so as to minimise the risk of accidental damage to the equipment;

5.8 where practicable, security systems should be installed so as to deter acts of vandalism and malicious damage.

Section 6: Verification

6.1 management systems should include as a minimum all details of introductions, grading, transfers, treatments, handling or any other incident or occurrence that may have led to an escape. These details shall be recorded and retained for audit. Detailed records should allow estimates of escapes to be made. It is recognised that not all discrepancies will be the result of escapes;

6.2 when an event occurs which leads to an escape defined as significant under the action plan, the operator shall advise the appropriate authorities immediately;

6.3 a site-specific contingency plan shall be developed for use when an event occurs which may have led to an escape defined as significant under the action plan. The contingency plan shall include details of the method of recapture to be used and the area and timeframe over which a recapture programme would apply. Efforts shall be made to recapture farmed salmon immediately provided that this is practicable and does not adversely affect wild Atlantic salmon populations;

6.4 action plans should require appropriate authorities to take all reasonable efforts to issue permits for facilitating the contingency plans developed for each farm.

Section 7: Implementation

7.1 each jurisdiction should draw up a national action plan, or regional plans, based on these guidelines and should advise the NASFI/NASCO Liaison Group of its plan or plans, of the means of enforcement and of the reporting procedures.

7.2 the action plan or plans should be based on co-operation between industry and the relevant authorities and should include the allocation of responsibilities under the plan or plans and a timetable for implementation.

Section 8: Revision

8.1 these guidelines shall be subject to revision, with the agreement of the Liaison Group, to take account of new scientific, technical and other relevant information.

ANNEX 19

Council

CNL(00)33

Transgenic Atlantic Salmon

CNL(00)33

Transgenic Atlantic Salmon

1. At its 1997 meeting the Council expressed its concerns about the risks posed to the wild stocks by transgenic salmon and adopted Guidelines for Action on Transgenic Salmon (document CNL(97)48). These guidelines recognise that, while there may be benefits from the introduction of transgenic salmon if, for example, they could not interbreed with wild stocks, there are also risks which may lead to irreversible genetic changes and ecological interactions. The Council considered that there was an urgent need to take steps to ensure the protection of the wild stocks and under the Resolution the Parties agreed *inter alia* to:

   - advise NASCO Council of any proposal to permit the rearing of transgenic salmonids and provide details of the proposed method of containment and other measures to safeguard the wild stocks;

   - take all possible actions to ensure that the use of transgenic salmon, in any part of the NASCO Convention area, is confined to secure, self-contained, land-based facilities.

2. The attached letter has been received from Canada advising the Council that a company located in Eastern Canada is presently producing transgenic Atlantic salmon and rainbow trout broodstock in Eastern Canada. Information from the company's website states that A/F Protein's mission includes "to develop fish with improved growth rates and other economically desirable traits through the use of gene constructs utilizing antifreeze protein gene promoters". The main focus of the work at the company's facility at Fortune Bay, Prince Edward Island, has been the production of Atlantic salmon with enhanced growth rates through use of a gene construct comprised of a chinook salmon gene sequence for growth hormone linked to a promoter sequence controlling antifreeze production in ocean pout. The effect is that the fish produce growth hormone all year round and are capable of growing 4-6 times faster than "standard" salmon grown under the same conditions.

3. Since the Council's last Annual Meeting there has been considerable media interest in transgenic salmon. Much of this was in relation to trials conducted in Scotland about five years ago (see document CNL(00)16) but more recent articles refer to ongoing development of transgenic Atlantic salmon by the company A/F Protein which is seeking US Food and Drug Administration and Health Canada approval of their transgenic salmon for human consumption.

4. The issue of transgenic salmon was considered by the Working Group on the Precautionary Approach which met in Brussels in 1998. At that meeting a paper was tabled by A/F Protein on the role transgenic salmon might play in contributing to the protection of the wild stocks. It was suggested in that paper that the use of transgenic salmon could facilitate the development of salmon farming based upon fully enclosed, land-based facilities at a distance from the coast and far from rivers containing wild salmon stocks. The Working Group recognised, however, that the development of transgenic salmon posed additional risks to the wild stocks. Under the Action Plan for Application of the Precautionary Approach the issue of transgenic salmon will be

addressed by the Standing Committee on the Precautionary Approach when it considers application of a Precautionary Approach to introductions and transfers, etc.

5. The issue of transgenic salmon was also considered at the 1998 meetings of the Wild and Farmed Salmon Liaison Group. The International Salmon Farmers' Association (ISFA) representatives indicated that it was not in favour of transgenic salmon and that a protocol on transgenic salmon has been developed by the ISFA. The Liaison Group did, however, recognise that there is a different attitude to genetically modified organisms between North America and Europe. Wild and farmed salmon interests are concerned, for different reasons, about the use of transgenic salmon.

6. Under the Guidelines for Action on Transgenic Salmon the Parties also agree to take into account the ongoing work by the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity to develop a Protocol on Biosafety. This Protocol, referred to as the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, was finalised in Montreal in January this year and will enter into force after 50 countries have ratified it. The Protocol reflects growing concerns about the potential risks from biotechnology. The Press Release following the agreement in Montreal indicates that, under the protocol, governments will signal whether or not they are willing to accept imports of agricultural commodities that include living modified organisms (LMOs). Stricter Advanced Informed Agreement procedures will apply to seeds, live fish and other LMOs that are to be intentionally introduced into the environment. The exporter must provide detailed information to each importing country in advance of the first shipment and the importer must then authorise the shipment, so that the recipient country has the opportunity to assess the risks.

7. Under the North American Commission's Discussion Document for revision to the Protocols for the Introduction and Transfer of Salmonids, a different approach is proposed under which reproductively viable transgenic salmonids may only be introduced to land-based facilities where the possibility of escapement is minimal, but transgenic salmonids may be used in marine and freshwater cages if they are reproductively sterile. These proposals for revision to the Protocols have not yet been agreed by the North American Commission. A/F Protein have indicated that they would intend to supply only sterile transgenic salmon for use in cage rearing units.

8. Salmon will likely be the first animal to be commonly available in transgenic form for food. A/F Protein have indicated that they will have transgenic salmon available for commercial production in 2001. A/F Protein are expecting a decision from the FDA in the near future. However, we are not aware of the situation regarding resolution of any environmental impacts. Although the industry has reacted against it, due mainly to marketing concerns, it is possible that some producers will decide that the advantages outweigh the marketing problems. The Council is asked to consider if further action should be taken.

Secretary
Edinburgh
12 May, 2000

(add Robichaud letter of 4/5/00)

ANNEX 20

Council

CNL(00)39

Summary of Points Arising from the Special Session on Habitat Issues held in 1999 and the Possible Future Role of NASCO in relation to Habitat Issues

CNL(00)39

Summary of Points Arising from the Special Session on Habitat Issues held in 1999 and the Possible Future Role of NASCO in relation to Habitat Issues

At its Sixteenth Annual Meeting in Westport, the Council held a Special Session on Habitat Issues. A report of this Special Session has been circulated, CNL(00)28. During the presentations and the subsequent discussions, a number of points emerged and we have attempted to summarise these below.

Scale of Losses

1. The historic run of Atlantic salmon in the US was estimated to approach 500,000 individuals (the estimated return in 1999 was 1,600 salmon). By the early 1800's Atlantic salmon runs had been severely depleted and by 1865 salmon had been eliminated from Southern New England rivers. The loss of the Connecticut and Merrimack populations shifted the southern limit of the species range about 2° North in latitude. In 1984 it was estimated that only approximately 35% of the historic salmon habitat in Maine was accessible. There is a proposal to list a distinct population segment of Atlantic salmon in Maine as endangered under the Endangered Species Act.

2. In Canada, it has been estimated that, since 1870, there has been a net loss of the productive capacity of salmon of 16%. There is a possibility that salmon in Inner Bay of Fundy rivers will be listed under a new act, the Species at Risk Act.

3. In Western Europe, there has been a very serious decline in both the extent and quality of salmon habitat, e.g. salmon stocks were lost from all the major catchments in France.

Cause of Losses

4. In the USA, the major cause of decline was the construction of hydro-electric dams with either insufficient or non-existent fish passage facilities. Low head dams, water pollution and over-exploitation were also contributory factors.

5. In Canada loss of habitat has been attributed to: chronic problems associated mainly with agriculture; impoundment, water diversion and obstruction; and acid rain. Dams and causeways represent the most significant cause of loss as a result of disruption of and obstruction to upstream and downstream passage.

6. In Western Europe the demise of salmon stocks has been related principally to two events – the Industrial Revolution of the last century and modern farming practices, including forestry. The effects of the Industrial Revolution are still being felt today with the continuing problem of acid rain.

7. A wide range of activities have adversely affected salmon production. Some of those identified during the Special Session include: urbanization, aquaculture, land drainage, over-grazing, infra-structure developments, water abstraction, sewage effluents, impacts of non-indigenous species and industrial effluents. It is, therefore, necessary to adopt a catchment management approach in order to safeguard salmon habitat.

8. It is clear that major impacts on salmon are much wider than those related to the fisheries. Habitat management is a key element in salmon management.

9. Two "new" threats were identified for which there are no estimates of loss – the effects of global warming and of endocrine-disrupting chemicals such as nonylphenols, which are widespread in waste water. Nonylphenol ethoxylates (NPEs) are found in a wide range of cleaning products, paints and pesticides and are used in some manufacturing processes.

10. Factors operating in fresh water may affect subsequent survival at sea. These need to be identified if appropriate management action is to be effectively targeted. For example, endocrine-disrupting compounds are thought to interfere with the smolting process, resulting in poor marine survival.

Progress and Challenges in Restoration of Salmon Habitat

11. In the US, progress has been made, and is continuing to be made, in improving upstream and downstream fish passage facilities at dams, in improving water quality and quantity and in restoring habitat. Efforts are now being made to remove outmoded dams for fish habitat reasons. Increased emphasis is being given to riparian buffer zones and watershed habitat protection. Non-indigenous salmon stocks have a low return rate, apparently as a result of loss of local adaptations, but the use of river-specific stocks should aid the restoration programmes. There is a need to address poor forestry and agricultural practices and poor culvert placement; to remove ineffective and inefficient dams; to reduce water withdrawals and institute clear water management plans; to reduce nutrient inputs and to eliminate chronic exposure to insecticides, pesticides, herbicides and endocrine-disrupting chemicals.

12. In Canada, habitat improvements have been made through bank stabilization, establishing pool and riffle sequences and in improving fish passage. Construction of fish passage facilities around natural obstructions has led to a gain in productive capacity of 2% compared to 1870 (overall there has been a net loss of 16% since 1870). Mitigation of the most significant causes of habitat loss continues to be difficult and in many cases economically unfeasible. Inadequate resources have in some cases been allocated for the regular cleaning and maintenance of fish passage facilities required to maintain their efficiency. The effects of acid rain will continue for decades even though emissions have been reduced. Because of the cost involved, liming may only be used to re-establish salmon in selected rivers.

13. In Europe, major salmonid habitat enhancement programmes are underway. However, many hydro-electric installations still do not provide fish passage facilities. In England and Wales there are now more salmon rivers than there were 150 years ago due to improvements in water quality.

14. Bridge aprons, culverts, weirs and micro-hydro electric facilities, though less imposing than large dams, may form obstacles to upstream migration. They may be very numerous. For example, in just a part of a rural Scottish river catchment over 230 obstructions to fish movement were recorded.

15. As population continues to increase pressures on salmon habitat from domestic, industrial and agricultural demands will increase.

16. There is a need not only to restore damaged habitat but to ensure that future activities do not lead to further deterioration. There are good legislative tools in many countries. For example, in Canada there is the "no net loss of habitat" guiding principle but management of fish habitat is becoming increasing complex and demanding. Additional management tools would be welcome. In this regard, the adoption of a Precautionary Approach by NASCO and its Contracting Parties should be a helpful initiative.

17. Management of fish habitat cannot be implemented in isolation - conservation measures are likely to be more successful and more widely received where the existing and future demands of other resource users are considered. Much has been achieved in restoration of habitat through partnerships.

18. Restoration efforts should be preceded by detailed physical, hydrological and ecological studies on a catchment-wide basis so that resources can be most efficiently targeted. Geographical Information Systems are a valuable tool in restoration programmes.

19. Salmonid habitat improvement work may offer conservation benefits to other species but there may also be conflicts with the conservation of other species, e.g. previously isolated brown trout populations when waterfalls are made passable to salmon.

Future Role for NASCO

20. It is clear that NASCO's objectives of conservation, restoration, enhancement and rational management of salmon can only be achieved if salmon habitat is protected and improved.

21. NASCO could provide a valuable forum for exchange, collation and dissemination of information on habitat issues such as guidelines on best practices.

22. The proposal was made that NASCO and its Contracting Parties should undertake an inventory of how much habitat has been lost, what areas still support salmon and what is being done to restore habitat so as to assist in formulating a long-term management strategy for salmon.

23. NASCO's Agreement on the Precautionary Approach commits NASCO and its Contracting Parties to action on fresh water habitat issues. It will be for the Council and the Standing Committee on the Precautionary Approach (SCPA) to decide on future actions.

Secretary
Edinburgh
30 May, 2000

ANNEX 21

Council

CNL(00)29

St Pierre et Miquelon Salmon Fisheries

CNL(00)29

St Pierre et Miquelon Salmon Fisheries

1. The islands of St Pierre et Miquelon are French dependencies close to and to the south of Newfoundland, Canada. Salmon fisheries on these islands harvest stocks of US and Canadian origin. Information on catches of salmon at St Pierre et Miquelon is provided to NASCO by the Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Pêche in Paris and is reviewed annually by the North American Commission. These statistics indicate that the catch in 1998 of 2.307 tonnes was well above the mean for the period 1987-1998 (1.96 tonnes) and was 55% higher than in 1997. Given the precarious state of North American stocks, ICES' advice for in-river exploitation only, and the measures taken by Canada and the USA to address conservation problems, the increased catch at St Pierre et Miquelon in 1998 was a serious concern for the North American Commission. This increase is thought to have been the result of an increase in the number of licences issued to fish for salmon in 1998 and to increased availability of salmon in St Pierre et Miquelon coastal waters. The provisional catch at St Pierre et Miquelon in 1999 was 2.322 tonnes.

2. Last year, at the request of the North American Commission, the Council asked that the Secretary write to the French authorities expressing NASCO's concern about the increased catches of salmon at St Pierre et Miquelon. In accordance with this request, I wrote to the French authorities on 12 July 1999 (Annex 1). At the suggestion of the Canadian Delegation I also wrote to the Head of the French Delegation to the Canada-France Advisory Committee, M. Bernard Boyer, inviting him to attend our meeting in Miramichi and to make a brief presentation on the salmon fisheries at St Pierre et Miquelon.

3. In his response, (Annex 2), M. Boyer has indicated that although he will be unable to take part in the Seventeenth Annual Meeting he wished to make available to NASCO background information on the management of the St Pierre et Miquelon salmon fishery. In summary:

   - the Atlantic salmon is an important resource because of the remoteness of the archipelago and the problems of its economic development;
   - there is a "commercial fishery" and a recreational fishery (in 1999 the catch was divided equally between the two). The "commercial fishery" is a subsistence fishery;
   - the fishery is controlled rigorously by restrictive measures limiting fishing effort and gear type;
   - St Pierre et Miquelon have respected the principles set out in an exchange of correspondence between France and Canada on 2 December 1994 to the extent that:

     - since 1995 fishing effort has remained stable - the number of permits has remained less than the 54 permits issued in 1994; 47 permits were issued in 1999 compared to 51 in 1998;

- the level of catches has remained stable compared to 1998 and is only about 67% of the catch in 1994 (the reference year under the exchange of correspondence between France and Canada);
- no commercial development of the fishery has ever been contemplated;

- An awareness campaign aimed at encouraging recreational fishermen to declare their catch has led to increased reporting of catches since 1998.

4. In 1995, the question of membership in NASCO by France (in respect of St Pierre et Miquelon) as in some other international fisheries fora was discussed by the North American Commission. However, it was felt that the France/Canada agreement, which required France to abide by the decisions of NASCO regarding management measures, made membership by France in NASCO unnecessary. The agreement stipulates that there should be no increase in the catch of salmon originating in other countries' rivers without the consent of the other country.

5. The Council is asked to consider whether in the light of the information provided by the French authorities it wishes to take any further action on this issue.

Secretary
Edinburgh
24 May 2000

NAC14.154

12 July 1999

Mr Stefane Le Den
Ministère de l' Agriculture et de la Pêche
Direction des Pêches Maritimes et des Cultures Maritimes
3 Place de Fontenoy
75700 Paris
France

The North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization (NASCO) is an international organization established by Convention to contribute through consultation and cooperation to the conservation, restoration, enhancement and rational management of salmon stocks in the North Atlantic Ocean. NASCO's Contracting Parties are Canada, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), the European Union, Iceland, Norway, the Russian Federation and the United States of America.

During our recent Sixteenth Annual Meeting in Ireland, information which had been provided by the Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Pêche was presented which showed that the catch of salmon at St Pierre et Miquelon in 1998 had increased by 55% compared to the previous year to a level well above the mean catch for the twelve-year period from 1987 for which statistics are available to NASCO. We are advised that this increase in catch is, in part, due to an increase in the number of licences issued to fish for salmon in 1998.

The salmon harvested at St Pierre et Miquelon are from US and Canadian stocks which are considered to be in a precarious condition, and very significant conservation measures have been taken by both these countries in response to the status of the stocks. The International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) had advised that there should be no exploitation of North American stocks of the 1997 smolt class as non-maturing one-sea-winter (1SW) salmon in 1998, or as mature two-sea-winter (2SW) in 1999, except for in-river harvests from stocks which are above biologically-based escapement requirements. Similar advice has been developed for exploitation of these stocks in 1999 (non-maturing 1SW salmon) and 2000 (mature 2SW salmon).

I have been asked by the Council of NASCO to convey to you this Organization's concern about the increased level of salmon catches at St Pierre et Miquelon in 1998. I understand that the Government of Canada also intends to raise this issue at the next Canada/France Advisory Committee meeting schedule for early next year.

Given the precarious condition of North American stocks and the catch advice from ICES, your cooperation in introducing measures to reduce the level of exploitation of salmon in the St Pierre et Miquelon fisheries would be welcomed.

Yours sincerely

Dr Malcolm Windsor
Secretary

Copies to: Dr A Rosenberg, National Marine Fisheries Service, USA
Mr J Robichaud, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa, Canada

Translation from French to English

MINISTERE
DE L'AGRICULTURE
ET DE LA PECHE

Sous direction des Pêches Maritimes
Bureau de la Ressource et de la Réglementation
et des Affaires Internationales
Affaire suivie par (Matter monitored by): S. LEDEN/B. PRINCE
Poste (Extension) : 8234 / 8238

The Secretary
NASCO
11 Rutland Square
Edinburgh EH1 2AS
Scotland
United Kingdom

Dear Secretary,

I am most grateful for your invitation to the seventeenth annual meeting of the North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organisation. Although I will not be in a position to take part in this meeting, I would like nonetheless to express our great concern with regard to the sustainable management of this stock. This is an issue of utmost importance for the inhabitants of Saint Pierre et Miquelon. Indeed, you will no doubt be aware that, beside recreational fishing, we are dealing here with a traditional subsistence practice. This type of fishing is carried out by communities who are particularly dependent on this activity and who have no other option but to rely strongly on this resource, because of the remoteness of the archipelago and of the problems associated with its economical development.

Our concern for the conservation of the North Atlantic salmon has been known for some time. This fishery is controlled rigorously by restrictive measures limiting fishing effort and types of fishing gear, details of which were sent to you in the previous years. The decree of 20 March 1987, setting management and conservation measures for marine resources in territorial waters and the French economic zone off the coasts of Saint Pierre et Miquelon, makes provision for the following measures:

- a system of administrative authorisations;
- a restriction of the fishing season: 3 months every year (from 1st May to 31st July);
- the setting of numbers, types and conditions of use for fishing gear (nets);
- the declaration of catches.

Thanks to this framework, the fishing effort has remained stable since 1995 (in accordance with the terms of the correspondence exchanged between France and Canada on 2nd December 1994) in so far as the number of fishing permits allocated is lower than in 1994 (54 permits). Thus 47 permits were awarded in 1999 instead of 51 in 1998.

The level of catches has also remained stable in comparison with 1998 and amounts to only 67% (2322 kg instead of 3423 kg) of all the catches recorded in 1994; that year being set as reference year for the conservation measures provided for in the exchange of correspondence dated 2nd December 1994. This demonstrates our will to honour our commitment with regard to management and conservation of the stock.
.../

The increase in the catch level recorded in 1998 should not, furthermore, be equated with an increase of fishing effort on the salmon stock compared with previous years. Indeed, because of our interest for this stock and its improvement, we have initiated an awareness campaign aimed at leisure fishermen to encourage them to declare their catches. Whilst this campaign produced a positive response, it also led to a somewhat erroneous presentation of the variations in the salmon catches in St Pierre and Miquelon; indeed, the increase recorded in 1998 simply reflected a greater honesty in numbers declared than in the previous years. The levelling out of the data for 1999 compared with those of 1998 is further proof of this having taken place.

In any case, given the low level of catches, the increase recorded in 1998 and stabilised in 1999 would be of little consequence.

The stabilisation of the fishing effort (number of awarded permits) and the general trend towards lower catches since 1994 highlight furthermore the respect Saint Pierre and Miquelon has for the principles set out in the exchange of correspondence between France and Canada on 2nd December 1994 relating to salmon fishing. Further, no commercial development of this activity has ever been contemplated.

Yours faithfully,

Le Directeur Adjoint
des Pêches Maritimes et de l'Aquaculture
Bernard BOYER

ANNEX 22

Council

CNL(00)59

Resolution by the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Conservation of Salmon in the North Atlantic Ocean Concerning St Pierre and Miquelon

CNL(00)59

Resolution by the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Conservation of Salmon in the North Atlantic Ocean Concerning St Pierre and Miquelon

The PARTIES,

RECALLING Article 66 of the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea;

RECALLING that the NASCO Convention recognizes that salmon originating in the rivers of different States intermingle in certain parts of the North Atlantic Ocean;

RECALLING ALSO that the NASCO Convention desires to promote the conservation, restoration, enhancement and rational management of salmon stocks in the North Atlantic Ocean through international cooperation;

NOTING that the United States has eliminated the catching of sea-run Atlantic salmon in its waters, including recreational catches, and has proposed to list the Gulf of Maine population segment of Atlantic salmon as endangered with extinction;

NOTING that Canada has implemented measures, consistent with advice from the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES), that reduce to the lowest level possible the harvest of salmon in its coastal waters in light of the tenuous status of salmon stocks of North American origin;

NOTING that Denmark, with respect to Greenland, is cooperating to rebuild salmon stocks of North American origin by reducing to the lowest level possible the harvest of salmon at West Greenland and by improving the monitoring and reporting of its fishery;

NOTING that in its 2000 report, ICES recommended that, "there should be no exploitation of the 1999 smolt cohort as non-maturing 1SW fish in North America or at Greenland in 2000 and that the cohort should not be exploited as mature 2SW fish in North America in 2001, expect for in-river harvests from stocks that are above biologically based spawning escapement requirements";

NOTING ALSO that NASCO has endorsed the use of the precautionary approach in salmon management;

FURTHER NOTING that the salmon fishery in St Pierre and Miquelon is a mixed-stock fishery that intercepts salmon of Canadian and United States origin, and that St Pierre and Miquelon is not a State of origin of Atlantic salmon;

RECOGNISING that France, in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon, although not a Contracting Party to NASCO, is bound by NASCO rules through an exchange of diplomatic letters attached to the 1994 Canada/France Proces-Verbal on fisheries;

CONSIDERING that in 1998 and 1999, the salmon catch in St Pierre and Miquelon was about 2.3 tons each year, representing a 55 percent increase in the 1997 catch figure and well above the last thirteen-year average;

MINDFUL that France, in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon, claims that the increased catch figures for 1998 and 1999 reflect improvements in reported catch;

EXPRESSING serious concern that current salmon harvesting levels in St Pierre and Miquelon are not consistent with scientific advice provided by ICES, and with the level of cooperation from France, in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon, with NASCO's efforts to rebuild salmon stocks of North American origin;

RESOLVE as follows:

The President of NASCO shall communicate through appropriate diplomatic channels with France in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon;

(a) to convey concerns over the level of salmon harvest in St Pierre and Miquelon in 1998 and 1999;

(b) to urge France, in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon to cooperate with NASCO to rebuild salmon stocks of North American origin by immediately setting harvest limits for the 2000 salmon fishery in St Pierre and Miquelon to the lowest possible level consistent with advice provided by ICES; and

(c) to request France, in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon, to inform NASCO by its 2001 annual meeting of measures it has taken to address the concerns of NASCO to reduce the level of harvesting of salmon in St Pierre and Miquelon in 2001 and beyond, and to provide additional details on the salmon fishery, to include licensing, reporting mechanisms, and unreported catch.

The members of the Council are encouraged to initiate or continue making demarches to France, in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon, in support of this resolution.

ANNEX 23

Council

CNL(00)56

Press Release

- ***The situation for stocks of wild North Atlantic salmon is extremely difficult, with scientific advice suggesting that their abundance is the lowest ever recorded. In the light of this situation, new, stronger measures designed to conserve wild stocks of Atlantic salmon were agreed internationally by the North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization meeting this week. The Annual Meeting was held in Miramichi, New Brunswick at the invitation of the Government of Canada.***

- In spite of restrictive management measures introduced both nationally and internationally in recent years, salmon stocks are still at seriously low levels. The reasons for the decline in abundance appear to be linked to conditions in the marine environment. NASCO will develop ideas for a five-year co-ordinated research programme to identify and explain the causes of increased marine mortality and to develop measures to counteract the problem.

- In the light of this situation, agreement was reached on a regulatory measure for the Faroese fishery for the year 2001 which relies on the Faroe Islands to use the Precautionary Approach and to take account of the scientific advice and which does not, therefore, set a tonnage for a quota. For the West Greenland salmon fishery a two-year measure agreed in 1999 restricts the catch during 2000 to that amount used for internal consumption in Greenland.

- In order to give long-term protection to wild salmon stocks NASCO and its Contracting Parties have agreed to implement the Precautionary Approach to salmon management. Use of this approach is in line with international agreements in the United Nations. A Decision Structure for use by NASCO and the relevant authorities in implementing a Precautionary Approach to Management of salmon fisheries was provisionally adopted. As its next steps, NASCO will now consider application of the Precautionary Approach in relation to protection and restoration of habitat and in relation to the interplay of socio-economic aspects under the Precautionary Approach.

- NASCO remains concerned about the potential for negative impacts of aquaculture on wild stocks, including loss of genetic diversity and increased disease and parasite interactions. The Council welcomed the establishment of a Liaison Group to pursue issues of mutual concern, and proposed suggestions on guiding principles for the new relationship. The production of draft Guidelines on Containment by the Liaison Group was viewed as a useful first step, but it was recognised that further progress is necessary. A final report will be discussed with the industry at the next Liaison Group meeting in February 2001.

- A Special Liaison Meeting was held in Miramichi to review the measures taken to minimise impacts of aquaculture on the wild stocks. The measures taken by the European Union were highlighted this year and those taken by the USA, Faroe Islands and Iceland will be reviewed next year.

- A Resolution was adopted calling for France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon) to immediately set harvest limits for the 2000 salmon fishery at the lowest possible level consistent with the scientific advice.

- The Parties agreed to do their utmost to reduce the level of unreported catches and to consider the effects of by-catch in other fisheries.

- NASCO elected a new President, Jacque Robichaud (Canada) and a new Vice-President, Mr Eidur Gudnason (Iceland).

- This Press Release was issued in Miramichi, New Brunswick on Friday 9 June 2000.

Notes to Editors:

1. The North Atlantic Salmon Conservation is an inter-governmental Organization established by a treaty with the objective of contributing to the conservation, restoration, enhancement and rational management of salmon stocks. The Contracting Parties are Canada, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), the European Union, Iceland, Norway, the Russian Federation and the United States of America.

2. The Organization consists of a Council, three regional Commissions (North American, North-East Atlantic, and West Greenland) and a Secretariat.

3. The Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Organization was held in Miramichi, New Brunswick during 5-9 June 2000.

4. Contact on this press release:

Dr Malcolm Windsor
Secretary
11 Rutland Square
Edinburgh
EH1 2AS

Telephone: Int+ 131 228 2551
Fax: Int+ 131 228 4384
e-mail: hq@nasco.org.uk
website: www.nasco.org.uk

ANNEX 24

List of Council Papers

Paper No.	Title
CNL(00)0	List of Papers
CNL(00)1	Provisional Agenda
CNL(00)2	Explanatory Memorandum on the Agenda (revised 17 April 2000)
CNL(00)3	Draft Agenda
CNL(00)4	Draft Schedule of Meetings
CNL(00)5	Election of Officers
CNL(00)6	Secretary's Report
CNL(00)7	Review of NASCO's Relationship with its Observer Organizations
CNL(00)8	Methods of Calculating the Contributions to NASCO
CNL(00)9	Report of the Finance and Administration Committee Meeting
CNL(00)10	Report on the Activities of the Organization in 1999
CNL(00)11	Report of the ICES Working Group on North Atlantic Salmon
CNL(00)12	Report of the ICES Advisory Committee on Fishery Management
CNL(00)13	Report of the Standing Scientific Committee Meeting
CNL(00)14	Catch Statistics - Returns by the Parties
CNL(00)15	Historical Catch Record 1960-1999
CNL(00)16	Review of International Salmon-Related Literature Published in 1999
CNL(00)17	Returns under Articles 14 and 15 of the Convention
CNL(00)18	Report of the Standing Committee on the Precautionary Approach - Application of a Precautionary Approach to Management of Salmon Fisheries
CNL(00)19	Unreported Catches
CNL(00)20	By-catch of Atlantic Salmon

CNL(00)21	Fishing for Salmon in International Waters by Non-Contracting Parties
CNL(00)22	Scientific Research Fishing in the Convention Area
CNL(00)23	Programme for the Special Liaison Meeting to Review Measures to Minimise Impacts of Aquaculture on the Wild Stocks
CNL(00)24	Report of the 1999 Special Liaison Meeting to Review Measures Taken by Canada and Norway to Minimise Impacts of Aquaculture on the Wild Stocks
CNL(00)25	Returns made under the Oslo Resolution
CNL(00)26	Report of the Liaison Meeting with the Salmon Farming Industry
CNL(00)27	Report of the Working Group to Develop Guidelines on Containment of Farmed Salmon
CNL(00)28	Report of the Special Session on Habitat Issues held in 1999
CNL(00)29	St Pierre et Miquelon Salmon Fisheries
CNL(00)30	Next Steps in Relation to Application of the Precautionary Approach
CNL(00)31	Dates and Places of 2001 and 2002 Meetings
CNL(00)32	Application for Non-Government Observer Status to NASCO by the World Wildlife Fund-US
CNL(00)33	Transgenic Atlantic Salmon
CNL(00)34	Calculation of NASCO Contributions (a paper presented by Iceland)
CNL(00)35	Not issued
CNL(00)36	Summary of Council Decisions
CNL(00)37	Draft Report
CNL(00)38	Draft Press Release
CNL(00)39	Summary of Points Arising from the Special Session on Habitat Issues held in 1999 and the Possible Future Role of NASCO in Relation to Habitat Issues
CNL(00)40	Preliminary Draft International Plan of Action to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing, developed by The Expert Consultation on Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing, Sydney, Australia, 15-19 May 2000 (tabled by USA)

CNL(00)41	Presentation by ICES to Council
CNL(00)42	Agenda
CNL(00)43	Atlantic Salmon in the Sea - Draft Proposal to Establish an International Co-operative Research Programme (tabled by Norway)
CNL(00)44	Measures taken in England and Wales to reduce illegal salmon catch (tabled by the European Union)
CNL(00)45	Review of Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries in England and Wales (tabled by the European Union)
CNL(00)46	Proposed Joint Meetings between NASCO, NPAFC and IBSFC to Explore Common Interests
CNL(00)47	Draft Resolution by the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Conservation of Salmon in the North Atlantic Ocean Concerning St Pierre and Miquelon
CNL(00)48	Predators: Effects on Atlantic Salmon (tabled by Canada)
CNL(00)49	Special Liaison Meeting to Review Measures to Minimise Impacts of Aquaculture on Wild Stocks - Presentation by European Union (Ireland)
CNL(00)50	Not issued
CNL(00)51	Special Liaison Meeting to Review Measures to Minimise Impacts of Aquaculture on Wild Stocks - Presentation by the European Union
CNL(00)52	Special Liaison Meeting to Review Measures to Minimise Impacts of Aquaculture on Wild Stocks - Presentation by the European Union (UK, Scotland)
CNL(00)53	2001 Budget, 2002 Forecast Budget and Schedule of Contributions
CNL(00)54	Special Liaison Meeting to Review Measures to Minimise Impacts of Aquaculture on Wild Stocks - EU Fish Health Regime
CNL(00)55	Possible Terms of Reference for the Standing Committee on the Precautionary Approach
CNL(00)56	Press Release
CNL(00)57	Report of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Council
CNL(00)58	Terms of Reference for the Standing Committee on the Precautionary Approach - Application of a Precautionary Approach to Habitat Protection and Restoration

CNL(00)59	Resolution by the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Conservation of Salmon in the North Atlantic Ocean Concerning St Pierre and Miquelon
CNL(00)60	Request for Scientific Advice from ICES
CNL(00)61	Declines and Extirpation of Wild Salmon in Northwest Scotland: Possible Links to Salmon Farming (tabled by the Association of Salmon Fishery Boards, Scotland)

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