

REPORT OF THE

NINETEENTH ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC COMMISSION

3-7 JUNE 2002
TÓRSHAVN, FAROE ISLANDS

Chairman: Mr Vladimir Moskalenko (Russian Federation)

Vice-Chairman: Mr Arni Isaksson (Iceland)

Rapporteur: Dr Niall Ó Maoiléidigh (European Union)

Secretary: Dr Malcolm Windsor

NEA(02)11

CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
Report of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the North-East Atlantic Commission, 3-7 June 2002, Tórshavn, Faroe Islands	55
Compte rendu de la Dix-neuvième réunion annuelle de la Commission de l'Atlantique du Nord-est, 3-7 juin 2002, Torshavn, Îles Féroé	63
Annex 1 NGO Joint Opening Statement to the North-East Atlantic Commission	73
Annex 2 Agenda, NEA(02)13	75
Annex 3 Returns under the North-East Atlantic Commission Resolution to Protect Wild Salmon Stocks from Introductions and Transfers, NEA(02)4	77
Annex 4 The Risk of Transmission of <i>Gyrodactylus salaris</i> in the Commission Area (tabled by Norway), NEA(02)7	87
Annex 5 Risks of Transmission of <i>Gyrodactylus salaris</i> (<i>Gs</i>) in the North-East Atlantic Commission Area (tabled by the European Union), NEA(02)9	89
Annex 6 Information from the EU on Developments in Salmon Management by EU Countries, NEA(02)8	93
Annex 7 Decision regarding the Salmon Fishery in Faroese Waters 2003, NEA(02)12	99
Annex 8 Request for Scientific Advice from ICES, CNL(02)51	101
Annex 9 List of North-East Atlantic Commission Papers	103

NEA(02)11

Report of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the North-East Atlantic Commission of the North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization 3-7 June 2002, Tórshavn, Faroe Islands

1. Opening of the Meeting

- 1.1 The Chairman, Mr Vladimir Moskalenko (Russian Federation) opened the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the North-East Atlantic Commission and welcomed delegates to Tórshavn.
- 1.2 An opening statement was made by the representative of the European Union. He highlighted the importance of the work of the Commission to the European Union and expressed concern that it had not been possible to establish a regulatory measure for the Faroes fishery for 2002, although he appreciated that there had been no fishery at Faroes in the past year. He indicated that his delegation intended to table papers outlining developments in management measures for fisheries in European Union Member States and on the measures being taken to prevent the spread of the parasite *Gyrodactylus salaris* in European waters. He wished the Parties success in their work and reiterated his hope that the Commission would successfully establish a regulatory measure for 2003.
- 1.3 An opening statement was made on behalf of all the fourteen Non-Government Organizations attending the Annual Meeting (Annex 1).
- 1.4 A list of participants at the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the Council and Commissions is included on page 255 of this document.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

- 2.1 The Commission adopted its agenda, NEA(02)13 (Annex 2).

3. Nomination of a Rapporteur

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

4. Election of Officers

- 4.1 The Commission unanimously elected Mr. Árni Ólafsson (Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)) as its Chairman and Mr. Steinar Hermansen (Norway) as its Vice-Chairman, to take office at the close of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting.

5. Review of the 2001 Fishery and ACFM Report from ICES on Salmon Stocks in the Commission Area

- 5.1 The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) informed the Commission that there had been no commercial fishery for salmon at Faroes in 2001 or during the 2002 season to date and no applications had been received for salmon fishing licences. He also confirmed that there had been no research fishing in 2001.
- 5.2 The representative of ICES, Mr Tore Jakobsen, Chairman of the ACFM, presented the scientific advice for ICES relevant to the North-East Atlantic Commission, CNL(02)10, prepared in response to a request from the Commission at its Eighteenth Annual Meeting. The ACFM Report from ICES, which contains the scientific advice relevant to all Commissions, is included on page 101 of this document.
- 5.3 The representative of Iceland noted that Icelandic salmon stocks had been included in the Northern European stock complex for the purposes of developing catch advice but stated that Icelandic stocks shared many characteristics of Southern European and North American stocks. He recognised, however, that Icelandic stocks are difficult for ICES to categorise. He requested information on fisheries which might have a high by-catch of salmon, and he asked if there was any supporting information on by-catch from sampling programmes.
- 5.4 The representative of ICES responded that the estimate of by-catch had not been established directly from sampling commercial mackerel fisheries but was based on the assumption that the relative catch of post-smolts and mackerel in research trawls in the Norwegian Sea was comparable to the catch in commercial mackerel fisheries. The by-catch in other mackerel fisheries was not known.
- 5.5 The representative of the European Union stated that it appeared that by-catch could be a serious problem for salmon stocks, but he noted that there were many uncertainties in the estimate. He asked how robust these estimates were and how they could be improved. He enquired if ICES had data on the timing and location of the mackerel fishery, since changes in the fishing pattern might offer a means to protect salmon. He wondered if Atlantic salmon post-smolts might also be caught in other pelagic fisheries, particularly those for blue whiting and Atlanto-Scandian herring, as he was aware that mackerel and blue whiting are often caught together. The representative of ICES replied that the analysis was based on only 14 experimental trawl hauls, half of which were empty. The information could, therefore, only be used to highlight a potential problem. He had no first-hand information on the distribution of post-smolts relative to blue whiting fisheries but the likelihood of capture of post-smolts in the blue whiting fishery was low because this fishery occurs in deep waters and salmon post-smolts occur in the upper layers.
- 5.6 The representative of the European Union referred to the new International Cooperative Salmon Research Board and asked ICES if the highest research priority should be by-catch of salmon in the North-East Atlantic area. The representative of ICES indicated that all research was a question of political priority but a solid basis for estimating post-smolt by-catch would require considerable vessel time over much of the season.

- 5.7 The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) suggested that another approach would be to place observers on vessels fishing for mackerel. He noted the preliminary nature of the estimate from ICES and that the timing, area of fishing and size of trawls in the experimental fishery were not the same as in the commercial mackerel fishery. He further noted that the post-smolt by-catch taken in 2001 had been compared to the mackerel catch in 2000, and cautioned that by-catch would vary greatly with changes in currents and other factors so there were still many questions to be answered. However, he acknowledged that the estimate was based on the best available information. It would be important to sample mackerel fisheries in other areas and other fisheries operating in the surface layers. He agreed that the blue whiting fishery was not likely to be a source of by-catch of salmon and that it was unlikely that significant numbers of post-smolts would be caught by purse seines.
- 5.8 The representative of Iceland asked if there had been a change from purse seining to trawling for pelagic fish over the last 10 years. He noted that trawls appeared to be getting larger and he referred to the possibility of by-catch in demersal gear (e.g. for cod). The representative of ICES indicated that there were more historical records available that might assist in estimating by-catch of salmon more accurately and that he could not rule out that there had been an increase in trawl fisheries leading to the potential for increased by-catch.
- 5.9 The representative of the European Union asked if a forecast of PFA for European stocks would be available in the near future as he could not see how real progress could be made in establishing quotas for the Faroes fishery until this information was available. The representative of ICES responded that some progress had been made in recent years and that he hoped this would continue.
- 5.10 The representative of Norway noted that the occurrence of farmed salmon in countries other than Norway was very low although escapes were known to occur, and he asked if ICES could explain this. The representative of ICES stated that this might be expected, given the higher production of farmed fish in Norway.

6. Salmonid Introductions and Transfers

- 6.1 The Secretary introduced papers NEA(02)4 (Annex 3) detailing the returns under the Resolution to Protect Wild Salmon Stocks from Introductions and Transfers, and NEA(02)5, providing a definition of the term “non-indigenous”. At its last Annual Meeting the Commission had discussed a definition of the term “non-indigenous” since this is not defined in the Resolution. It was agreed that further consideration should be given to an appropriate definition at the Commission’s Nineteenth Annual Meeting but, to assist the Parties in making their returns for 2002, the definition used by the North American Commission had been used on an interim basis.
- 6.2 The Commission recognised that there is a need for care in developing definitions. The representative of the European Union referred to other definitions of the term “non-indigenous” in the EU Habitats Directive, in an FAO report on introductions and transfers and that used by EIFAC. The Secretary was asked to consult with the Parties on these different definitions with a view to adopting a definition for use by

the Commission. In the event that a definition other than that used by the North American Commission was adopted, the issue would need to be referred to the Council for resolution.

- 6.3 In response to a request from the European Union, the representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) provided details on the incidence of the disease Infectious Salmon Anaemia (ISA) in aquaculture in the Faroes, as contained in document NEA(02)4. He stressed that all fish in infected farms have been destroyed in accordance with Directive 93/53/EC. He noted that, while the disease was not reported from Ireland or UK (Northern Ireland, England and Wales), no reference had been made in document NEA(02)4 to the situation in Scotland. The representative of the European Union stated that ISA was first confirmed in Scotland in May 1998 and the last confirmed case was April 1999. The last suspected case was in November 1999. In total 11 cases had been confirmed. An ISA contingency plan has been tabled at the Standing Veterinary Committee.

7. Risk of Transmission of *Gyrodactylus salaris* in the Commission Area

- 7.1 The representative of Norway referred to the very serious threat to wild salmon stocks posed by the parasite *Gyrodactylus salaris* and the need for close cooperation among members of the Commission to minimise the risk of its further transmission in the Commission area. He introduced paper NEA(02)7 (Annex 4) and stated that Norway would be willing to develop, in consultation with other members of the Commission, proposals as to how the issues raised in this document might be addressed. The objective would be to minimise the risk of further transmission of this damaging parasite within the Commission area.
- 7.2 The representative of Iceland stated that Iceland was fortunate to be free of the parasite, and asked for details on how it was spread between rivers. The representative of Norway replied that during adaptation to sea water, salmon smolts carrying the parasite may re-enter fresh water, resulting in the spread of the parasite between rivers flowing into the same fjord. There is no information to suggest that the parasite has been spread by human activity in recent years.
- 7.3 The representative of the European Union indicated support for the proposal from Norway and suggested that co-operation with the International Baltic Sea Fishery Commission (IBSFC) might also offer benefits. He tabled document NEA(02)9 (Annex 5) detailing the measures taken to prevent the spread of the parasite within the European Union.
- 7.4 The representative of Russia agreed with the views expressed by Norway and the European Union about the serious threat posed by *G. salaris*. He was particularly concerned as smolts had recently been imported from Norway for use in the first commercial salmon farm in Russia. *G. salaris* occurs in one river flowing into the north-west region although the source of the infection is not known. He supported the proposal by Norway to strengthen international co-operation and exchange of information. The representatives of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) and of Iceland also supported the proposal.

- 7.5 The Commission asked that Norway co-ordinate the initial exchange of information in accordance with its proposal through correspondence with other members of the Commission, and consult with the IBSFC. The observer from the IBSFC agreed to bring this initiative to the attention of his Commission.

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

- 8.1 The Secretary referred to the substantial work undertaken by the Council with regard to application of the Precautionary Approach but questioned whether this item needed to be further considered within the Commission. The representative of the European Union referred to document NEA(02)8 (Annex 6) which detailed developments in salmon management in EU Member States. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) noted that while the Commission had been precautionary in managing fisheries, there had been no consideration of predation of salmon. He referred to the work carried out by the North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission (NAMMCO) and to reported problems with seals in Scotland, and suggested that this issue should also be considered under the Precautionary Approach.

9. Regulatory Measures

- 9.1 The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) made the following statement:

“For the people of the Faroe Islands, the ocean and all its marine resources are the very basis of our existence. Last year this Commission recognised our right to fish for salmon in our area of fisheries jurisdiction. However, in 2001 no fishing was allowed and historically our quotas had been significantly reduced to the present level which means no fishing. The fishery has only been on a precautionary basis during these years and we strongly continue to stress our right to fish and maintain a sustainable utilisation of the stocks based upon the best scientific advice presented to NASCO, bearing in mind the precautionary principle. We intend to work expeditiously with ICES to improve the estimation of a combined conservation limit and thus enable catch advice for the Faroe Islands salmon fishery to be given on an effort or a quantitative basis. Our great concern is also the high proportion of unreported catches of salmon, which are estimated to be several times higher than the combined quotas of the Faroe Islands and Greenland. Although unreported catches may have decreased from 32% to 27.5% during the last four years, the level remains at a constant high of about 1000 tonnes each year. The reason for this apparent decline is the increased reported catches in the North Atlantic Ocean. Many other factors are affecting the salmon stocks, such as pollution, habitat damage, by-catches of post-smolts and impacts from aquaculture. All these factors reduce the spawning opportunities and the survival of wild salmon and the effects of these factors are more severe than the effects of the fisheries by the Faroe Islands and Greenland. A research fishery has been recognised as being of major importance to the scientific programme and such a programme was recommended by ICES. The proposed Salmon Research Fund will greatly improve such possibilities for Parties like the Faroe Islands and Greenland to participate in large-scale salmon research on mortality at sea. We are looking forward to hearing and sharing views which may provide inspiration for solutions for rational utilisation of the fisheries resources in the North Atlantic with the purpose of ensuring

sustainable fisheries for the future. However, we suggest that the decision regarding the salmon fishery in Faroese water made for 2002 should remain for 2003.”

- 9.2 The representative of the European Union noted these views with interest, acknowledging that Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) had shown great responsibility in recent years and had kept the high moral ground which he respected. However, he drew attention to the obligations of NASCO to regulate the fishery and pointed out that there was no legal basis for management in the absence of a regulatory measure. Contracting Parties had elections and new policies often prevailed. The European Union proposed reverting to a practice of fixing a TAC with the objective of reducing the impact of mixed stock fishing. He noted the European Union was making efforts, and continued to make efforts, in this regard and the Faroes should do the same, and he suggested following the same procedure of reducing the quota as the Commission had done from 1994 to 2000. He noted that this will have no economic impact on the Faroese salmon fishermen. Therefore the European Union proposed fixing a TAC lower than the last TAC allocated to Faroes. He might also be prepared to look at alternative approaches if necessary.
- 9.3 The representative of Norway indicated that he appreciated the responsible attitude shown by Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) and he could, therefore, accept their proposal not to set a quota for 2003.
- 9.4 The representative of Iceland referred to the low numbers of 2SW salmon returning to Icelandic rivers and stressed that there should be no mixed stock fishery. He was not concerned whether there was a decision, as proposed by Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), or a TAC as favoured by the European Union.
- 9.5 The representative of Russia stated that, as a Contracting Party to NASCO and in accordance with the NASCO Convention, Russia had made significant commitments by reducing commercial fisheries and introducing catch and release in rod fisheries. He stressed that the objective of the Commission is to establish regulatory measures and reduce mixed stock fisheries and he asked whether Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) intended to establish any legal basis for management of the fishery. Russia supported the proposal from the European Union to fix a quota for fishing for salmon in Faroese waters. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) stated that he considered the measures established as regulatory and they are using an effort system as previously. It was most important to retain the right to fish and they could not go into a dialogue on fishing a TAC below 200t as proposed by the European Union. He preferred not to set a TAC as the previous decisions had been precautionary. The representative of the European Union expressed concern since, in his experience from other fisheries and disputes, legal certainty was the best approach. He referred to the functions of the Commission, as detailed in Article 8 of the Convention, which include “to propose regulatory measures for fishing in the area of fisheries jurisdiction of a member of salmon originating in the rivers of other Parties”. He confirmed that Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) had a right to fish in its waters but he would be concerned if there was not a solid foundation for managing the fishery. He would, therefore, prefer that a TAC was established. He noted that the representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) had suggested that he would not enter into dialogue with the European Union and Russia, who had also supported

the proposal. However, he would be willing to look at alternatives as a last resort. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) noted the regulatory measure in 2000 which had set a reduced quota for Faroes and this was the lowest quota he could agree. He did not intend to stop discussion with any Contracting Party but reiterated his desire to continue with the measure adopted last year.

9.6 Following substantial discussion among the Heads of Delegations, the Commission considered a proposal from the Chair for a decision regarding the salmon fishery in Faroes waters in 2003, NEA(02)10. The Chairman indicated that this was not a regulatory measure but a decision of the Commission. Following minor amendments, the Commission adopted this decision, NEA(02)12 (Annex 7).

9.7 The representative of the European Union stated that he wished to qualify his acceptance of the decision. He indicated that his delegation very much regrets that it was not possible to reach agreement on a regulatory measure as required by the Convention, and the European Union would continue to propose these measures at future meetings of the Commission. However, he acknowledged that the decision had been unanimously agreed and had demonstrated solidarity between the Parties. He respected the way the Faroes had operated the fishery in recent years and it was in this context that his delegation had, therefore, been able to accept the decision.

9.8 The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) expressed his appreciation for the cooperation of the Parties in reaching agreement and hoped that this cooperative spirit would persist in future in order to protect salmon stocks as required by the Convention.

10. Announcement of the Tag Return Incentive Scheme Prize

10.1 The Chairman announced that the winner of the Commission's \$1,500 prize was Mr Robert Ritchie, Montrose, Scotland. The Commission offered its congratulations to the winner.

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

11.1 The Commission reviewed the relevant sections of document SSC(02)2 and, following one minor amendment, agreed to recommend it to the Council as part of the annual request to ICES for scientific advice. The request to ICES as agreed by the Council, CNL(02)51, is contained in Annex 8.

11.2 In regard to question 2.6, the representative of the European Union requested a structured response from ICES concerning the incidence of escaped farm salmon from Scotland, Ireland and the Faroe Islands in Norwegian waters.

12. Other Business

12.1 There was no other business.

13. Date and Place of Next Meeting

- 13.1 The Commission agreed to hold its next Annual Meeting in conjunction with the Twentieth Annual Meeting of the Council during 2-6 June 2003.

14. Consideration of the Report of the Meeting

- 14.1 The Commission agreed a report of the meeting, NEA(02)11.

Note: The annexes mentioned above begin in page 73, following the French translation of the report of the meeting. A list of North-East Atlantic Commission papers is included on page 103 of this document.

NEA(02)11

Compte rendu de la Dix-neuvième réunion annuelle de la Commission de l'Atlantique du Nord-Est de l'Organisation pour la Conservation du Saumon de l'Atlantique Nord 3-7 juin 2002, Tórshavn, Îles Féroé

1. Ouverture de la réunion

- 1.1 La Dix-neuvième réunion annuelle de la Commission de l'Atlantique du Nord-Est a été ouverte par le Président, M. Vladimir Moskalenko (Fédération de Russie), qui a souhaité la bienvenue aux délégués, à Tórshavn.
- 1.2 Le représentant de l'Union européenne a prononcé une déclaration d'ouverture. Il a souligné l'importance du travail de la Commission à l'Union européenne et a exprimé son regret quant au fait qu'il n'avait pas été possible de définir une mesure de réglementation pour la pêcherie de 2002 aux Îles Féroé. Il était toutefois conscient qu'aucune pêche n'avait eu lieu aux Îles Féroé au cours de la dernière année. Il a indiqué que sa délégation avait l'intention de soumettre des documents qui présentaient dans leurs grandes lignes la progression des mesures de gestion appliquées aux pêcheries des Etats membres de l'Union européenne. Viendraient s'ajouter à ceux-ci des documents sur les mesures qui étaient prises pour éviter la propagation du parasite *Gyrodactylus salaris* dans les eaux européennes. Le représentant de l'Union européenne a souhaité aux Parties un travail fructueux et a réitéré combien il espérait voir la Commission établir avec succès une mesure de réglementation pour 2003.
- 1.3 Une déclaration d'ouverture a été prononcée au nom des quatorze Organisations non gouvernementales présentes à la Réunion annuelle (annexe 1).
- 1.4 Une liste des participants à la Dix-neuvième réunion annuelle du Conseil et des Commissions de l'OCSAN figure à la page 255 de ce document.

2. Adoption de l'ordre du jour

- 2.1 La Commission a adopté son ordre du jour, NEA(01)13 (annexe 2).

3. Nomination d'un Rapporteur

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

4. Election des membres du comité directeur

- 4.1 La Commission a élu Président, à l'unanimité, M. Árni Olafsson (Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland)) et Vice-Président, M. Steinar Hermansen (Norvège). Ces

nouveaux membres du comité directeur entrèrent en fonction à la fin de la Dix-neuvième réunion annuelle.

5. Examen de la pêche de 2001 et du rapport du CGCP du CIEM sur les stocks de saumons dans la zone de la Commission

- 5.1 Le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) a informé la Commission du fait qu'il n'y avait eu aucune pêche commerciale au saumon effectuée aux Îles Féroé en 2001. On n'avait également jusqu'à ce jour noté aucune pêche commerciale pour la saison de 2002. Par ailleurs aucune demande de permis de pêche au saumon n'avait été reçue. Le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) a aussi confirmé l'absence de pêche réalisée à des fins scientifiques en 2001.
- 5.2 Le président du CCGP et représentant du CIEM, M. Tore Jakobsen, a fait état des recommandations scientifiques du CIEM intéressant la Commission de l'Atlantique du Nord-Est, CNL(02)10, formulées suite à une demande émanant de la Commission lors de la Dix-huitième réunion annuelle. Le rapport du CCGP du CIEM contenant les recommandations scientifiques pour l'ensemble des Commissions figure à la page 101 du présent document.
- 5.3 Le représentant de l'Islande a noté que les stocks de saumons islandais avaient été inclus, pour l'élaboration de recommandations de captures, dans le groupe de stock d'Europe du nord. Les stocks islandais partageaient cependant plusieurs caractéristiques des stocks de l'Europe du sud et de l'Amérique du Nord. Il reconnaissait toutefois qu'il était difficile pour le CIEM de les catégoriser. Il a par ailleurs sollicité des informations sur les pêches qui pourraient présenter une grande proportion de captures accidentelles de saumons. Il a de plus cherché à savoir si les programmes d'échantillonnage avaient produit des informations qui confirmeraient la présence de captures accidentelles.
- 5.4 Le représentant du CIEM a répondu que l'estimation des captures accidentelles n'avait pas été produite directement à partir de l'échantillonnage prélevé sur les pêcheries commerciales de maquereaux, mais qu'elle se basait sur la supposition que les captures relatives de post-smolts et de maquereaux par les navires de recherche dans la mer de Norvège étaient comparables aux captures effectuées dans les pêcheries commerciales de maquereaux de la mer de Norvège. Les captures accidentelles effectuées dans les autres pêcheries de maquereaux demeuraient inconnues.
- 5.5 Le représentant de l'Union européenne a déclaré qu'il semblait en effet que les captures accidentelles puissent représenter un grave problème pour les stocks de saumons. Il a cependant fait remarquer que l'estimation était très incertaine. Il s'est enquis sur la solidité de ces calculs et sur la façon dont on pourrait les améliorer. Il a demandé si le CIEM avait des données sur la période à laquelle avait lieu la pêche au maquereau et sur son étendue. On pourrait en effet protéger le saumon en modifiant l'organisation des pêches. Il s'interrogeait aussi sur la possibilité de captures de post-smolts de saumons atlantiques au cours des autres pêches pélagiques, notamment pendant les pêches au merlan bleu et au hareng Atlanto-Scandinave. Il savait en effet que les maquereaux et les merlans bleus étaient souvent pêchés ensemble. Le

représentant du CIEM a répondu que l'analyse portait uniquement sur la récolte de 14 chaluts, prise à des fins expérimentales. La moitié de ceux-ci n'avaient en fait contenu ni saumon, ni maquereaux. L'information obtenue ne pouvait par conséquent être utilisée que pour mettre en relief la possibilité d'un problème. Il n'avait aucun renseignement de première main sur la distribution des post-smolts par rapport aux pêcheries de merlans bleus. La possibilité de capture de post-smolts dans cette pêcherie était cependant très faible car la pêche au merlan bleu se passait en profondeur tandis que celle des post-smolts de saumons s'effectuait en surface.

- 5.6 Le représentant de l'Union européenne s'est rapporté à la nouvelle Commission chargée de la coopération en matière de recherche internationale sur le saumon pour demander au CIEM si l'on devait considérer les captures accidentelles de saumons dans l'Atlantique du Nord-Est comme la plus haute priorité en termes de recherche. Le représentant du CIEM a indiqué que la recherche était soumise aux priorités politiques, mais qu'une base solide pour l'estimation des captures accidentelles de post-smolts nécessiterait certes un temps d'allocation de navire considérable pendant la plupart de la saison.
- 5.7 Le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) a suggéré une autre approche, qui consisterait à placer des observateurs sur les navires de pêche au maquereau. Il a noté le caractère provisoire de l'estimation du CIEM et le fait que la période, la zone de pêche et la taille des chaluts de la pêche menée à des fins expérimentales différaient de ceux de la pêche commerciale au maquereau. Il a par ailleurs indiqué que les captures de post-smolts en 2001 avait été comparées aux captures de maquereaux de 2000. Le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) a aussi prévenu que des changements de courants ou d'autres facteurs affecteraient grandement le volume des captures accidentelles. Il restait donc toujours de nombreuses questions auxquelles il fallait apporter une réponse. Il acceptait que l'estimation ait été fondée sur les meilleurs renseignements disponibles. Il serait toutefois important de faire des prélèvements sur les pêches au maquereau à d'autres endroits et sur les pêches qui s'effectuaient à la surface. Il a convenu qu'il serait peu probable que la pêche au merlan bleu soit une des sources des captures accidentelles de saumons. De même, les captures d'un nombre important de post-smolts par des essaigures demeuraient peu plausibles.
- 5.8 Le représentant de l'Islande a demandé si au cours des 10 dernières années, on était passé de la pêche à l'essaigure à la pêche pélagique au chalut. Il a fait remarquer que les chaluts semblaient devenir plus importants et a mentionné la possibilité de captures accidentelles par les engins du type démersal (comme dans le cas de la morue). Le représentant du CIEM a indiqué que les données historiques étaient maintenant plus étendues et que ceci pourrait permettre de rendre l'estimation des captures accidentelles de saumons plus précise. Il a ensuite ajouté qu'il ne pouvait pas exclure une augmentation de la pêche au chalut et par conséquent la possibilité d'un nombre plus important de captures accidentelles.
- 5.9 Le représentant de l'Union européenne a demandé si une prévision de l'APP des stocks européens serait disponible dans un avenir proche. Il ne voyait en effet pas comment l'on pouvait vraiment progresser dans l'établissement de quotas pour la pêcherie des Îles Féroé tant que cette information n'était pas disponible. Le

représentant du CIEM a répondu que des progrès avaient été réalisés ces dernières années et qu'il espérait voir cette tendance continuer.

- 5.10 Le représentant de la Norvège a indiqué que l'apparition de saumons d'élevage dans les pays autres que la Norvège ne représentait pas un phénomène très important, bien que l'existence d'échappés soit connue. Il a demandé au CIEM s'ils pouvaient expliquer ce phénomène. Le représentant du CIEM a déclaré que ceci était à prévoir étant donné que la Norvège produisait plus de poissons d'élevage.

6. Introductions et transferts de salmonidés

- 6.1 Le Secrétaire a présenté le document NEA(02)4 (annexe 3) qui décrivait en détail les renvois d'informations effectués aux termes de la Résolution visant à protéger les stocks de saumons sauvages contre les introductions et les transferts. Le document NEA(02)5 qu'il a présenté par la suite proposait une définition du terme « non-indigène ». Lors de sa dernière Réunion annuelle, la Commission avait abordé la question de définition du terme « non-indigène », puisque la Résolution n'offrait pas d'interprétation. Il avait été convenu d'examiner à nouveau la question lors de la Dix-neuvième réunion de la Commission. Cependant, en vue de faciliter la tâche des Parties lors de leurs renvois de 2002, la Commission avait convenu d'utiliser, provisoirement, la définition adoptée par la Commission Nord-Américaine.
- 6.2 La Commission a reconnu que la formulation de définitions exigeait une certaine prudence. Le représentant de l'Union européenne a mentionné d'autres définitions du terme « non-indigène », telles qu'elles étaient employées par l'Union européenne dans la Directive concernant les habitats (Directive « Habitats » de l'UE), par la FAO dans un rapport qui traitait des introductions et transferts et par la EIFAC. Le Secrétaire a été prié de consulter les Parties à propos de ces différentes interprétations afin d'aboutir à une définition qui puisse être utilisée par la Commission. Au cas où une définition autre que celle employée par la Commission Nord-Américaine serait adoptée, la question devra être soumise au Conseil pour résolution.
- 6.3 En réponse à une demande de l'Union européenne, le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) a fourni des renseignements sur l'incidence de la maladie Anémie infectieuse du saumon (AIS) dans les élevages aquacoles des Îles Féroé (voir document NEA(02)4). Il a souligné que tous les poissons des élevages infectés par la maladie avaient été détruits, conformément à la Directive 93/53/EC. Il a noté l'absence de cas en Irlande et au Royaume-Uni (Irlande du Nord, Angleterre et Pays de Galles), mais également qu'aucune référence n'avait été faite dans le document NEA(02)4 à propos de la situation en Ecosse. Le représentant de l'Union européenne a déclaré que le premier cas confirmé en Ecosse avait été en mai 1998 et le dernier cas confirmé, en avril 1999. Le dernier cas suspect avait été au mois de novembre 1999. En tout, 11 cas avaient été confirmés. Un programme pour parer d'avance à l'imprévu avait été présenté, dans le cas de l'AIS, lors de la dernière réunion du Comité permanent vétérinaire.

7. Risque de transmission du Gyrodactylus salaris dans la zone de la Commission

- 7.1 Le représentant de la Norvège a fait allusion à la très grave menace que le parasite Gyrodactylus salaris représentait pour les stocks de saumon sauvage. Une coopération étroite entre les membres de la Commission était par conséquent de mise si l'on voulait réduire au maximum le risque d'une propagation plus étendue dans la zone de la Commission. Le représentant de la Norvège a présenté le document NEA(02)7 (annexe 4) et a déclaré que la Norvège serait disposée à travailler, de pair avec les autres membres de la Commission, à l'élaboration de propositions suggérant différentes façons de résoudre les questions soulevées dans ce document. L'objectif serait de réduire au maximum le risque d'une plus grande propagation de ce parasite nuisible dans la zone de la Commission.
- 7.2 Le représentant de l'Islande a déclaré que son pays était, heureusement, exempt de ce parasite. Il a toutefois cherché à savoir comment ce parasite se propageait d'une rivière à l'autre. Le représentant de la Norvège a répondu que lors de leur adaptation à l'eau de mer, il arrivait que les smolts de saumon, porteurs de parasites, reviennent dans les eaux douces, propageant ainsi le parasite dans les différentes rivières qui se jettent dans le même fjord. Il n'existait aucune information qui imputerait, au cours de ces dernières années, la propagation de ce parasite à des activités humaines.
- 7.3 Le représentant de l'Union européenne a indiqué qu'il approuvait la proposition de la Norvège et a suggéré que la coopération de la Commission internationale des Pêches de la mer Baltique (CIPMB) puisse aussi s'avérer salutaire. Il a présenté le document NEA(02)9 (annexe 5) qui décrivait les mesures prises en vue d'éviter la propagation du parasite dans l'Union européenne.
- 7.4 Le représentant de la Fédération de Russie partageait l'opinion de la Norvège et de l'Union européenne quant à la gravité du danger posé par le G. salaris. Il se montrait particulièrement inquiet étant donné que des smolts avaient récemment été importés de Norvège pour être utilisés dans le premier élevage commercial de saumons de la Fédération de Russie. Le G. salaris était présent dans un cours d'eau qui s'écoulait dans la région du nord-ouest. On ne connaissait toutefois pas la source de l'infection. Le représentant de la Fédération de Russie a appuyé la proposition émise par la Norvège, à savoir le renforcement de la coopération et de l'échange des informations à ce sujet au niveau international. Les représentants du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) et de l'Islande approuvaient également la proposition.
- 7.5 La Commission a prié la Norvège de coordonner, dans le cadre de sa proposition, les échanges initiaux d'informations entre les autres membres de la Commission. Cette tâche était censée s'effectuer par correspondance. La Norvège a également été priée de consulter la CIPMB. Le représentant de la CIPMB, présent en tant qu'observateur, a convenu de porter cette initiative à l'attention de sa Commission.

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

- 8.1 Bien que le Conseil entreprenait un grand travail en ce qui concernait l'application de l'approche préventive, le Secrétaire se demandait si cette question nécessitait un plus ample examen au niveau de la présente Commission. Le représentant de l'Union

européenne s'est reporté au document NEA(02)8 (annexe 6) qui décrivait comment progressait la gestion du saumon au sein des Etats membres de l'UE. Le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) a fait remarquer que bien que la Commission ait adopté une approche préventive en ce qui concernait la gestion des pêcheries, aucune considération n'avait été donnée à la prédation du saumon. Il a fait référence au travail réalisé par la Commission pour les mammifères marins de l'Atlantique Nord (CMMAN) et aux problèmes bien connus, engendrés par les phoques en Ecosse. Il a ainsi suggéré qu'il serait également bon d'étudier cette question dans le cadre de l'approche préventive.

9. Mesures de réglementation

9.1 Le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) a prononcé la déclaration suivante :

« L'océan et l'ensemble des ressources marines constituent, pour le peuple des Îles Féroé, la base même de leur existence. L'année dernière, cette Commission reconnut notre droit à la pêche au saumon, dans la zone relevant de notre juridiction en matière de pêche. Cependant, en 2001, aucune pêche ne fut autorisée et, d'un point de vue historique, nos quotas furent grandement réduits pour atteindre le niveau actuel, à savoir un niveau de non-pêche. Ces dernières années, les pêches n'ont été effectuées que dans un contexte d'approche préventive. Nous continuons par conséquent à revendiquer notre droit à la pêche et au maintien d'une utilisation durable des stocks, utilisation guidée par les meilleures recommandations scientifiques présentées par l'OCSAN et inspirée du principe de précaution. Il est dans notre intention d'œuvrer de pair avec le CIEM, à une prompt amélioration de l'estimation d'une limite de conservation commune et ce, afin d'offrir des recommandations de captures pour la pêcherie de saumons des Îles Féroé, basées sur l'effort ou un critère quantitatif. Nous désirons par ailleurs exprimer notre grande inquiétude à propos de la haute proportion de captures non déclarées de saumons, qui selon les estimations dépassent de beaucoup les quotas combinés des Îles Féroé et du Groenland. Même si les captures non déclarées sont passés de 32% à 27,5% pendant les quatre dernières années, le niveau demeure constamment très haut, à environ 1 000 tonnes chaque année. La véritable raison de cette baisse apparente est l'augmentation des captures déclarées de l'Atlantique Nord. Maints autres facteurs affectent les stocks de saumon, tels la pollution, la dégradation de l'habitat, les captures accidentelles des post-smolts et les impacts de l'aquaculture. Ces facteurs réduisent tous les chances de reproduction et de survie du saumon sauvage. Les effets produits par ces facteurs ont par ailleurs des conséquences plus graves que les effets causés par les pêcheries des Îles Féroé et le Groenland. Il a été reconnu qu'une pêche menée à des fins de recherche était primordiale pour le programme scientifique. De plus ce programme a été recommandé par le CIEM. La proposition d'un fonds alloué à la recherche sur le saumon (le Fonds pour la recherche sur le saumon) améliorera grandement la possibilité pour les Parties, telles que les Îles Féroé et le Groenland, de participer à des activités de recherche de grande envergure sur la mortalité du saumon en mer. Nous attendons avec anticipation d'entendre et de partager les points de vue qui pourraient conduire à des solutions permettant une utilisation rationnelle des ressources des pêcheries dans l'Atlantique Nord, et ce afin de garantir des pêcheries durables pour l'avenir. Nous suggérons cependant que la décision concernant la pêcherie de saumons dans les eaux féringsiennes, prise pour 2002, demeure inchangée pour 2003. »

- 9.2 Le représentant de l'Union européenne a pris acte de ces points de vue avec intérêt. Il a de même reconnu que le Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) avait, ces dernières années, démontré un haut sens des responsabilités et agit avec moralité, ce qu'il respectait. Cependant, il a attiré l'attention sur l'obligation de l'OCSAN à réglementer la pêche et a souligné que sans mesure de réglementation, la gestion n'aurait pas de base légale. Des élections avaient eu lieu dans les pays des Parties signataires et souvent c'était les nouvelles politiques qui prévalaient. L'Union européenne proposait de revenir à la pratique de fixation d'un TAC dans le but de réduire les effets causés par la pêche à stock mixte. Il a indiqué que l'Union européenne faisait des efforts, et continuait à faire des efforts, dans ce domaine et que les Îles Féroé devaient faire de même. Il a suggéré de suivre la même procédure de réduction de quota que la Commission avait adoptée de 1994 à 2000. Il a fait remarquer que ceci n'aurait aucun impact économique sur les pêcheurs au saumon des Îles Féroé. L'Union européenne proposait ainsi de fixer un TAC qui soit plus bas que le dernier qui fut alloué aux Îles Féroé. Il se montrait également disposé à examiner d'autres approches, si nécessaire.
- 9.3 Le représentant de la Norvège a indiqué qu'il appréciait l'attitude responsable adoptée par le Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) et de ce fait, acceptait leur proposition de ne pas fixer de quota pour 2003.
- 9.4 Le représentant de l'Islande a mentionné combien le nombre de saumons 2HM remontant vers les rivières d'Islande étaient faible et a souligné par conséquent que l'on ne devrait pratiquer aucune pêche à stock mixte. La question de savoir si la décision prise serait celle proposée par le Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) ou celle proposée par l'Union européenne, à savoir un TAC, lui était indifférente.
- 9.5 Le représentant de la Fédération de Russie a déclaré qu'en tant que Partie signataire de l'OCSAN, et conformément à la Convention de l'OCSAN, la Fédération de Russie s'était grandement engagée en réduisant les pêcheries commerciales et en introduisant la pratique des captures avec remise à l'eau des poissons pour les pêches utilisant la canne à pêche. Il a signalé que l'objectif de la Commission était d'établir des mesures de réglementation et de réduire les pêcheries de stock mixte. Il a ainsi demandé si le Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) avait l'intention d'établir une base légale à la gestion de la pêche. La Fédération de Russie appuyait la proposition émise par l'Union européenne qui consistait à fixer un quota pour la pêche au saumon dans les eaux féringiennes. Le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) a déclaré qu'il considérait que les mesures établies étaient des mesures de réglementation. De plus, ils utilisaient, comme auparavant, un système basé sur l'effort. Le maintien du droit à la pêche était primordial et par conséquent ils ne pourraient pas participer à un dialogue sur un TAC de pêche en dessous des 200 t, comme le proposait l'Union européenne. Etant donné que les décisions précédentes avaient été préventives, sa préférence était de ne pas fixer de TAC. Le représentant de l'Union européenne a exprimé son inquiétude car, son expérience de désaccords concernant d'autres pêcheries lui avait démontré que l'établissement d'une certitude légale était la meilleure approche. Il s'est reporté aux fonctions de la Commission, telles qu'elles sont détaillées à l'Article 8 de la Convention et qui incluent « de proposer des mesures de réglementation de pêche dans la zone de juridiction des

pêcheries d'un membre, de saumons provenant de rivières d'autres Parties ». Il a confirmé le droit du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) à pêcher dans ses propres eaux, mais a également indiqué qu'il serait inquiet si la gestion de la pêche ne reposait sur aucune fondation solide. Aussi penchait-il en faveur de l'établissement d'un TAC. Il avait noté que le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) avait suggéré qu'il ne participerait pas au dialogue avec l'Union européenne et la Fédération de Russie, qui avait également appuyé la proposition. En dernier recours, il se montrait disposé toutefois à considérer d'autres options. Le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) a fait remarquer que la mesure de réglementation de 2000 avait fixé un quota réduit pour les Îles Féroé et que ce quota représentait le niveau le plus bas qu'il puisse accepter. Son intention n'était pas de cesser de débattre ce sujet avec quelle que Partie signataire qui soit. Il réitérait toutefois son souhait de voir l'extension de la mesure adoptée l'année dernière.

9.6 A la suite de longs débats entre les Chefs de délégations, la Commission s'est penchée sur une proposition émanant du Président, proposition qui permettrait d'arriver à une décision quant à la pêche au saumon dans les eaux féringiennes en 2003, NEA(02)10. Le Président a indiqué qu'il ne s'agissait pas là d'une mesure de réglementation, mais d'une décision de la Commission. La Commission a adopté la décision NEA(02)12 (annexe 7), après y avoir apportée quelques légères corrections.

9.7 Le représentant de l'Union européenne a déclaré qu'il désirait qualifier son acceptation de la décision prise. Il a indiqué que sa délégation regrettait vivement le fait qu'il n'avait pas été possible de conclure un accord sur une mesure de réglementation, telle que l'exigeait la Convention. L'Union européenne continuerait à proposer ce type de mesures au cours des prochaines réunions de la Commission. Il reconnaissait cependant que la décision avait été prise à l'unanimité, démontrant ainsi une solidarité entre les Parties. Il respectait la façon dont les Îles Féroé avaient géré la pêche au cours des dernières années et c'était dans ce contexte que sa délégation avait par conséquent été en mesure d'accepter la décision.

9.8 Le représentant du Danemark (pour les Îles Féroé et le Groenland) a exprimé son appréciation de la coopération démontrée par les Parties dans la conclusion de l'accord. Il espérait qu'à l'avenir cet esprit de coopération appliqué, conformément à la Convention, à la protection des stocks de saumons persisterait.

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

10.1 Le Président a annoncé que M. Robert Ritchie de Montrose en Ecosse avait remporté le prix de 1 500 dollars de la Commission. La Commission a offert ses félicitations au gagnant.

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

11.1 Après avoir passé en revue les sections pertinentes du document SSC(02)2, la Commission a convenu de les recommander au Conseil dans le cadre de la demande annuelle de recommandations scientifiques au CIEM. La demande de

recommandations scientifiques adressée au CIEM et approuvée par le Conseil, CNL(02)51, figure à l'annexe 8.

- 11.2 En ce qui concernait la question 2.6, le représentant de l'Union européenne a sollicité une réponse structurée de la part du CIEM sur l'incidence des saumons échappés d'élevages d'Ecosse, d'Irlande et des Îles Féroé présents, dans les eaux norvégiennes.

12. Divers

- 12.1 Aucune autre question n'a été traitée.

13. Date et lieu de la prochaine réunion

- 13.1 La Commission a convenu de tenir sa prochaine Réunion annuelle lors de la Vingtième réunion annuelle du Conseil, qui se tiendra du 2 au 6 juin 2003.

14. Examen du compte rendu de la réunion

- 14.1 La Commission a approuvé le compte rendu NEA(02)11 de la réunion.

Note : Une liste des documents de la Commission de l'Atlantique Nord figure à la page 103 de ce document.

NGO Joint Opening Statement to the North-East Atlantic Commission

The NASCO NGOs welcome this first opportunity to make an opening statement to the North-East Atlantic Commission. The NGOs wish to draw attention to two particular aspects of the business to be conducted by the Commission.

Gyrodactylus

It is observed that Item 7 of the Agenda deals with the risk of transmission of *Gyrodactylus salaris* in the Commission area. The NGOs emphasise in the strongest terms the need for all possible precautions to be taken to avoid the spread of this parasite. Noting that *G. salaris* may be transported on:

- a. susceptible fish species, including Atlantic salmon, Arctic char, grayling and rainbow trout, or their eggs;
- b. other fish species acting as carriers, including brown trout, coarse fish and eels;
- c. clothing and equipment used in infected areas;

they call on all Parties represented in the Commission to impose appropriate measures to prevent its transmission.

These measures should include:

- a. effective action to eradicate the parasite in rivers that are already infected;
- b. the preparation and implementation of contingency plans to deal with an outbreak of the disease in previously uninfected areas;
- c. control of the movement of live fish and eggs of all species from areas that have not been shown to be free from *G. salaris*;
- d. prohibition of the importation of live fish and eggs of susceptible species into free areas;
- e. action to ensure the disinfection of clothing and equipment that has been used in potentially infected areas, before return to areas free from the parasite.

Implementation of these measures, especially in dealing with current infection, will require close regional and international co-operation. This should be accompanied by information and education programmes to ensure that all potential transmitters or carriers of *G. salaris* are aware of the risk, and of the necessary precautions.

By-catch of post smolts in pelagic fisheries in the Norwegian Sea

NGOs note with concern the estimates by the ICES Advisory Committee on Fishery Management of the possible extent of this by-catch (CNL(02)10, Section 2.6). These estimates, although provisional, demonstrate that this by-catch may represent a very significant proportion of the pre-fishery abundance of salmon in the area. Further, the protracted shoaling behaviour that has been observed among post-smolts suggests the possibility that the fishery may disproportionately affect runs from individual rivers.

The ACFM has recommended further research and investigation, in order to refine the estimates of the effect of the by-catch. The NGOs endorse the urgent need for such further research. However, they consider that the Precautionary Approach must apply in this context. Means of minimising the potential impact of these pelagic fisheries (such as the prohibition of fishing within an agreed distance from the surface) should be sought immediately, without awaiting the completion of research. The Parties represented in the Commission are urged to initiate appropriate action.

NEA(02)13

**Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the
North-East Atlantic Commission
Hotel Foroyar, Tórshavn, Faroe Islands
3-7 June, 2002**

Agenda

1. Opening of the Meeting
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Nomination of a Rapporteur
4. Election of Officers
5. Review of the 2001 Fishery and ACFM Report from ICES on Salmon Stocks in the Commission Area
6. Salmonid Introductions and Transfers
7. Risk of Transmission of *Gyrodactylus salaris* in the Commission area
8. Application of the Precautionary Approach to the Work of the Commission
9. Regulatory Measures
10. Announcement of the Tag Return Incentive Scheme Prize
11. Recommendations to the Council on the Request to ICES for Scientific Advice
12. Other Business
13. Date and Place of the Next Meeting
14. Report of the Meeting

North-East Atlantic Commission

NEA(02)4

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

NEA(02)4

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

1. In 1997, the Commission unanimously adopted a Resolution to Protect Wild Salmon Stocks from Introductions and Transfers, NEA(97)12. The request for the return of information for the calendar year 2001, the third year of returns, was circulated to members of the North-East Atlantic Commission on 4 January 2002. The returns are attached. Where the return seeks details of new measures only, measures previously reported by some Parties may still apply (see NEA(00)4, NEA(01)4 and NEA(01)6). At the time of preparation of this paper, information has not been received from some EU Member States (France, Portugal or Spain) which have salmon interests.
2. The main areas of note are as follows:
 - (a) During 2001, 1.62 million ova were imported to Scotland from Tasmania. There were no other movements into the Commission area of live Atlantic salmon and their eggs which originated from outside the Commission area.
 - (b) There were no proposals to release transgenic salmonids to the environment or use them in aquaculture during 2001.
 - (c) Epidemiological zones, with monitoring to confirm the disease status of the zones, have been established by a number of Parties. New or expanded monitoring programmes within epidemiological zones were reported by EU (Denmark and Sweden) and Norway. Only one Party reported movements of live salmonids from a zone where a specified disease was present to a zone free of the disease. In this case the transfer was from an area close to an ISA-free zone in Norway in which the disease ISA had not been recorded since 1991. A number of conditions were placed on the transfer.
 - (d) With regard to unknown diseases and parasites, no new procedures for the early identification and detection of, and rapid response to, new diseases or parasitic infections likely to affect Atlantic salmon were reported. No new additional protective measures have been introduced by any Party.
 - (e) There were no known movements from hatcheries to areas with salmon, or to facilities where there is a risk of transmission of infection to such areas, other than those from hatcheries where regular health inspections did not detect significant diseases or parasites.
 - (f) There were no reports of introductions of non-indigenous anadromous salmonids into rivers containing Atlantic salmon. Rainbow trout eggs from health-certified sites in South Africa were introduced to England and Wales.
 - (g) Only EU (Denmark) reported that the NEAC system of classifying salmon rivers had been introduced and that management measures had been

introduced for each class of river. Iceland and EU (Finland) had previously advised on the categorisation of rivers.

- (h) No new steps to limit the risks of unintentional introductions were reported.

Secretary
Edinburgh
22 May, 2002

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

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

European Union

United Kingdom

1.62 million ova were imported to Scotland from Tasmania in 2001.

Other Parties

No movements of live Atlantic salmon and their eggs which originated from outside the Commission area were reported by the other Parties or the other EU Member States.

Article 2: Transgenic Atlantic Salmon

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

There have been no proposals to release transgenic salmonids to the environment by any Party.

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

3.1 Specified diseases and parasites

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

Denmark (Faroe Islands)

The Faroe Islands are free of VHS, IHN and *Gyrodactylus salaris* infections in farmed salmonids. During the period 2000-2002 outbreaks of infectious salmon anaemia (ISA) have been reported on 7 occasions: 1 in 2000; 4 in 2001 and 2 in 2002. The diagnoses have been confirmed by clinical pathology and virus isolation and/or PCR technique and/or serology. All fish in ISA-infected farms have been or are being destroyed in accordance with Directive 93/53/CEC.

European Union

Denmark

Denmark is an IHN-free zone and part of Denmark is a VHS-free zone.

Ireland

Ireland is currently an Approved Zone for IHN. Ireland, with the exception of Cape Clear Island, is an Approved Zone with respect to VHS. ISA is a List 1 disease and, as such, all of Europe (with the exception of Scotland in 1998/1999) is presumed to be free of the disease. Ireland is also free of *G. salaris* and has an “Additional Guarantee” with respect to this parasite under EU legislation.

United Kingdom

Great Britain and Northern Ireland is an approved zone for VHS and IHN under the EC Fish Health Regime. It is considered to be free of *Gyrodactylus salaris*, and has additional guarantees under the EU Fish Health Regime to prevent its introduction from infected areas or those of unknown status. ISA is technically exotic to the EU, and has never been detected in England and Wales and Northern Ireland.

Iceland

Iceland is basically one zone. Stringent measures apply regarding management of wild salmonids. More liberal movement of farmed salmonids is permitted from facilities with good health inspection.

Norway

For 2001, the following free zones are in force:

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

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

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

Other Parties

No details of the establishment of epidemiological zones were provided by the other Parties or the other EU Member States.

3.1.2 If epidemiological zones have been established:

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

European Union

Denmark

The Danish Veterinary and Food Directorate regularly inspects fish farms to monitor disease status.

Sweden

The monitoring programme for *Gyrodactylus salaris* was expanded in 2001. It now covers all salmon rivers where the parasite has not been found.

Norway

The official surveillance program for *Gyrodactylus salaris* has been extended, and 50% of the freshwater fish farms are now examined for *Gyrodactylus salaris* every year.

Other Parties

No new management measures were reported by the other Parties or the other EU Member States.

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

Norway

Four transfers of live salmonids from an ISA zone into an ISA-free zone were approved. The salmonids came from an area close to the ISA-free zone, and ISA has not been recorded in that county since 1991. Additionally, requirements for the transfer were that the fish had not been fed moist feed, that the fish had not been transferred in seawater, that the fish had been kept under shelter, and that the fish were protected from potentially infectious seawater during the transport.

Other Parties

No movements of live salmonids and their eggs from a zone where any of the specified diseases is present to a zone free of these diseases were reported by the other Parties.

3.2 Unknown diseases and parasites

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

No new procedures or changes to existing procedures have been reported by any Party.

3.2.2 Details of any additional protective measures which have been introduced

No additional protective measures have been introduced by any Party.

3.3 Health inspection of donor facilities

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

No movements other than those from facilities where regular inspections did not detect the presence of significant diseases and parasites were reported by any Party.

Article 4: Movements of Non-Indigenous Fish

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

No known introductions of non-indigenous fish into a river containing Atlantic salmon have been reported by any Party.

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

European Union

United Kingdom

In England and Wales rainbow trout eggs were imported from health-certified sites in South Africa.

Other Parties

No introductions of non-indigenous salmonids were reported by the other Parties or the other EU Member States.

Article 5: Classification of Rivers

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

European Union

Denmark

Denmark has a national salmon rehabilitation plan for rivers in which salmon originally occurred.

Other Parties

The NEAC system of classifying rivers has not been introduced by the other Parties or the other EU Member States.

In Sweden, there is no formal implementation of the classification system but there is strict regulation of salmon releases in rivers where compensatory releases do not occur. Iceland had previously indicated that most rivers fall into groups 2 and 3, depending on the definition of the term “pristine”. EU (Finland) had previously indicated that the Rivers Teno and Näätamo are in group 3.

Article 6: Management Measures

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

European Union

Denmark

Group 1 rivers: Non-indigenous salmon can be released.

Group 2 rivers: Only genetically similar salmon from local rivers can be released.

Group 3 rivers: Only salmon from the same river can be released.

Other Parties

No new management measures reported by the other Parties or the other EU Member States.

Article 7: Unintentional Introductions and Releases

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

No new steps taken by any Party.

Other Information

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

Iceland

The amendment of the aquaculture section of the Salmonid Fisheries Act (no. 83/2001) has indirectly affected the ability of the authorities to deal with a number of issues concerning introductions and transfers primarily within Iceland. Transfers into Iceland from abroad are discouraged and very limited although to a certain extent influenced by EEC regulations as a result of Iceland's participation in the European Economic Area.

Other Parties

No other relevant information provided by the other Parties.

North-East Atlantic Commission

NEA(02)7

The Risk of Transmission of Gyrodactylus salaris in the Commission Area

(tabled by Norway)

NEA(02)7

The Risk of Transmission of Gyrodactylus salaris in the Commission Area

(tabled by Norway)

The parasite *Gyrodactylus salaris* represents a fatal threat to wild stocks of Atlantic salmon in the North-East Atlantic Commission area and perhaps beyond. A number of stocks have been practically wiped out by this parasite and infections with *G. salaris* pose a serious threat to salmon stocks in near-by rivers. Preventing its further spread within the Commission area must be a priority.

The North-East Atlantic Commission of NASCO has previously discussed, through an *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Introductions and Transfers, the devastating negative effects of *Gyrodactylus salaris*. This led to the development of the Resolution to Protect Wild Salmon Stocks from Introductions and Transfers, NEA(97)12. Despite measures taken by the Members of the North-East Atlantic Commission, infections of *G. salaris* have occurred in new regions. Incidents have also occurred where effective action to treat infections has been delayed, increasing the risk of further spread of the parasite. On this basis, Norway believes that the Commission should now carefully consider the problems related to *Gyrodactylus salaris*, and the need for further action. Future topics for consideration by the Commission should include the following:

1. the need to minimise the threat posed by *Gyrodactylus salaris* to Atlantic salmon, particularly in the Fennoscandic region (Norway, Sweden, Finland, and northern Russia), with particular attention on preventing the spread of the parasite in border regions between countries and transboundary watercourses;
2. the need to enhance cooperation on monitoring, research and dissemination of information regarding *G. salaris*, with special regard to the lack of knowledge on distribution and ecology of the parasite;
3. the need to strengthen national legislation to prevent further spreading of *Gyrodactylus salaris*;
4. the need to consider revisions to the Commission's Resolution on Introductions and Transfers (and possibly other NASCO agreements and resolutions) to take account of current knowledge and the Precautionary Approach.

If the Commission agrees, Norway would be willing to develop, in consultation with other Members of the Commission, proposals as to how these issues might be addressed, and report back next year. The objective would be to minimise the risk of further transmission of this most damaging parasite within the Commission area.

North-East Atlantic Commission

NEA(02)9

***Risks of Transmission of Gyrodactylus salaris (Gs)
in the North-East Atlantic Commission Area***

(tabled by the European Union)

NEA(02)9

Risks of Transmission of Gyrodactylus salaris (Gs) in the North-East Atlantic Commission Area

(tabled by the European Union)

EUROPEAN UNION

Finland

In Finland, advice has been provided to fishermen about the disinfection of fishing gear and, in 2002 disinfection facilities will be available at all locations selling fishing licences. Disinfection is considered advisable, but it is not obligatory. In addition, in 2001, the Norwegian authorities started to require the disinfection of gear in the case of fishermen who come ashore in Norway even if they do not fish there. Monitoring of the possible occurrence of *Gs* has been organised in recent years in co-operation with the Norwegian authorities. The survey covers both common border rivers, the Rivers Teno and Näätämöjoki (Tana and Neidenelva). Monitoring of the parasite has been intensified also in some Baltic river systems that have headwaters close to those of the Atlantic rivers (Teno and Näätämöjoki).

Widespread education programmes have been started in recent years in order to improve the public awareness of *Gs*, its effects on Atlantic salmon stocks, and the measures required to prevent it spreading. These programmes have included distribution of information in different forms, e.g. roadside signs, video tapes, leaflets handed out in various places, e.g. together with issuing salmon fishing licenses etc. Commercial fish farming and transfers of fish from other catchments are strictly prohibited in the catchment areas of the Rivers Teno and Näätämöjoki.

Ireland

There have been no incidences of *Gs* recorded in Ireland. However, the Irish authorities are aware of the significant risks to stocks if *Gs* was to become established. A programme of education has been in operation since 1998 to inform the general public, fishermen, aquaculture producers and all other users of the freshwater environment to alert these user groups to the dangers of inadvertently introducing this organism into Ireland. The dangers highlighted include movement of anglers between regions with and without *Gs* and guidelines on disinfection of tackle and gear. Similar information has been developed for boat owners and users of other freshwater equipment who may be moving between EU regions. The educational material available includes leaflets and posters, which were supported with information presented by technical experts from the Fisheries Board staff. An annual sampling programme is in place to investigate the incidence of *Gs* on juvenile salmon in rivers. The Irish Authorities are preparing a contingency plan for measures to take in the event of *Gs* being detected.

Sweden

Specific national legislation regarding aquaculture, introduction and transfer of fish was introduced during 1999 (FIFS 1999:10) in order to reduce the risk of spreading *Gs*.

Basic monitoring of the parasite has been going on in a few Atlantic salmon rivers during the last ten years. A more comprehensive monitoring programme was started in 2001, which also includes some sensitivity tests of different salmon populations. Sweden participates in regional cooperation with Finland, Russia and Norway to reduce infections with, and prevent the spread of, *Gs*. All infected rainbow trout at a fish farm in Lake Bullaren were slaughtered and removed from the lake during April 2002.

United Kingdom

UK has taken the line that prevention of the introduction of *Gs* is a much better approach to control than attempting eradication. Safeguard measures have been agreed with the European Commission to prohibit the importation of all live salmonids except from areas also recognised as free from *Gs*. In addition, Codes of Practice, leaflets and posters have been produced to inform managers and anglers of the potential means by which *Gs* may be introduced, and the steps that may be taken to minimise these risks. It is recognised, however, that despite these measures, *Gs* may still be introduced, and contingency plans for containment/eradication have been prepared in England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, and are at various stages of consultation. Regular inspections by Fish Health Inspectorate staff of both aquaculture and wild salmon are designed to provide early evidence of the occurrence of *Gs* throughout the UK. To date, no *Gs* has been detected.

Codes of Practice

A “Code of Practice to Avoid the Introduction of *Gyrodactylus salaris* to GB” has been issued in Scotland and in England and Wales. Copies of this document are available from Fisheries Research Services in Scotland, and from the Department of Food, Environment and Rural Affairs for England and Wales. Leaflets and posters are being prepared, updating similar material issued some years ago. These publications describe the parasite, and provide advice on the possible modes of transmission, and measures that the public can take to minimise the risk of introducing *Gs* if they have visited a country where the parasite is known to exist.

Contingency Plans

The Contingency Plans being prepared to cover all parts of the UK provide details of the following issues:

- The legal framework;
- Central decision-making process;
- Roles of the various Agencies;
- Detection and diagnosis;
- Actions to be taken in the event of identification of *Gs*;
- Management strategies, including containment, eradication, enhancement of resistance;
- Communications/media/publicity.

Other EU Member States

Measures are under consideration in other Member States.

North-East Atlantic Commission

NEA(02)8

*Information from the EU on Developments in Salmon Management
by EU Countries*

NEA(02)8

Information from the EU on Developments in Salmon Management by EU Countries

Finland

- Management of Atlantic salmon fisheries in Finland is based on bilateral agreements between Norway and Finland, as both of the Finnish salmon river systems running to the Atlantic Ocean are border rivers with Norway.
- Tourist angling in these rivers is regulated by regional fisheries authorities in Finland and Norway.
- Management measures are based on salmon stock monitoring carried out in cooperation by Finnish and Norwegian research bodies.
- Disinfection procedures have been established in 2002 for each location selling salmon fishing licences in an attempt to prevent the dispersion of *Gyrodactylus salaris*.
- There are attempts to improve the quality of the salmon catch statistics, e.g. actions have been taken to improve the accuracy of the register of local people involved in fishing for salmon.

Germany

- Initiatives have been taken to re-establish salmon populations in the River Elbe since 1994 and River Rhine since 1998 which had highly productive salmon populations up to the beginning of the 19th century. Restocking has been carried out using Irish and Swedish strains in the Rhine and Elbe respectively.
- Several million Euros are being spent on this restocking and associated habitat surveys and enhancement in a carefully planned programme being implemented by the German Federal State (Bundesländer). These measures involve close coordination with other associated programmes (e.g. Rhine 2020 and landscape restoration programmes), leisure and tourism activities and organisations such as the International Commission for the Protection of the Rhine.
- These activities also involve cooperation with neighbouring countries such as the Netherlands where there is an agreed moratorium on salmon catches in the Dutch part of the Rhine and its estuary and the Czech Republic where there is restocking of Czech tributaries of the Elbe.
- Other smaller but important restocking and habitat restoration programmes are being carried out in the Ems and Weser rivers which also flow into the North Sea.

Ireland

- Under the EU-supported Tourism Angling Measure (TAM 1995-1999) € 15.6 million was spent on freshwater habitat improvements.
- 2,000 km of salmonid rivers and streams were surveyed and rehabilitation was carried out on 400 km.
- 22 fish counters have been installed on significant salmon rivers over the past 6 years.
- A comprehensive fish counter implementation programme has been designed and will be implemented in 2002. This will support future scientific advice relating to conservation limits.

- Recent management measures include the introduction of a comprehensive carcass tagging and logbook scheme for the commercial and the recreational rod fishery. The system has the dual benefits of reducing the level of unreported catch and simplifying the identification of illegally caught salmon.
- A National Salmon Commission representing all of the stakeholders was set up in 2001 to advise the Government on the management and conservation of salmon, in particular schemes relating to carcass tagging and TACs.
- Through its Scientific Committee, the Commission has available for the first time, scientific advice on conservation limits for the 17 fishery districts in Ireland in 2002.
- This scientific advice formed the basis for the introduction of TACs for the commercial fishery in each of the 17 fishery districts which has been put in place in 2002.
- It is intended to refine the scientific model over the coming years to provide the best possible basis for future management decisions.
- There is now no commercial fishing on early running spring salmon and in 2002 anglers were limited to one salmon per rod day up until June 1st.
- A ban on the sale of rod caught salmon was also introduced in 2001.

Spain

- The management of salmon stocks in Spain is administered in two parts, i.e. marine and aquaculture, and river fisheries and stock management.
- Marine fisheries and aquaculture are managed by the marine authorities. As there is no marine fishery for salmon there are no specific regulations in place.
- Aquaculture production is between 200 and 300 t per year and this is all based in Galicia.
- The management of aquaculture is vested with the Regional Governments and specifically to the marine fisheries.
- The management of the stocks and rivers fisheries is the responsibility of the environmental authorities, the Regional Government which is coordinated by the Central Ministry.

Sweden

- Fishing with drift nets has been banned since 1993 and salmon fishing is not allowed outside four nautical miles from baselines.
- Nets with mesh size less than 100 mm (diagonal) are not allowed in coastal waters of less than 3 m in depth.
- New regulations introduced in 2001 alter the opening and closing dates of the fishery from the last day of February to the 15th of September. The new season opens on the 31st of March and ends on the 1st of October.
- A comprehensive monitoring programme for *Gyrodactylus salaris* in wild salmon rivers was started in 2001.

UK (England And Wales)

- Salmon Action Plans have been completed for over half of the 68 principal salmon rivers in England and Wales. The consultation process reviews stock and fishery status (including the use of conservation limits), identifies factors limiting performance and lists a series of costed options to address these. The Final Plans

contain agreed actions which must be addressed within 5 years and provide refined salmon conservation limits. Salmon Action Plans should be completed for all principal salmon rivers by 2003.

- Twelve rivers have been designated as Special Areas of Conservation for salmon under the EU Habitats Directive. All consents affecting these rivers, including abstractions and discharges, will therefore be reviewed by 2006, and amended if necessary by 2010.
- Nationally, £2 billion is being spent to improve water quality in all rivers and estuaries over the period 2000-2005, directly or indirectly benefiting fisheries, including salmon.
- Fishing regulations in England & Wales are not revised annually. All previous restrictions remain in force. They include a national byelaw, preventing netsmen from taking, and in most cases, fishing for salmon before 1 June and requiring all rod-caught salmon caught before 16 June to be released.
- Measures to phase out the mixed stock coastal fisheries, as fishermen retire or surrender their licences, have continued. Negotiations to accelerate the phase-out of the north east coast drift net fishery, by compensating fishermen that surrender their licences early, have continued, with the offer of pump-priming funding from the Government.
- One new Net Limitation Order was introduced, reducing the number of licences in the River Tavy seine net fishery from 5 to 1. Arrangements were also made to reduce netting effort in nine other salmon fisheries (on the rivers Tavy, Tamar, Lynher, Fowey, Avon, and Severn, and on the Cumbrian Coast) in 2001 by compensating netsmen not to fish for some, or all, of the season, or to release alive any salmon caught.
- The total number of salmon netting licences issued fell to 388 in 2001, representing a 57% reduction over the past 15 years. Angling effort also continued to decline.
- Although still legally required to release salmon caught before 16 June, anglers have been voluntarily releasing an increasing proportion of their catch after this date. Overall, 43% of all rod-caught salmon were released in 2001.
- The Environment Agency introduced a second reminder system to improve the reporting rate for salmon and migratory trout rod catches. Together with improvements in the national rod licence database, this helped to increase the proportion of anglers (annual licences) making catch returns from 71% in 2000 to 86% in 2001.

UK (Northern Ireland)

- New bye-laws - the Fisheries (Amendment) Bye-Laws (Northern Ireland) 2002 - came into operation in the Fisheries Conservancy Board (FCB) area on 1 March 2002. These restrict angling for salmon to "catch and release" from the start of the angling season to 31 May and introduce a two-fish bag limit from 1 June for the rest of the season. These bye-laws give legal status to the voluntary arrangement which was introduced in the 2001 fishing season. (We did not have the necessary statutory powers to introduce a ban on the sale of rod-caught salmon).
- A voluntary scheme to buy out the commercial nets in the FCB area was announced in April 2001, with funding of £1.5m from the Northern Ireland Executive and £0.5m to be contributed by the North Atlantic Salmon Fund (NASF). To date 16 out of a total of 34 salmon businesses have signed up formal agreements to cease fishing. In

effect this has removed nine fixed draft nets, four fixed bag nets, five drift nets, four tidal draft nets and four salmon boxes from commercial salmon fishing.

- The FCB has agreed proposals for further controls on commercial exploitation of wild salmon to ensure that the potential effectiveness of the voluntary buyout scheme is not compromised. This will reduce the number of commercial fishing licences available in line with the number of licences compensated under the voluntary scheme. These bye-laws will also introduce further restrictions on the fishing season for drift nets in the sea and tidal waters in the FCB area – the fishing season will be restricted from 1 June to 31 July in any year. It is proposed that these bye-laws will come into operation on 1 August 2002.
- Salmon tagging regulations were introduced during 2001 (on 14 May 2001 for the Foyle, Carlingford and Irish Lights Commission area and 3 September 2001 for the FCB area). These require a tag to be fixed to all salmon and sea trout over 50 cm which are caught and retained and catch statistics are required to be recorded in log-books. These regulations will provide much improved information on salmon catches (commercial and angling), reduce poaching and improve estimates of unreported catches.
- The Foyle area continues to operate a “real time” management of the salmon stock system which effectively means that the exploitation of the returning adult fish can be reduced if the numbers of fish reaching the spawning tributaries is insufficient.
- Work has continued on the implementation of the Salmon Management Plan in the FCB area, which is also a catchment-based approach to salmon management, involving the setting of spawning/conservation targets at catchment level consistent with the NASCO Precautionary Approach.
- A programme of in-river surveys of habitat status is currently ongoing in a number of the main catchments including the Foyle, the River Bush, River Blackwater, River Maine and Glendun River.
- In December 2001 an EU-funded Water-Based Tourism programme was launched which will make funding available to angling clubs for, *inter alia*, fisheries habitat improvement works.

UK (Scotland)

- The Salmon Conservation (Scotland) Act 2001 came into force in April 2001. This makes provision for the Scottish Ministers to make regulations for the conservation and management of salmon and sea trout in Scotland. Regulations may be made upon application to Ministers by fishery managers, or by the Ministers themselves. In each case, full public consultation is required.
- The Western Isles Salmon Fishery District Designation Order 2001 created a new salmon fishery district covering all of the Outer Hebrides, and abolishing the old salmon fishery districts that it replaced. A new Western Isles District Salmon Fishery Board has been established as the local management body, and to enforce salmon fishery legislation in this new district.
- Work continues to maintain and update the list of owners and operators of salmon fisheries from whom catch returns are required by law. Catch statistics are published annually. 95% of the forms issued are returned.
- The voluntary practice of catch and release in the Scottish angling fishery for salmon has continued to increase, rising from 32% in 2000 to 39% in 2001.
- In 2001, Scottish salmon netsmen deferred the start of their fishing season by 6 weeks again.

- Work has continued by Fishery Trusts and District Salmon Fishery Boards throughout Scotland on habitat restoration and enhancement of streams. In the Tweed catchment, for example, the area accessible to spawning salmon has been increased by some 40% over the last decade as a result of removal of barriers to migration and habitat improvement.
- The establishment of Fishery Trusts continues, with recent bodies being set up in the Clyde and Ayrshire rivers areas. Scientists employed by Fishery Trusts and District Salmon Fishery Boards now provide advice to managers throughout most of mainland Scotland and the Western Isles.
- A series of Area Management Agreements has been established in the west and north-west of Scotland under the auspices of the Tripartite Working Group. This Group comprises representatives of the wild salmon interests, the salmon farming industry and the Scottish Executive. These Agreements have led to closer cooperation between wild salmon and salmon farming interests on issues of mutual concern.
- A Scottish Statutory Instrument has been issued requiring notification of escapes from fish farms. A Code of Practice on containment, based largely on that developed by NASCO, has been adopted throughout the Scottish salmon farming industry. Contingency plans for the recapture of escaped fish are being developed on a site-specific basis.
- The Scottish Fisheries Coordination Centre (SFCC) has continued to develop its proposals for collecting and collating data in a standard format. SFCC is a partnership including representatives of District Salmon Fishery Boards, Fishery Trusts, Fisheries Research Services Freshwater Laboratory, and the Scottish Executive. Valuable input is provided by other organisations such as Scottish and Southern Energy (the principal hydro-electricity generator in Scotland), and the University of Durham Geography Department.
- A Green Paper, Scotland's Freshwater Fish and Fisheries: Securing their Future, was issued for consultation in August 2001. An analysis of the results of the consultation has been submitted to the Scottish Ministers. The Green Paper was debated in the Scottish Parliament in April 2002.

NEA(02)12

Decision Regarding the Salmon Fishery in Faroese Waters 2003

The North-East Atlantic Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

NOTING ALSO the intention of the Faroe Islands to make management decisions with due consideration to the advice of ICES concerning the biological status of the stocks contributing to the fishery, and should such fishing be decided upon it will be limited in scope, subject to close national surveillance and control, and will be organized in close cooperation between the fishermen and the authorities, taking due regard of the recommendation by ICES to provide further scientific knowledge of the salmon resource. Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) will inform NASCO in the case of an opening of the fishery and its attached conditions;

decides not to set a quota for the Faroe Islands fishery for 2003.

CNL(02)51

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 2002;
 - 1.2 report on significant developments which might assist NASCO with the management of salmon stocks;
 - 1.3 provide long-term projections for stock re-building, focussing on trajectories for restoring stocks to target levels above conservation limits;
 - 1.4 provide a compilation of tag releases by country in 2002.

2. With respect to Atlantic salmon in the North-East Atlantic Commission area:
 - 2.1 describe the key events of the 2002 fisheries and the status of the stocks; ¹
 - 2.2 evaluate the extent to which the objectives of any significant management measures introduced in the last five years have been achieved;
 - 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, if possible based on a forecast of PFA, with an assessment of risks relative to the objective of exceeding stock conservation limits;
 - 2.5 validate the methodology and further refine the estimate of by-catch of salmon post-smolts in pelagic trawl fisheries for mackerel and provide estimates for other pelagic fisheries that may catch salmon; ²
 - 2.6 advise on an appropriate methodology to improve knowledge on the distribution and movements of escaped farmed salmon;
 - 2.7 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 key events of the 2002 fisheries and the status of the stocks; ¹
 - 3.2 evaluate the extent to which the objectives of any significant management measures introduced in the last five years have been achieved;
 - 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 provide an analysis of existing biological and/or tag return data, and recommendations for required data collection, to identify the origin of Atlantic salmon caught at St Pierre and Miquelon;
 - 3.6 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 2002 fisheries and the status of the stocks; ^{1,3}
 - 4.2 evaluate the extent to which the objectives of any significant management measures introduced in the last five years have been achieved;
 - 4.3 provide information on the origin of Atlantic salmon caught at West Greenland at a finer resolution than continent of origin (river stocks, country or stock complexes);
 - 4.4 provide catch options or alternative management advice with an assessment of risk relative to the objective of exceeding stock conservation limits;
 - 4.5 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
 - 4.6 identify relevant data deficiencies, monitoring needs and research requirements.

Notes:

1. *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.*
2. *With regard to question 2.5, descriptions (gear type; and fishing depth, location and season) should be provided for all pelagic fisheries that may catch salmon post-smolts.*
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 4.5, "changes to the model" would include the development of any new model.*

List of North-East Atlantic Commission Papers

<u>Paper No.</u>	<u>Title</u>
NEA(02)1	Provisional Agenda
NEA(02)2	Draft Agenda
NEA(02)3	Election of Officers
NEA(02)4	Returns under the North-East Atlantic Commission Resolution to Protect Wild Salmon Stocks from Introductions and Transfers
NEA(02)5	Definition of “non-indigenous”
NEA(02)6	Draft Report
NEA(02)7	The Risk of Transmission of <i>Gyrodactylus salaris</i> in the Commission Area (tabled by Norway)
NEA(02)8	Information from the EU on Developments in Salmon Management by EU Countries
NEA(02)9	Risk of Transmission of <i>Gyrodactylus salaris</i> (<i>Gs</i>) in the North-East Atlantic Commission Area (tabled by the European Union)
NEA(02)10	Proposal from the Chair - Decision regarding the Salmon Fishery in Faroese Waters 2003
NEA(02)11	Report of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the North-East Atlantic Commission
NEA(02)12	Decision Regarding the Salmon Fishery in Faroese Waters 2003
NEA(02)13	Agenda

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

