

CONVENTION SUR LE COMMERCE INTERNATIONAL DES ESPECES
DE FAUNE ET DE FLORE SAUVAGES MENACEES D'EXTINCTION



Trente-troisième session du Comité pour les animaux
Genève (Suisse), 12 – 19 juillet 2024

Conservation et commerce d'espèces

Espèces aquatiques

ANGUILLES (ANGUILLA SPP.)

1. Le présent document a été soumis par les co-présidents du groupe de travail intersessions du Comité pour les animaux sur les anguilles (*Anguilla spp.*)*.
2. À sa 19e session (CoP19 ; Panama, 2022), la Conférence des Parties a adopté les décisions 19.218 à 19.221, *Anguilles* (*Anguilla spp.*) comme suit :

À l'adresse des États de l'aire de répartition de l'anguille d'Europe (*Anguilla anguilla*) et des Parties qui sont des États de transit et d'importation

19.218 Les États de l'aire de répartition de l'anguille d'Europe (*Anguilla anguilla*), et les Parties qui sont des États de transit et d'importation sont encouragés à :

- a) *renforcer la coordination entre les États de l'aire de répartition et les Parties qui sont des États de (ré)exportation et d'importation pour améliorer la traçabilité et l'efficacité des mesures de lutte contre la fraude pour le commerce d'Anguilla spp., et en particulier de l'anguille d'Europe ;*
- b) *soumettre tout avis de commerce non préjudiciable qu'ils auraient formulé sur l'anguille d'Europe au Secrétariat, pour publication sur le site Web de la CITES ; explorer les différentes approches qui pourraient être adoptées pour réaliser des avis de commerce non préjudiciable pour les anguilles d'Europe commercialisées au stade juvénile (FIG) par comparaison avec celles qui sont commercialisées comme autres anguilles vivantes (LIV) ; collaborer et échanger avec d'autres Parties, en particulier lorsque les Parties partagent des bassins versants ou des zones humides, les informations concernant de telles études et leurs résultats ; demander une évaluation et un avis du Comité pour les animaux ou d'un autre organisme compétent sur les avis de commerce non préjudiciable pour l'anguille d'Europe, le cas échéant ;*
- c) *élaborer et/ou mettre en œuvre des plans de gestion adaptative de l'anguille d'Europe, à l'échelle nationale ou infranationale (ou par bassin versant), incluant des objectifs définis et limités dans le temps, et renforcer la collaboration au sein des pays entre les autorités et les autres parties prenantes ayant des responsabilités en matière de gestion des anguilles, et entre les pays dont les zones humides ou les bassins versants sont partagés ;*
- d) *mettre en œuvre les recommandations relatives à l'établissement de rapports figurant dans le document SC75 Doc. 12 pour faire en sorte, dans la mesure du possible, que le commerce des anguillidés soit déclaré au niveau de l'espèce et différencié selon le stade de vie (comme*

¹ Les appellations géographiques employées dans ce document n'impliquent de la part du Secrétariat CITES (ou du Programme des Nations Unies pour l'environnement) aucune prise de position quant au statut juridique des pays, territoires ou zones, ni quant à leurs frontières ou limites. La responsabilité du contenu du document incombe exclusivement à son auteur.

indiqué dans les Lignes directrices sur la préparation et la soumission des rapports annuels CITES) ;

- e) partager les informations sur l'évaluation des stocks, les prélèvements, les résultats des suivis et d'autres données pertinentes avec le groupe de travail conjoint sur les anguilles (WGEEL) de la Commission européenne consultative pour les pêches et l'aquaculture dans les eaux intérieures, du Conseil international pour l'exploration de la mer et de la Commission générale des pêches pour la Méditerranée (CECPAI/CIEM/GFCM) afin de dresser un tableau complet de l'état du stock d'anguilles d'Europe ;*
- f) élaborer des mesures ou appliquer plus rigoureusement les mesures existantes pour améliorer la traçabilité ou l'évaluation de l'acquisition légale des anguilles commercialisées (vivantes et mortes) et en aquaculture et les communiquer au Secrétariat ;*
- g) informer le Secrétariat de tout changement dans les mesures mises en place pour limiter le commerce des spécimens vivants de civelles ou d'anguilles juvéniles d'Europe ;*
- h) partager avec le Secrétariat les protocoles et lignes directrices disponibles, le cas échéant, pour la réintroduction dans la nature d'anguilles d'Europe vivantes ayant fait l'objet de saisies ; et*
- i) fournir des informations au Secrétariat sur la mise en œuvre de cette décision ou sur toute mise à jour de l'information précédemment soumise en réponse à la notification aux Parties n° 2021/018 sur les anguilles, pour qu'il puisse rendre compte au Comité pour les animaux et au Comité permanent, s'il y a lieu.*

À l'adresse du Secrétariat

19.219 Le Secrétariat :

- a) émet une notification invitant les États de l'aire de répartition de l'anguille d'Europe (Anguilla anguilla), les Parties de transit et les Parties d'importation à soumettre au Secrétariat des informations sur la mise en œuvre de la décision 19.218, toute information demandée dans la notification aux Parties n° 2021/018 qui n'a pas encore été communiquée ou toute mise à jour des informations soumises précédemment en réponse à la notification aux Parties n° 2021/018 sur les anguilles, en particulier celles qui portent sur les niveaux actuels du commerce des spécimens d'Anguilla spp. ou sur les nouvelles tendances ;*
- b) prépare et soumet un résumé des réponses à la notification aux Parties n° 2021/018 sur les anguilles, y compris toute mise à jour apportée au titre de la décision 19.218 accompagné, selon qu'il convient, de projets de recommandations sur la conservation et la gestion de l'anguille d'Europe à l'adresse du Comité pour les animaux et de projets de recommandations visant à améliorer l'application de la Convention à l'anguille d'Europe à l'adresse du Comité permanent, pour examen ; et*
- c) soumet l'étude préparée dans le cadre de la mise en œuvre de la décision 18.199, paragraphe d), sur les niveaux et les structures du commerce, en particulier des anguilles vivantes destinées à l'aquaculture, et les sources d'approvisionnement, en identifiant toute disparité entre elles, et rédige des recommandations pour une gestion future plus efficace des prélèvements et du commerce, pour examen par le Comité pour les animaux et le Comité permanent, selon qu'il convient.*

À l'adresse du Comité pour les animaux

19.220 Le Comité pour les animaux :

- a) sur demande, examine les rapports soumis par les Parties sur les avis de commerce non préjudiciable pour l'anguille d'Europe et fournit des avis et des orientations, si nécessaire ; et*
- b) examine l'étude mentionnée au paragraphe c) de la décision 19.219, le rapport préparé par le Secrétariat conformément au paragraphe b) de la décision 19.219 et fait des recommandations s'il y a lieu visant à améliorer la conservation et la gestion de l'anguille*

d'Europe, pour examen par le Comité permanent ou la 20e session de la Conférence des Parties.

À l'adresse du Comité permanent

19.221 Le Comité permanent :

- a) *étudie le rapport établi par le Secrétariat et toute autre information disponible concernant le commerce illégal d'anguilles d'Europe et fait des recommandations le cas échéant ;*
- b) *examine tout avis et toute recommandation émanant du Comité pour les animaux concernant la décision 19.220 et fait des recommandations visant à améliorer l'application de la Convention à l'anguille d'Europe, et étudie si l'élaboration d'une résolution spécifique serait utile aux Parties ou à la Conférence des Parties, selon le cas;*
- c) *avec l'aide du Secrétariat, examine avec l'Organisation mondiale des douanes la possibilité d'harmoniser les codes de douane pour le commerce de toutes les espèces d'Anguilla ; et*
- d) *fait rapport sur l'application de cette décision à la 20e session de la Conférence des Parties.*

3. À la 32e session du Comité pour les animaux (AC32 ; Genève, juin 2023), le Comité a examiné le document [AC32 Doc. 36](#), préparé par le Secrétariat et est convenu d'établir un groupe de travail intersessions investi du mandat présenté dans le compte rendu résumé [AC32 SR](#) :

4. La composition du groupe de travail a été convenue comme suit :

Co-présidence : représentant de l'Amérique centrale et du Sud et Caraïbes (M. Gongora),
représentant de l'Europe (M. Benyr²), représentant suppléant de l'Europe
(M. Novitsky) ;

Parties : Allemagne, Australie, Autriche, Brésil, Canada, Chine, Etats-Unis d'Amérique, Inde,
Indonésie, Japon, Malaisie, Nouvelle-Zélande, Portugal, République de Corée,
Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande du Nord, Union Européenne ; et

OIG et ONG : Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture, International
Union for Conservation of Nature, Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center,
Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Global Guardian Trust, IWMC-
World Conservation Trust, Species Survival Network, World Wide Fund for Nature,
Zoological Society of London.

5. À sa 77e session, le Comité permanent (SC77 ; Genève, novembre 2023) a examiné le document [SC77 Doc. 66](#) sur les Anguilles (*Anguilla* spp.) et est convenu d'inviter le Comité pour les animaux à donner son avis sur la possibilité d'élaborer une résolution spécifique sur les anguilles européennes ou d'une résolution sur le genre *Anguilla* spp. Un groupe de travail intersessions du Comité permanent a été créé avec le mandat suivant :

- a) examiner la synthèse des réponses à la notification aux Parties n° 2021/018 et à la notification aux Parties n° 2023/062 sur les anguilles, y compris toute mise à jour apportée au titre de la décision 19.218 et toute recommandation du Secrétariat visant à améliorer l'application de la Convention à l'anguille d'Europe ;
- b) examiner les recommandations du Comité pour les animaux ;
- c) étudier si l'élaboration d'une résolution spécifiquement consacrée à l'anguille d'Europe serait utile ; et
- d) formuler des recommandations sur l'amélioration de l'application de la Convention à l'anguille d'Europe pour examen à la 78e session du Comité permanent.

² M. Gerald Benyr a remplacé Mme Zikova en tant que représentant pour l'Europe à la suite de l'AC32

6. À la demande de la présidence du Comité pour les animaux, il a été convenu de modifier le mandat du groupe de travail intersessions du Comité pour les animaux sur les anguilles de la manière suivante :
- a) examiner la synthèse des réponses à la Notification aux Parties n° 2021/018 et à la Notification aux Parties n° 2023/062 sur les anguilles, y compris toute mise à jour apportée au titre de la décision 19.218 et toute recommandation du Secrétariat ;
 - b) examiner l'utilisation éventuelle du code de source R (élevage en ranch) pour les spécimens d'anguilles d'Europe (*A. anguilla*) issus de systèmes de production en aquaculture ainsi que les risques et avantages potentiels de la réintroduction dans la nature d'anguilles d'Europe vivantes ayant fait l'objet de saisies ;
 - c) à la demande du Comité permanent en sa 77e session (SC77, Genève, novembre 2023), envisager la possibilité d'élaborer une résolution spécifique sur les anguilles d'Europe ou d'une résolution sur le genre *Anguilla* spp. et
 - d) formuler des recommandations préalables sur la conservation et la gestion de l'anguille d'Europe pour examen par le Comité pour les animaux lors de sa 33e session.
7. Les travaux du groupe de travail intersessions conjoint dans le cadre de l'exécution de son mandat se sont fait par voie électronique.

Paragraphe a) du mandat

8. Le Secrétariat a produit un résumé consolidé des réponses reçues à la notification aux Parties n° 2021/018 et à la notification aux Parties n° 2023/062 sur les anguilles, y compris toutes les mises à jour apportées dans le cadre de la décision 19.218 sur les Anguilles (*Anguilla* spp.). Ce résumé est présenté dans l'annexe au présent document.
9. Le Secrétariat a recommandé que le groupe de travail prenne en compte les éléments suivants dans ses délibérations :
- a) Les catégories utilisées par les Parties sont subjectives et ce qui peut être considéré comme des restrictions strictes par une Partie peut ne pas être considéré comme tel par une autre.
 - b) À sa 75e session (SC75 ; Panama City, novembre 2022), le Comité permanent a encouragé les Parties qui n'ont pas répondu à la notification aux Parties n° 2020/018 et qui ont été identifiées dans l'annexe 4 du document SC74 Doc. 64.1 comme occupant une place importante dans le commerce mondial de l'anguille européenne, en particulier la Chine, l'Égypte et la Turquie, à apporter leurs réponses à cette notification de suivi demandant des informations sur le commerce de l'anguille (voir le compte rendu de la SC75). Ce texte a été inclus dans la notification aux Parties n° 2023/062.
 - c) Aucune réponse n'a été reçue de l'Égypte ou de la Turquie, ce qui laisse subsister d'importantes lacunes en matière de connaissances.
 - d) Bien que la Chine ait répondu, elle n'a pas apporté le type de détails nécessaires pour avoir une compréhension claire du commerce.
10. Le groupe de travail conclut qu'il y a un manque important de renseignements pour certains pays et que des décisions visant à combler ces lacunes seraient utiles, mais il note également que ces Parties pourraient toujours apporter des informations dès à présent, sans avoir besoin d'une décision spécifique.

Paragraphe b) du mandat

11. Concernant l'utilisation potentielle du code de source R (élevé en ranch) pour les spécimens d'anguilles d'Europe (*A. anguilla*) provenant de systèmes de production aquacole, le groupe de travail a conclu ce qui suit :
- a) Dans la résolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP15) sur *l'Élevage en ranch et le commerce des spécimens élevés en ranch d'espèces transférées de l'Annexe I à l'Annexe II*, la CoP décide que le terme « élevage en ranch » signifie l'élevage dans un milieu contrôlé d'animaux prélevés au stade d'œufs ou de juvéniles dans la nature, où ils auraient autrement eu une très faible probabilité de survivre jusqu'à l'âge adulte.

- b) La résolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP15) traite principalement des populations transférées de l'Annexe I à l'Annexe II. La situation de reclassement n'est pas applicable à l'élevage en ranch d'*Anguilla anguilla* car l'espèce est inscrite à l'Annexe II et n'a pas été transférée de l'Annexe I. Cependant, la résolution donne un cadre utile pour l'examen des objectifs et de l'utilisation du code de source de l'élevage en ranch.
- c) Concernant les crocodiles, la résolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP15) rappelle que l'élevage en ranch sur la base du prélèvement contrôlé d'œufs ou de jeunes à peine éclos peut être potentiellement un outil de conservation précieux et positif, alors que le prélèvement d'animaux sauvages adultes nécessite un contrôle plus strict. La résolution met également en garde sur le risque qu'il y a d'inciter plus à la création d'établissements d'élevage en captivité, pouvant nuire aux efforts de conservation des populations sauvages, qu'à celle d'établissements d'élevage en ranch qui, en principe, sont plus favorables à la conservation des crocodiliens ;
- d) La définition de l'élevage en ranch dans la résolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP15) est basée sur trois critères :
 - i) élevage en milieu contrôlé,
 - ii) animaux prélevés à l'état d'œufs ou de juvéniles dans la nature ;
 - iii) une très faible probabilité pour les spécimens prélevés de survivre jusqu'à l'âge adulte dans leur habitat naturel.
- e) En outre, la Res. Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP15) recommande également qu'un programme d'élevage en ranch visant à transférer des populations de l'Annexe I à l'Annexe II réponde à des critères généraux, notamment que :
 - i) le programme d'élevage soit, en premier lieu, profitable à la conservation de la population locale (c'est-à-dire, lorsque c'est possible, contribue à l'augmentation de son effectif dans la nature ou promeut la protection de l'habitat des espèces tout en maintenant une population stable) ;
 - ii) tous les produits (y compris les spécimens vivants) de chaque opération soient identifiés et documentés de manière adéquate afin qu'ils puissent être facilement distingués des produits des populations de l'Annexe I [*note : bien que ce critère ne soit pas directement applicable aux anguilles de l'Annexe II, il peut être conseillé d'établir des mécanismes de traçabilité appropriés afin de distinguer facilement les spécimens élevés en ranch des autres spécimens*] ;
 - iii) le programme comporte les inventaires appropriés, un contrôle du niveau des prélèvements et un suivi des populations sauvages ; et
 - iv) des mesures de précautions suffisantes soient prises dans le programme, garantissant qu'un nombre adéquat d'animaux sont renvoyés dans la nature s'il y a lieu ;
- f) La Résolution Conf.10.16 (Rev) donne la définition suivante d'un « milieu contrôlé » : milieu manipulé pour produire des animaux d'une espèce donnée ; un tel milieu comporte des barrières physiques empêchant que des animaux, des œufs ou des gamètes de cette espèce y soient introduits ou en sortent et présente des caractéristiques générales pouvant inclure, sans que la liste soit exhaustive, abris artificiels, évacuation des déchets, soins, protection contre les prédateurs et nourriture fournie artificiellement ;
- g) L'aquaculture des anguilles, qui repose sur le confinement, l'apport de nourriture et le traitement de l'eau, répond à la définition d'un milieu contrôlé. En revanche, le transfert de jeunes anguilles vers un autre biotope où elles vivent de ressources naturelles ne constitue pas un milieu contrôlé et ne peut donc pas être considéré comme de l'élevage en ranch. L'élevage d'anguilles dans des étangs est une situation intermédiaire qui doit être évaluée en fonction du degré d'intervention humaine. Il faut également tenir compte du fait que les étangs peuvent être naturels ou créés par l'homme et qu'ils diffèrent par leur écosystème et leur vocation.
- h) L'aquaculture d'*Anguilla anguilla* commence par l'élevage de civelles ou anguillettes sauvages âgées de plus d'un an. Bien qu'il n'existe pas de définition spécifique de ce qu'est un « juvénile » pour les anguillidés, dans le contexte du cycle de vie de ces espèces, il est raisonnable de considérer les civelles

et les anguillettes comme telles. À cet égard, l'aquaculture des anguilles répond aux critères selon lesquels l'élevage en ranch est basé sur le prélèvement d'œufs ou de juvéniles dans la nature.

- i) Aucune résolution de la CITES ne donne de marges ou d'exemples pour différencier entre les probabilités faibles et élevées de survie jusqu'à l'âge adulte.
- j) Il est difficile d'établir une base de référence pour la mortalité naturelle, car seules quelques populations d'anguilles d'Europe vivent dans des conditions naturelles intactes. Même les populations non exploitées sont souvent fortement affectées par les installations hydrotechniques, l'altération de leur habitat et la pollution (Boulenger *et al.*, 2016³). Cela est d'autant plus compliqué qu'il y a également des facteurs biologiques tels que les prédateurs locaux ainsi que la mortalité liée à la densité et au stade de vie.
- k) Dekker (2000)⁴ propose une valeur moyenne de $M=0,1386 \text{ an}^{-1}$ pour la mortalité des anguilles durant leur phase d'anguillette et d'anguille jaune. Cependant, l'âge auquel les anguilles passent au stade argenté et entreprennent leur migration de reproduction dépend de la latitude et de la température de l'environnement dans lequel elles ont grandi, de la disponibilité de la nourriture, des barrières physiques qui bloquent les voies de migration, du taux de croissance et du sexe. Il varie de 2 à 15 ans pour les mâles et de 4 à 20 ou 30 ans pour les femelles (Tesch, 2003⁵; Durif *et al.*, 2009⁶). Le taux de mortalité cumulé est également variable. Pour des spécimens d'une masse corporelle de 100g, Bevacqua *et al.* (2011⁷) ont prédit une variation de la mortalité entre 0,02 an⁻¹ à 8°C-basse densité et 0,47 an⁻¹ à 18°C-haute densité. Une étude réalisée dans le Lough Neagh a indiqué une mortalité naturelle instantanée des anguilles dépendant de la densité, allant de 0,02 an⁻¹ lorsque les stocks sont peu denses (100 à 200 civelles par hectare) à 0,12-0,14 an⁻¹ lorsque les stocks sont très denses (700 civelles par hectare) (Aprahamian *et al.*, 2021⁸).
- l) Ces données indiquent que, dans des conditions optimales, la mortalité naturelle des anguilles d'Europe au cours de leur croissance du stade de la civelle à celui de l'anguille argentée peut être très faible, avec jusqu'à 75 % des spécimens survivant aux stades de l'ontogenèse qui relèvent de l'applicabilité du code de source R.
- m) La mortalité des anguilles augmente avec la densité de la population (Eberhardt, 2002⁹) et le recrutement des civelles peut dépasser la capacité de charge des habitats (Fleming *et al.*, 2023¹⁰). Cependant, le « surplus » peut encore jouer un rôle dans l'écosystème.
- n) Le recrutement de civelles a diminué entre 1980 et 2011 par rapport aux données des deux décennies précédentes. En 2022, le recrutement de civelles dans la zone d'indice « mer du Nord » ne représentait que 0,7 % de la moyenne géométrique pour la période allant de 1960 à 1979 (CIEM, 2023¹¹). Par

³ Boulenger, C., Acou, A., Gimenez, O., Charrier, F., Tremblay, J. & Feunteun, E. (2016). Factors determining survival of European eels in two unexploited sub-populations. (*Facteurs déterminant la survie des anguilles d'Europe au sein de deux sous-populations non exploitées.*) *Freshw. Biol.* **61**, 947–962.

⁴ Dekker, W. (2000). A Procrustean assessment of the European eel stock. (*Évaluation procruste du stock des anguilles d'Europe.*) *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* **57**, 938-947.

⁵ Tesch, F. w. (2003). *The eel. (L'anguille)* Blackwell Sci. Oxf. Engl. **2993**, 408

⁶ Durif, C.M., van Ginneken, V., Dufour, S., Müller, T. & Elie, P. (2009). Seasonal evolution and individual differences in silvering eels from different locations. In *Spawning migration of the European eel: Reproduction index, a useful tool for conservation management*: 13–38. (*Évolution saisonnière et différences individuelles des anguilles argentées de différents endroits. Au cœur de la migration du frai de l'anguille d'Europe : index de reproduction, un outil utile pour la gestion de la conservation*) Springer.

⁷ Bevacqua, D., Melià, P., De Leo, G.A. & Gatto, M. (2011). Intra-specific scaling of natural mortality in fish: the paradigmatic case of the European eel. (*Échelle intra-spécifique de mortalité naturelle des poissons : le cas pratique de l'anguille d'Europe*) *Oecologia* **165**, 333–339

⁸ Aprahamian, M.W., Evans, D.W., Briand, C., Walker, A.M., McElarney, Y. & Allen, M. (2021). The changing times of Europe's largest remaining commercially harvested population of eel *ANGUILLA ANGUILLA* L. . (*La nouvelle ère de la plus grande population d'anguilles encore exploitée commercialement en Europe*) *J. Fish Biol.* **99**, 1201–1221

⁹ Eberhardt, L.L. (2002). A paradigm for population analysis of long-lived vertebrates. (*Un paradigme pour l'analyse des populations de vertébrés de grande longévité*) *Ecology* **83**, 2841–2854.

¹⁰ Fleming, V., Walker, A., Evans, D., Aprahamian, M., James, M., Connor, S., McAlpine, J. & Littlewood, A. (2023). Non-detriment finding assessment for the export from the United Kingdom of CITES-listed European eel *Anguilla anguilla* (2023–26), (*Évaluation d'avis de commerce non-préjudiciable pour l'exportation au Royaume-Uni de l'anguille d'Europe Anguilla anguilla inscrite à la CITES.*), JNCC Report.

¹¹ CIEM (en anglais, ICES). (2023). European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) throughout its natural range. (*L'anguille d'Europe à travers son aire de répartition naturelle.*) ICES Advice: Recurrent Advice.

conséquent, la mortalité des civelles en fonction de la densité pourrait avoir été plus importante avant le déclin de la population.

- o) En conclusion, *Anguilla anguilla* n'a pas un taux de mortalité intrinsèquement élevé au stade de civelle à anguille jaune ou, plus généralement, n'a pas une probabilité très faible de survivre jusqu'à l'âge adulte, mais le recrutement au-delà de la capacité de charge des habitats peut entraîner des taux de mortalité qui entrent dans le champ de définition de l'élevage en ranch.
- p) On sait que la pêche et les centrales hydroélectriques/de pompage sont des causes de mortalité des anguilles (Dekker, 2000; Pedersen *et al.*, 2012¹²). On sait que la pêche et les centrales hydroélectriques/de pompage sont des causes de mortalité des anguilles (Dekker, 2000 ; Pedersen *et al.*, 2012). Ces causes anthropiques de mortalité ne sont pas exclues des considérations déterminant si les œufs ou les juvéniles prélevés dans la nature auraient eu une très faible probabilité de survivre jusqu'à l'âge adulte, mais elles devraient principalement être prises en compte lors de la préparation d'un ACNP pour la durabilité des anguilles d'élevage en ranch.
- q) La survie des civelles capturées pour l'aquaculture est affectée par les équipements et les pratiques de pêche, le transport et les premiers apports alimentaires. Kirkegaard *et al.* (2010)¹³ supposent que la mortalité des échantillons collectés à l'aide de filets à main ou de passes-pièges peut être proche de zéro, que la mortalité pendant le transport est inférieure à 0,5 % et que 10 à 20 % des spécimens meurent pendant la période critique de transition à une nourriture sèche. Ils signalent que la mortalité reste plus élevée jusqu'à ce que les anguilles atteignent une taille d'environ 5 g et qu'elle tombe ensuite à moins de 1 %. La survie globale jusqu'à la taille de commercialisation pour la consommation humaine est estimée à 75-80 %.
- r) Les taux de survie rapportés pour *Anguilla bicolor* par des établissements d'élevage en Indonésie sont d'environ 65% pour le premier stade d'élevage intermédiaire (de 0,17 g à 2 g par anguille) et d'environ 71% pour le deuxième stade d'élevage (de 2 g à 30 g par anguille), (Iskandar *et al.*, 2021¹⁴).
- s) Par conséquent, la capacité de survie en aquaculture est comparable aux chances de survie des civelles jusqu'à l'âge adulte dans des conditions naturelles favorables.
- t) Compte tenu de la grande variation de la probabilité de survie, il semble impossible de déterminer si la mortalité des anguilles prélevées au stade de civelle ou aiguillette pour être mises en élevage avant d'être commercialisées répond aux critères énoncés dans la résolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP15) d'une très faible probabilité de survie jusqu'à l'âge adulte. Des décisions précises ne peuvent être prises qu'au cas par cas et des évaluations régionales, comme indiqué par Fleming *et al.* (2023).
- u) D'autres éléments relatifs aux conséquences de l'approbation du code de source R pour des situations spécifiques pourraient être que :
 - i) L'élevage d'*Anguilla anguilla* commence par des civelles ou anguillettes sauvages et se termine par le commerce de spécimens plus grands, dans des conditions commerciales bien définies.
 - ii) Le prélèvement de civelles est susceptible d'avoir moins d'impact sur le stock reproducteur que le prélèvement du même nombre d'anguilles jaunes ou argentées et si le commerce est jugé durable, le code de source R peut être utilisé pour les spécimens cultivés afin d'exprimer cette différence d'impact écologique, ce qui est similaire aux considérations reconnues dans le préambule de la résolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP15) concernant les crocodiliens. Dans ce cas, le code de source R serait utile permettant d'indiquer que les spécimens ont été prélevés pour être élevés et qu'ils n'ont pas été commercialisés à la suite d'un prélèvement direct dans la nature.

¹² Pedersen, M.I., Jepsen, N., Aarestrup, K., Koed, A., Pedersen, S. & Økland, F. (2012). Loss of European silver eel passing a hydropower station. (Pertes d'anguilles argentées d'Europe lors du passage de centrale hydroélectrique) *J. Appl. Ichthyol.* 28, 189–193.

¹³ Kirkegaard, E. & *et al.* (2010). *European eel and aquaculture (Anguille d'Europe et aquaculture)* No. DTU Aqua-rapport No. 229-2010). DTU Aqua.

¹⁴ Iskandar, A., Mulya, M.A., Belina, M. & Inoue, M. (2021). PELABUHANRATU, SUKABUMI DI PT. JAWA SUISAN INDAH SUKABUMI, JAWA BARAT 2.

- iii) L'utilité théorique du code de source R pour le commerce des anguilles est restreinte par la difficulté pratique de distinguer les spécimens adultes prélevés dans la nature ou cultivés, ce qui offre une possibilité de blanchiment.
 - iv) Actuellement, certaines anguilles cultivées sont commercialisées sous le code de source R et d'autres sous le code W. L'utilisation de ces codes de sources pour les anguilles selon des critères bien définis contribuerait probablement à améliorer le contrôle.
 - v) L'utilité éventuelle du code de source R pour le commerce d'*Anguilla anguilla* ne permet pas de prédire la durabilité générale du prélèvement d'anguilles dans un biotope spécifique. Des recommandations pour l'évaluation de la durabilité du commerce des anguilles d'Europe ont été faites par le CIEM (2015)¹⁵ : « For the anthropogenic impacts, if the estimate of lifetime anthropogenic impacts for the area considered is below the threshold of $\Sigma A = 0.92$ (corresponding to a mean survival to the silver eel stage of at least 40%, in comparison to a situation without anthropogenic impacts), the anthropogenic impacts can be considered to be at a sustainable level. » (Pour les impacts anthropiques, si l'estimation des impacts anthropiques sur toute la durée de vie pour la zone considérée est inférieure au seuil de $\Sigma A = 0.92$ (correspondant à une survie moyenne au stade de l'anguille argentée d'au moins 40 %, par rapport à une situation sans impacts anthropiques), les impacts anthropiques peuvent être considérés comme se maintenant à un niveau soutenable.) En outre, il pourrait être nécessaire d'évaluer l'équilibre entre les sexes et la condition physique des anguilles argentées libres (Belpaire *et al.*, 2009)¹⁶.
 - w) Pour savoir si, et dans quelle mesure, l'élevage d'anguilles juvéniles a moins d'impact sur les populations que le prélèvement d'anguilles adultes, il faut comparer la capacité de survie dans un biotope naturel spécifique et dans les établissements d'élevage utilisant des anguilles juvéniles de ce même biotope. Ces données ne sont pas disponibles à l'heure actuelle et varieront probablement considérablement. C'est pourquoi l'aquaculture des anguilles a été considérée par certaines Parties comme ne répondant pas aux critères de l'élevage en ranch.
 - x) La préparation d'ACNP qui soient positifs au niveau régional est compliquée par le fait qu'*Anguilla anguilla* est une espèce en danger critique d'extinction (Pike *et al.*, 2018¹⁷) dont la tendance démographique est en déclin au sein d'une seule population mondiale et par des facteurs biologiques tels que la détermination du sexe et la capacité de survie qui dépendent de la densité. À cet égard, le conseil du CIEM (2023) peut être pertinent : « ICES advises that when the precautionary approach is applied, there should be zero catches in all habitats in 2024. This applies to both recreational and commercial catches and includes catches of glass eels for restocking and aquaculture.” and “Since cultured eels are always wild caught and either permanently removed from the stock (for consumption) or used for restocking (and hence not for conservation purposes following the definition above), no catch for aquaculture purposes should be allowed. » (Le CIEM recommande que, si le principe de précaution est appliqué, les captures soient nulles dans tous les habitats en 2024. Cela s'applique à la fois aux captures récréatives et commerciales et inclut les captures de civelles pour le repeuplement et l'aquaculture. Il ajoute qu'étant donné que les anguilles d'élevage sont toujours issues de captures dans la nature et qu'elles sont soit définitivement retirées du stock (pour la consommation), soit utilisées pour le repeuplement (et donc pas à des fins de conservation selon la définition ci-dessus), aucune capture à des fins d'aquaculture ne devrait être autorisée.)
12. En ce qui concerne les risques et les avantages potentiels de la réintroduction dans la nature d'anguilles d'Europe vivantes provenant de saisies, le groupe de travail n'a pas été en mesure d'exécuter cette partie du mandat, par manque de temps et en raison de la complexité de l'évaluation de l'élevage en ranch. Il est suggéré que le Comité pour les animaux propose un projet de décision pour que cette tâche soit accomplie après la CoP20. Le projet de décision suivant est proposé :

À l'adresse du Comité pour les animaux

20.AA Le Comité pour les animaux :

¹⁵ CIEM (en anglais ICES) (2015). *Report of the Workshop on Eel and CITES (WKEELCITES)*. (Rapport sur l'atelier sur les anguilles et la CITES) ICES Expert Group reports.

¹⁶ Belpaire, C.G.J., Goemans, G., Geeraerts, C., Quataert, P., Parmentier, K., Hagel, P. & De Boer, J. (2009). *Decreasing eel stocks: survival of the fattest?* (Diminution des stocks d'anguilles : survie des plus gros ?) *Ecol. Freshw. Fish* **18**, 197–214.

¹⁷ Pike, C., Crook, V. & Gollock, M. (2018). *Anguilla anguilla* (The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2020). (*Anguilla anguilla*, La liste rouge de l'UICN des espèces menacées 2020)

- a) examinera les risques et les avantages potentiels de la réintroduction dans la nature d'anguilles d'Europe vivantes provenant de saisies ; et
- b) formulera des recommandations pour examen par le Comité permanent ou la 21e session de la Conférence des Parties, selon qu'il convient.

Paragraphe c) du mandat

13. En ce qui concerne le développement potentiel d'une résolution spécifique sur les anguilles d'Europe ou d'une résolution sur le genre *Anguilla* spp, le groupe de travail a conclu que, indépendamment du fait qu'une future CoP décide ou non d'inscrire des espèces supplémentaires d'*Anguilla*, le champ d'application de la résolution devrait couvrir l'ensemble du genre, car il n'est pas possible de séparer les problèmes liés à la mise en œuvre de l'inscription d'*Anguilla anguilla* de questions plus vastes.

14. Le groupe de travail a dressé une liste de sujets (accompagnés de plusieurs commentaires) qui pourraient être inclus dans une potentielle résolution sur les anguilles. Cette liste doit être affinée au cours de la prochaine phase de discussion.

- *Lacunes en matière de connaissances*

- Asie de l'Est : La Chine est le plus grand producteur d'anguillidés au monde, la Province de Taïwan est également un grand éleveur d'anguilles et la Région administrative spéciale de Hong Kong (Chine) compte les principaux points d'entrée/de transit pour les civelles qui arrivent dans la région. Le manque d'informations de la part de ces acteurs importants rend très difficile la tâche de remettre les réponses des autres Parties en contexte. La contribution directe des autorités compétentes est cruciale.
- Amériques : Haïti et la République dominicaine sont devenus des exportateurs clés de civelles de l'anguille d'Amérique ces dernières années, et il serait utile d'en savoir plus sur leurs prélèvements et leurs exportations.
- Afrique du Nord : Les données indiquent que l'Égypte et la Turquie ont pêché et exporté des anguilles d'Europe ces dernières années ; il serait utile de clarifier davantage l'utilisation et le commerce qui en est faite dans ces pays.
- En outre, il serait utile de disposer d'informations supplémentaires sur le commerce d'anguilles à destination de la République de Corée.

- *Codes douaniers et tarifaires et autres exigences en matière de déclarations commerciales*

- Les Parties devraient être encouragées à modifier leur système national de codes douaniers afin de distinguer les anguilles anguillides vivantes juvéniles et de plus grande taille - et, si possible/pertinent, de les affiner jusqu'au niveau de l'espèce.
- Il est nécessaire d'améliorer la réglementation et/ou le contrôle dans les pays/territoires de transit/d'exportation afin de lutter contre les déclarations erronées et le commerce illégal.

- *Prélèvements/commerce illégal et défis en matière de lutte contre la fraude*

- Il est important que la gestion nationale de la pêche soit alignée sur les possibilités de répondre légalement à la demande, qu'il s'agisse d'élevage, de repeuplement ou de consommation.
- Un portail d'information sur la législation pourrait être mis en place pour aider les pays importateurs à connaître la législation des pays exportateurs et vice versa.
- Pour tirer parti des succès des opérations de lutte contre la fraude et des saisies, il est important de maintenir, d'étendre et de renforcer la coopération infranationale, bilatérale et multilatérale au sein des pays impliqués dans le commerce de l'anguille et entre eux.
- Il serait extrêmement bénéfique que les Parties continuent à partager leurs bonnes pratiques pour surmonter les défis de gestion et de lutte contre la fraude spécifiques à la pêche et au commerce de l'anguille.

- *Traçabilité des civelles tout au long de la chaîne d'approvisionnement*

- Il serait bénéfique pour les Parties de partager leurs expériences sur les défis et les solutions en matière de traçabilité, en particulier en ce qui concerne la chaîne internationale d'approvisionnement en anguilles, éventuellement sous la forme d'un atelier/webinaire.

- Les mécanismes de traçabilité actuellement utilisés ou en cours de développement pour d'autres espèces/pêcheries pourraient potentiellement être appliqués et/ou modifiés pour l'anguille.
 - Si un cadre ou une législation nationale en matière de traçabilité est déjà en place, mais n'est pas encore appliqué à *Anguilla* spp. les pays pourraient envisager de le modifier.
- *Lorsque des plans de gestion et/ou des évaluations de stocks ont été élaborés, il serait utile d'en partager les enseignements tirés afin que ceux d'autres États de l'aire de répartition et d'autres espèces puissent s'en inspirer. Plus précisément, il serait utile d'obtenir des précisions sur les points suivants :*
 - Les plans et évaluations sont-ils monospécifiques ou comprennent-ils plusieurs espèces ?
 - Est-ce que ces plans prévoient des mesures pour faire face aux menaces en dehors du prélèvement et/ou du commerce, et comment ces mesures sont-elles coordonnées ?
 - Quelles sont les données/connaissances sur lesquelles repose ce plan de gestion et à quelle fréquence sont-elles mises à jour ?
 - Quels sont les travaux de recherche menés au niveau national pour étayer la gestion adaptative ?
 - Ces activités sont-elles coordonnées avec d'autres États de l'aire de répartition et/ou des pays qui partagent des cours d'eau transfrontaliers ?
 - Toutes les agences et tous les organismes nationaux concernés participent-ils à l'élaboration des plans de gestion ?
 - *Lorsque des programmes de surveillance ont été mis en place, il serait utile d'en partager les enseignements tirés afin que ceux d'autres États de l'aire de répartition et d'autres espèces puissent s'en inspirer. Plus précisément, il serait utile d'obtenir des précisions sur les points suivants :*

Pêcheries

- À quel niveau de la chaîne d'approvisionnement le contrôle s'effectue-t-il et selon quelle méthode ?
- Est-ce au niveau national et/ou international ?
- Quels sont les stades de vie concernés et sont-ils suivis séparément ?
- Un contrôle indépendant de la pêche est-il mis en place pour recouper les données relatives à la pêche ?
- La surveillance est-elle coordonnée avec d'autres États de l'aire de répartition et/ou des pays qui partagent des cours d'eau transfrontaliers ?
- Pour les bassins versants abritant plusieurs espèces, comment les captures sont-elles distinguées ?
- Toutes les agences et tous les organismes nationaux compétents participent-ils à l'élaboration des programmes de surveillance ?

Commerce

- À quel niveau de la chaîne d'approvisionnement le contrôle s'effectue-t-il et selon quelle méthode ?
 - Est-ce au niveau national et/ou international ?
 - Quels sont les stades de vie concernés et sont-ils suivis séparément ?
 - Dans les pays où il existe plusieurs espèces, comment le commerce des différentes espèces est-il distingué et géré ?
 - La surveillance est-elle coordonnée avec d'autres États de l'aire de répartition et/ou des pays d'importation et de réexportation ?
 - Toutes les agences et tous les organismes nationaux compétents participent-ils à l'élaboration des programmes de surveillance ?
 - Des codes spécifiques aux espèces et/ou aux stades de vie sont-ils utilisés pour apporter des précisions sur les anguilles anguillidés dans le commerce ?
- *Lorsque des mesures ont été prises pour assurer la traçabilité, il serait utile d'en partager les enseignements tirés afin que ceux d'autres États de l'aire de répartition et d'autres espèces puissent s'en inspirer. Plus précisément, il serait utile d'obtenir des précisions sur les points suivants :*
 - À quelle partie de la chaîne d'approvisionnement les mesures s'appliquent-elles ?
 - Comment les lacunes en matière de traçabilité sont-elles gérées ?

- Ces mesures sont-elles coordonnées avec d'autres États de l'aire de répartition et/ou des pays d'importation et de réexportation ?
- Quels sont les mécanismes mis en place pour garantir une traçabilité efficace ?
- Toutes les agences et tous les organismes nationaux compétents participent-ils à l'élaboration des mesures de traçabilité ?
- *Lorsque des ACNP ont été préparés, il serait utile d'en partager les enseignements tirés afin que ceux d'autres États de l'aire de répartition et d'autres espèces puissent s'en inspirer. Plus précisément, il serait utile d'obtenir des précisions sur les points suivants :*
 - Quelles sont les données utilisées comme référence pour l'ACNP et comment sont-elles validées et mises à jour régulièrement ?
 - Quels sont les stades de vie inclus ?
 - Comment l'ACNP tient-il compte de notre manque de compréhension de l'impact des menaces autres que celles liées à la pêche et au commerce, et de la manière dont elles interagissent ?
 - Comment l'ACNP est-il coordonné avec d'autres États de l'aire de répartition - avec ou sans ACNP - et/ou avec les pays d'importation et de réexportation ?
 - Toutes les agences et tous les organismes nationaux compétents participent-ils à la préparation des ACNP ?
- *Comment les prélèvements et le commerce sont-ils étayés par les avis scientifiques nationaux/internationaux/mondiaux, et à quelle fréquence ces renseignements sont-ils mis à jour ?*
- *Comment sont fixées les limites et/ou les interdictions en matière de prélèvement, d'intrants aquacoles et/ou de commerce ? Plus précisément, il serait utile d'obtenir des précisions sur les points suivants :*
 - Quelles sont les données qui étayent celles-ci ?
 - Des modèles sont-ils utilisés et, le cas échéant, comment sont-ils renseignés/actualisés ?
 - Quels sont les stades de vie inclus ?
 - Quelle est la fréquence de révision ?
 - Comment sont-elles mises en œuvre ?
 - Comment leur efficacité est-elle contrôlée ?
- *Les prélèvements et/ou la production aquacole sont-ils influencés par la demande nationale/régionale/internationale ? Plus précisément, il serait utile d'obtenir des précisions sur les points suivants :*
 - Comment cela est-il contrôlé et/ou coordonné avec les autres États de l'aire de répartition, les États de l'aire de répartition d'autres espèces faisant l'objet d'échanges commerciaux et/ou les pays d'importation et de réexportation ?
 - Quels sont les stades de vie inclus ?
 - Comment les approvisionnements sont-ils ajustés de manière durable et légale en réponse aux changements dans la demande afin de minimiser les surplus ?
 - Comment la « fuite » de tout surplus légal de prélèvement vers le commerce illégal est-elle évitée ?
 - La production aquacole est-elle utilisée pour gérer les approvisionnements ? Dans l'affirmative, comment cette gestion est-elle coordonnée au niveau national et/ou international ?
- *Quels sont les mécanismes de partage/transparence des données en place, par exemple s'agit-il d'une exigence pour les licences de pêche/commerce ?*
- *Parmi les mesures décrites, quelles sont celles qui sont volontaires et celles qui sont obligatoires ?*
- *Y a-t-il des domaines dans lesquels le partage des connaissances/capacités serait utile aux Parties ?*
- *Comment les mesures nationales sont-elles alignées sur les mesures régionales/internationales ?*
- *Si le repeuplement fait partie de certaines mesures de prélèvement ou de commerce, y a-t-il un suivi de l'efficacité de ces mesures ?*

Divers

15. Bien qu'il soit reconnu que les mesures nationales sont souvent considérées comme ne relevant pas de la CITES, en raison de la nature panmictique de l'espèce, il est également considéré comme essentiel que les stratégies de gestion nationales soient coordonnées afin de garantir la durabilité, la traçabilité et la légalité du commerce des anguilles anguillidés.

Recommandations

16. Le Comité pour les animaux est invité à :
- a) demander à la Chine, l'Égypte et la Turquie de transmettre des informations détaillées sur le commerce des anguilles pour examen à la 78e session du Comité permanent, et à inviter le Comité permanent à soumettre un projet de décision destiné spécifiquement aux Parties qui n'ont pas répondu, en vue d'obtenir ces informations ;
 - b) prendre note des informations figurant au paragraphe 11 concernant l'utilisation potentielle du code de source R (élevé en ranch) pour les spécimens d'anguilles d'Europe (*A. anguilla*) provenant de systèmes de production aquacole et formuler des recommandations, selon qu'il convient ;
 - c) convenir de proposer à la 20e session de la Conférence des Parties le projet de décision figurant au paragraphe 12 visant à renouveler la mission inachevée consistant à examiner les risques et les avantages potentiels de la réintroduction dans la nature d'anguilles d'Europe vivantes provenant de saisies ; et
 - d) transmettre le contenu des paragraphes 13 et 14 au Comité permanent pour examen, par l'intermédiaire de son groupe de travail intersessions sur les anguilles.

Consolidated summary of the responses to Notification to the Parties No. 2021/018 and Notification to the Parties No. 2023/062 on eels, including any updates provided under Decision 19.218 on Anguillid EELS (*Anguilla* spp.).

1. A combined total of 37 Parties responded to one, or both, of the Notifications to the Parties indicated above. The Parties concerned were: Algeria, Austria, Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, European Union, Finland, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovakia, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America. The responses are summarised in the paragraphs below and in the table that follows.¹⁸
2. Twenty-eight Parties responded to Notification to the Parties No. 2021/018, including Algeria, Australia, Canada, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovakia, Republic of Korea, Spain, Sweden, Tunisia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America.
3. Twenty-one Parties responded to Notification to the Parties No. 2023/062, including Austria, Belgium, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Finland, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Italy, The Netherlands, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America.
4. Twenty-seven Parties indicated that they have management plans in place for anguillids (Austria, Belgium, Canada, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America). Of those 27 Parties, sixteen are Member States of the European Union (EU) with management plans following Council Regulation (EC) No. 1100/2007 (Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Spain, and Sweden). Slovakia, an EU Member State, however, is exempt from providing a management plan under Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/2007 as their river basins are not considered natural habitats of the European eel (*Anguilla Anguilla*). Six Parties have management plans that are partially developed or under development (Algeria, Australia, Cuba, Morocco, Norway, and Slovakia). Two Parties do not have any management plans in place for anguillid species (Dominican Republic and Ukraine). Mexico did not provide information on their current management plans.
5. Twenty-five Parties indicated that they have monitoring programmes in place for anguillids (Austria, Belgium, Canada, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Korea, Spain, Sweden, Tunisia, and the United States of America). Of those 25 Parties, fifteen are EU Member States with monitoring programmes following Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/2017 (Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain and Sweden). Five Parties have monitoring programmes that are partially developed or under development (Algeria, Australia, Morocco, Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland). Four Parties do not have any monitoring programmes in place for anguillid species (Cuba, Dominican Republic, Slovakia and Ukraine). Mexico did not provide information on their current monitoring programme.
6. Twenty-three Parties indicated that they have stock assessments in place for anguillids (Algeria, Australia, Austria, Belgium, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Tunisia, and the United States of America). Seven Parties have stock assessments that are partially developed or under development (Canada, Dominican Republic, Japan, Mexico, Morocco, Norway, Ukraine, and the United

¹⁸ The response received from the European Union is included in the table., while responses from individual EU Member States are included separately.

Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland). Seven Parties do not have any stock assessments in place for anguillid species (Cuba, Malaysia).

7. Twenty-five Parties indicated that they have mechanisms in place to ensure national/international traceability of anguillids (Algeria, Austria, Belgium, Canada, China, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Italy, Malaysia, Morocco, the Netherlands, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland). Of those 25 Parties, fifteen are following EU legislation (Control Regulation) and illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing regulation to ensure national and international traceability (Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, the Netherlands, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden). Six Parties indicated that have traceability mechanisms that are partially developed or under development (Cuba, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Ireland, Japan, New Zealand, and Norway). Four Parties do not have any traceability mechanisms in place for anguillid species (Australia, Tunisia, Ukraine and the United States of America,). Mexico did not respond with relevant information on the traceability mechanism they have in place for anguillids.
8. Thirty Parties responded regarding the development of non-detriment findings (NDFs). Of the 30 responses, only two Parties indicated that they have NDFs in place for the European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) (Tunisia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland). Twenty-eight Parties do not have NDFs for the European eel (Algeria, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, , Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, and the United States of America). Of these 23 Parties, two do not have NDFs due to a lack of species-specific data (Algeria and Croatia). Ten Parties do not have NDFs following the EU Significant Review Group's recommendation for zero exports for all EU Member States (Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Ireland, the Netherlands, Slovakia, and Sweden). Seven Parties do not have NDFs due to country-specific matters (Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Korea, Spain, Tunisia, and Ukraine), and five Parties responded stating they do not have NDFs as they are not range States of the European eel (Australia, Canada, Japan, Malaysia, and the United States of America).
9. Of the 29 Parties to respond to the question concerning harvest restrictions of glass eels, 24 Parties indicated that they have restrictions in place for the harvest and/or trade in glass eels., while 5 Parties responded to not having any restrictions in place for glass eels (Denmark, Estonia, France, Malaysia and Slovakia). Of the 24 Parties that responded to having harvest and/or trade restrictions in place for glass eels, 19¹⁹ Parties reported that they have strict measures to restrict the harvest and/or trade of glass eels (Algeria, Belgium, Czech Republic, France, Greece, Ireland, Japan²⁰, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom, and the United States of America), and six Parties have limited restrictions on harvest and trade (Croatia, Dominican Republic, Finland, Germany, Italy and Spain). Under the Eel Regulation, EU Member States permitting fishing for eels of less than 12 cm in length are obliged to reserve at least 60% of their catches to be marketed for use in restocking for the purpose of increasing the escapement levels of silver eels. Several EU Member States that reported having no or limited restrictions due to the absence of glass eels in its waters.

¹⁹ Added or amended by the chairs of the working group according to information provided by Japan about their initial reply to the questionnaire.

²⁰ Added or amended by the chairs of the working group according to information provided by Japan about their initial reply to the questionnaire.

Responses to Notification 2021/018		Responses to Notification 2023/062
A. CONSERVATION STATUS AND MANAGEMENT		
A1: Is your country a range State of anguillid eels? If “Yes”, please indicate which species occur in your country		
Algeria	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>	
Australia	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla australis</i>• <i>Anguilla bicolor</i>• <i>Anguilla marmorata</i>• <i>Anguilla obscura</i>• <i>Anguilla reinhardtii</i>	
Austria		Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>
Belgium		Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>
Canada	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla rostrata</i>	
China		Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla bicolor</i>• <i>Anguilla japonica</i>• <i>Anguilla luzonensis</i>• <i>Anguilla marmorata</i>
Croatia	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>
Cuba	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla rostrata</i>	
Czech Republic	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>

Denmark	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>	
Dominican Republic	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla rostrata</i>	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla rostrata</i>
Estonia	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>	
Finland	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>
France	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> (metropolitan France)• <i>Anguilla australis</i> (New Caledonia)• <i>Anguilla bengalensis</i> (la Réunion)• <i>Anguilla bicolor</i> (la Réunion and Mayotte)• <i>Anguilla marmorata</i> (la Réunion and Mayotte)• <i>Anguilla megastoma</i> (French Polynesia – Tahiti)• <i>Anguilla mossambica</i> (la Réunion and Mayotte)• <i>Anguilla obscura</i> (French Polynesia – Rurutu and Tubuai)• <i>Anguilla reinhardtii</i> (New Caledonia)• <i>Anguilla rostrata</i> (Martinique, Guadeloupe, Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon)	
Germany		Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>
Greece	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>
Indonesia		Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla bengalensis</i>• <i>Anguilla bicolor</i>• <i>Anguilla borneensis</i>• <i>Anguilla celebesensis</i>• <i>Anguilla interioris</i>• <i>Anguilla marmorata</i>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Anguilla megastoma</i> • <i>Anguilla obscura</i>
Ireland	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> 	
Italy		Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>
Japan	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Anguilla japonica</i> • <i>Anguilla marmorata</i> 	
Malaysia	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Anguilla bicolor</i> • <i>Anguilla borneensis</i> • <i>Anguilla celebesensis</i> 	
Mexico	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Anguilla rostrata</i> 	
Morocco	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> 	
The Netherlands	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> 	Yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>
New Zealand	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Anguilla australis</i> • <i>Anguilla dieffenbachii</i> • <i>Anguilla reinhardtii</i> 	
Norway	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> 	

Republic of Korea	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla japonica</i>• <i>Anguilla marmorata</i>	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla japonica</i>• <i>Anguilla marmorata</i>
Slovakia	No. <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> considered as introduced in Slovakia.	No. <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> is considered introduced in Slovakia
Slovenia		Yes <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>
Spain	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>
Sweden	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>
Switzerland		Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>
Tunisia	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>
Ukraine	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>	
United Kingdom	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>• <i>Anguilla rostrata</i> <p><i>A. rostrata</i> is native to a number of UK Overseas Territories in the Caribbean, however, there is limited information on these populations and there are no targeted fisheries, so unless otherwise stated this return relates to <i>A. Anguilla</i>.</p>	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>• <i>Anguilla rostrata</i> <p><i>A. rostrata</i> is native to a number of UK Overseas Territories in the Caribbean, however, there is limited information on these populations and there are no targeted fisheries, so unless otherwise stated this return relates to <i>A. anguilla</i>.</p>
United States of America	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla australis</i>• <i>Anguilla bicolor</i>• <i>Anguilla celebesensis</i>	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla australis</i> (American Samoa)• <i>Anguilla bicolor</i> (Northern Mariana Islands, Guam)• <i>Anguilla celebesensis</i> (American Samoa)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Anguilla marmorata</i> • <i>Anguilla rostrata</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Anguilla marmorata</i> (American Samoa, Northern Mariana Islands, Hawaiian Islands) • <i>Anguilla rostrata</i>
A2: Do management plans/mechanisms exist for some, or all of, the anguillid species in your country? Please explain your answer and where possible provide details including links, references, collaborations, etc.		
Algeria	Partially or under development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation of a research project on the evaluation of the biomass of the European eel in Algeria. 	
Australia	Partially or under development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of two species of Anguillid eel (<i>A. australii</i> and <i>A.reinhardtii</i>) is undertaken by state fisheries management agencies. • Some fisheries have management plans, one fishery has a management plan under development. • Details on the eel fisheries in each harvesting state are in the links below. Management plans can be found in the assessment report for each fishery. • Assessment reports for the eel fisheries are published on the Department's website: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Queensland: http://www.environment.gov.au/marine/fisheries/qld/eel-fishery - New South Wales: http://www.environment.gov.au/marine/fisheries/nsw/estuary - Victoria: http://www.environment.gov.au/marine/fisheries/vic/eel - Tasmania: http://www.environment.gov.au/marine/fisheries/tas/freshwater-eel 	
Austria		Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austria was one of five EU Member States to be exempt from preparing EMPs in 2009, pursuant to Article 3 of the Eel Regulation, as their river basins or maritime waters concerned cannot be identified and defined as constituting natural habitats for the European eel. • In December 2022, Austria was among 16 Member States who, together with the European Commission, committed to a partnership under the renewed <u>Joint Declaration for strengthening the recovery for European eel</u>.
Belgium		<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Eel Management Plan of Belgium with all relevant details can be downloaded here. • In June 2023, the triannual progress reports under Article 9 of the Eel Regulation took place. • In 2022, Flanders decided not to buy glass eels anymore for restocking. Instead, Flanders is increasing its efforts in placing eel ladders and also applies <i>adjusted tidal barrage management</i> (leaving sluice doors ajar during tidal rise) on several waterways along the Belgian coast as a measure to improve glass eel passage through tidal gates at the salt/freshwater interface. This measure was taken following the ICES advice 2022-11-03: “ICES advises that when the precautionary approach is applied, there should be zero catches in all habitats in 2023. This [...] includes catches of glass eels for restocking and aquaculture.” Wallonia has no direct access to the sea, so restocking is the only measure to maintain the eel population. Glass eel restocking will continue to take place in Wallonia: scientific evaluation of restocking showed positive results.
Canada	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of American Eel in Canada is multi-jurisdictional involving five administrative regions of Fisheries and Oceans Canada 	

	<p>(Ontario and Prairie, Gulf, Maritimes, Newfoundland and Labrador, and Quebec) and the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec.</p> <p>Commercial Fisheries for Yellow and Silver American Eel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Ontario, the commercial fishery of eel has been closed since 2004. - In Quebec, the eel fishery is conducted in the St. Lawrence Estuary and there are no longer any commercial fisheries upstream of Lac St. Pierre. - Multispecies commercial licences that allow eel catches in Lac St-Pierre to Orleans Island. - In the Gulf Region, the fisheries are managed under Integrated Fisheries Management Plans (IFMPs) for each area office in Prince Edward Island, Gulf of New Brunswick, and Gulf Nova Scotia (2007-2010). - Licenced areas vary from single watershed, to multiple watersheds, and various proportions of coastal areas. - Licence holders are restricted to the type of gear that is set out in their licence. - Logbooks are mandatory as per their licence conditions. - In Newfoundland and Labrador Region, licenced areas vary from single watersheds, to multiple watersheds, and various proportions of coastal areas; sites are restricted and specified on river systems; fishers are not permitted to move from their designated site; site locations are noted by latitude and longitude coordinates in licence conditions; and transferring sites is not permitted on river systems, unless the fish harvester meets stringent criteria. - In Maritimes Region, the commercial fishery has limited entry (no additional licences since 1993). - Licence holders are restricted to the area (typically county), type of gear and seasons set out in their licences. - Eel catches are more regulated by water temperature than by official seasons. - Commercial fishing locations are virtually in all inland and tidal waters with most of the landings occurring from May to November. <p>Commercial Fisheries for Elvers</p>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The commercial elver fishery is conducted in the Maritimes Region (9 licences). • Elver Integrated Fisheries Management Plan has been developed and is updated on a regular basis. • Elvers are defined in regulations as eels with a maximum length of 10 cm. • The elver fishery was developed as an Enterprise Allocation fishery; licence holders have assigned fishing areas and individual quotas (total annual fishery quota is 9,960 kg wet weight per annum). • Daily hail-in and hail-out requirements, 100% mandatory weigh-out and daily landings reports to a Dockside Monitoring Company. • Elver fishers are only authorized on rivers that do not have established commercial fisheries for large eels, and there are limits on catch from any particular river (with a maximum quota of 400kg (wet weight) per river annually) and screening devices are required on elver pots and traps to prevent bycatch. • Other measures specified in license conditions are: restrictions on gear type, gear size and gear number; restrictions on the waterbodies in which fishing is permitted; restrictions on fishing locations within waterbodies; and restrictions on the number of persons permitted to fish under a license. <p>Aquaculture and Experimental Elver Fishery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is one licence holder in the Newfoundland and Labrador region for aquaculture and experimental elver fishery with an annual quota of 150kg. • Elvers are reared to a larger size in an aquaculture facility before being sold. • Maximum retention size for elvers is 10cm. Screening devices on gear are required to prevent bycatch of other species and salmonoid by-catch exclusion devices are required on all fyke nets. Logbooks are mandatory. <p>Recreational Fisheries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is currently an authorized recreational fishery for American Eel in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland and Labrador. 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No recreational fishery for American Eel in Ontario and Quebec. Recreational licences are required in some regions (i.e pots, traps, spear). • Licenses are not required for angling or for spearing in tidal waters in the Atlantic Provinces. • Recreational fishery is regulated by annual seasons, daily bag limits and gear restrictions which vary by area. • Recreational licences in Maritimes Region are non-transferable. <p>Food, Social and Ceremonial Fisheries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • American Eel is an important species that Indigenous communities in Canada fish for Food, Social and Ceremonial (FSC) purposes. • FSC fishery is managed under the Aboriginal Communal Fishing Licence Regulations and Aboriginal Fisheries Strategy Agreements. There are currently 27 First Nations that have communal licences for FSC purposes. Fishing gear, quotas, seasons and fishing locations varies by aboriginal groups. • American eel is of great cultural, spiritual and economic significance to First Nations. • American eel had a significant role in the 1999 Supreme Court of Canada Marshall Decision which confirmed that aboriginal people had a treaty right to catch and sell fish in order to earn a moderate livelihood. • As a result of the Marshall Decision, communal commercial licences are issued to First Nations organizations for participation in the general commercial fishery. <p>Bycatch</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In commercial and recreational fisheries, any bycatch of American Eel caught incidentally while fishing for other species must be returned to the water. • In First Nations FSC fisheries, any bycatch of American Eel caught incidentally while fishing for other species may be retained if specified in the Aboriginal Fisheries Strategy Agreements; otherwise, it must be returned to the water. 	
--	--	--

China		<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no natural population of European eel in China, which imports, breeds and re-exports European eel. • Since 2009, when European eel was included in Appendix II of CITES, the National Forestry and Grassland Administration (NFGA) and the Bureau of Fisheries of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs of the People's Republic of China (MARA) has attached great importance to the species and strictly followed CITES provisions and the Regulations of the People's Republic of China on the Administration of the Import and Export of Endangered Wild Fauna and Flora (the Regulations) and other relevant requirements to strengthen the supervision and management of European eel, including through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengthened import approval: strict inspection of import contracts, import agreements (orders) and CITES foreign export licenses. Enterprises may apply to the National Endangered Species Import and Export Management Office for a certificate of import and export permit with the "Approval Form". The exporting countries are Morocco and Egypt. - Traceability management: The Fisheries Administration of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs and the Endangered Species Import and Export Management Office jointly issued the "Interim Measures for the Traceability Management of European Eel" on December 27, 2016, which converted the imported European eel seedlings/fingerlings into export quotas according to the actual cultivation ratio and allocated them to related breeding enterprises, implemented tracking management, and realized the traceability management of the import and export trade and production and processing of European eel. - Strengthened re-export approval: Strict inspection of all breeding and processing certification materials of European eel, as well as the CITES certificates and related export quotas for certain batches of elver imported. Importing countries are Japan, Russian Federation, the United States of
-------	--	--

		<p>America, Malaysia, Thailand, Canada, Australia, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Publicity and training: Help Chinese eel enterprises understand and adapt to the management requirements of European eels after its listing in CITES, and raise awareness of eel industry practitioners. Also, MARA has actively participated in /fingerlings.
Croatia	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eel fishing in Croatia is regulated by way of Ordinance on commercial fishing with gillnets, pots, hook and line gears spears and particular fishing techniques (OG 84/15, 94/15, 107/15, 62/17 and 64/17) as well as Ordinance on fishing in protected areas, special habitats and areas with particular management regimes (OG 125/20) and Ordinance on eel closure season (adopted on annual basis). • Upgrade of the national management framework is currently under way. 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At its 45th annual meeting in 2022, the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) adopted Recommendation GFCM/45/2022/1 strengthening the management measures for European eel in the Mediterranean Sea (GFCM geographical subareas 1 to 27), previously established by Recommendation GFCM/42/2018/1. Those measures include an annual closure period of six months to be determined by each Contracting Party in accordance with the management plan or plans for eel and the temporal migration patterns of eel in the Contracting Parties, as well as a prohibition of recreational fisheries. Contracting Parties may decide to establish a closure period of six consecutive months or establish a closure period from 1 January to 31 March and three additional months to be chosen between 1 April and 30 November. • In December 2022, Croatia was among 16 Member States who, together with the European Commission, committed to a partnership under the renewed <u>Joint Declaration for strengthening the recovery for European eel</u>. • Eel fishing in Croatia is regulated by way of Ordinance on commercial fishing with gillnets, pots, hook and line gears spears and particular fishing techniques (OG 84/15, 94/15, 107/15, 62/17 and 64/17) as well as Ordinance on the protection of fish and other marine organisms and on

		<p>criteria for determining compensation for damages caused to fish and other marine organisms (OG 64/23).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National management plan for eel shall reflect all the recent developments with regards to the management of this species on regional level and amended if needed in a given deadline.
Cuba	Partially or under development	
Czech Republic	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Czech National Action Plan for the Management of European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>), for details in the Czech language please see: http://eagri.cz/public/web/file/233931/Management_plan.pdf An update of this strategic document is planned to be conducted in close future. 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In December 2022, the Czech Republic was among 16 Member States who, together with the European Commission, committed to a partnership under the renewed <u>Joint Declaration for strengthening the recovery for European eel</u>. The Czech Republic is currently preparing an update of its National Action Plan for the Management of European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>).
Denmark	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>	
Dominican Republic	No.	No.
Estonia	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the EU regulation (EU 2023/194) the closed period of seven months during Silver eel migration peak (Sept. - March) was established and all-year recreational fishing ban for eel at sea.
European Union	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/2007</u> establishes measures for the recovery of the stock of European eel. This Regulation sets out (i) obligations for the EU Member States to adopt eel management plans, (ii) specific measures relating to 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The common response provided by European Union Member States reiterates much of the information already provided in response to</p>

Member States²¹	<p>restocking of glass eels, (iii) specific provisions on the reduction of fishing efforts for eels caught in marine waters and (iv) provisions on the control and enforcement of import and export of European eels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key objective is to ensure the escapement to the sea of at least 40% of adult eels relative to the escapement levels that would have existed in the absence of human influences. • This escapement target is to be achieved in the long term. • More details on the management framework and implementation of the EMPs can be found in the <u>Commission report on the evaluation of the Eel Regulation</u>, published in February 2020. • In accordance with Article 1(2) of the Eel Regulation and based on scientific evidence, the Black Sea and the river systems connected to the Black Sea have been assessed as not constituting a natural habitat for European eel for the purpose of the Regulation. Hence, EU Member States with river basins flowing only into the Black Sea (HUN for rivers flowing to the Black Sea, ROU) were exempted from preparing the EMPs. • Since 2018, temporary eel fishing closures have been set at EU level through the so-called Fishing Opportunities Regulations under the EU Common Fisheries Policy (CFP). • Currently, a 3 consecutive months fishing closure applies to commercial and recreational fishing and all life stages of eels in marine and transitional waters. • Member States in the North-East Atlantic (incl. adjacent seas of the Baltic and North Seas), are required to notify the fishing closure period between August and February, whereas in the Mediterranean Sea this period is to be chosen from the whole year. The closures need to be consistent with the eel migration patterns. • The European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) does not specifically refer to eel recovery or the Eel Regulation but initiatives for implementing the Eel Regulation can be supported (e.g. via Article 37(2) on direct restocking and Article 54 on aquaculture providing environmental services). Its successor, the European Maritime, Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund (for the period 2021-2027) will continue supporting various conservation measures that may be of relevance to the management and conservation of eels. 	<p>Notification 2021/018. Only new or updated information provided in response to Notification 2023/062 is summarized here.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five EU MSs (CYP, MLT, AUT, ROU, SVK) were exempted from preparing EMPs in 2009, pursuant to Article 3 of the Eel Regulation, as their river basins or maritime waters concerned cannot be identified and defined as constituting natural habitats for the European eel. • The European Maritime, Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund (2021-2027), the successor of the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF), continues to support various conservation measures that may be of relevance to the management and conservation of eels. • At the request of the European Commission, the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) <u>assessed</u> over the period 2021-22 the Member States 4th progress reports on the implementation of their EMPs. It concluded that no overall progress had been made in achieving the EU-defined biomass escapement target across the whole EU. • In December 2022, 16 Member States (Austria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia), together with the European Commission, committed to a partnership under the renewed <u>Joint Declaration for strengthening the recovery for European eel</u>. • In February 2023, the European Commission adopted the <u>Marine Action Plan for sustainable and resilient fisheries</u>, which calls on Member States to improve conservation measures for eel and enhance transboundary cooperation. • In addition, European eels are included in Annex B of Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97, which implements CITES provisions in the EU. Exports of European eels
-----------------------------------	--	---

²¹ NB: The European Union did not provide a separate response to the Notifications, however, in the interest of brevity, the common elements of the responses provided by EU Member States are summarized as such in this table, to avoid repetition.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Also relevant is the <u>Joint (European Commission and EU Member States) Declaration on strengthening the recovery for European eel</u>, December 2017, and reconfirmed in - the “Our Baltic” Declaration of 2020, and - General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) Recommendation GFCM/42/2018/1 establishing management measures for European eel in the Mediterranean Sea. • A multiannual management Plan for eel is adopted on the level of the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (Recommendation GFCM/42/2018/1) and is obligatory to all CPCs. • European eels are included in Annex B of Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97, which implements the CITES provisions in the EU. • For Annex B species, one of the conditions for issuance of an export permit by the relevant EU Member State is that the applicant for the export permit provides “documentary evidence that the specimens have been obtained in accordance with the legislation in force on the protection of the species in question” (cf. Article 5(4) and 5(2)(b)). • Exports from the EU of European eels have been suspended since December 2010, as the scientific authorities of the EU Member States have concluded that a “non-detriment finding” for the species could not be performed. This assessment has been confirmed again for 2021 by the competent EU expert Group, the Scientific Review Group, in December 2020. 	<p>from the EU have been suspended since December 2010, as the scientific authorities of EU Member States concluded that non-detriment findings (NDFs) could not be performed for the species. This assessment was re-confirmed for 2023 by the competent EU expert group, the Scientific Review Group, in December 2022.</p>
Finland	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In December 2022, Finland was among 16 Member States who, together with the European Commission, committed to a partnership under the renewed <u>Joint Declaration for strengthening the recovery for European eel</u>. • In Finland, eel fishing is prohibited throughout the year, except in July. In marine areas, recreational fishing of eel is prohibited throughout the year.
France		<p>Yes.</p>

		<p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pursuant to Regulation No. 1100/2007, France has adopted an Eel Management Plan in 2010, which is subject to an implementation report every 3 years. These reports are transmitted to the European Commission. • The French management plan aims to halt the decline of the species by taking short-term and medium-term action on the primary human-induced causes of mortality and disturbance. The plan consists of a national component and nine local components (one for each Eel Management Unit). France has a Migratory Fish Management Committee (COGEPOMI) for each of its large river basins. Every committee has a dedicated management plan (PLAGEPOMI) which aims to manage migratory fish resources and fisheries at the level of each river basin. • In 2018, the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) adopted a management plan for European eel in the Mediterranean Sea. • Réunion Island has in place a Conservation Master Plan for Anguillidae on Reunion Island (2018-2027), which covers <i>A. bicolor</i>, <i>A. marmorata</i>, and <i>A. mossambica</i>.
Germany		<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In December 2022, Germany was among 16 Member States who, together with the European Commission, committed to a partnership under the renewed <u>Joint Declaration for strengthening the recovery for European eel</u>. • In general, fisheries in inland and coastal waters, including eel fisheries, are also regulated in the fisheries laws and regulations of the 16 Federal States of Germany. In line with the objective of Regulation (EC) No. 1100/2007 to ensure that 40% of the pristine silver eel biomass of each

		<p>river system can migrate to sea, Germany introduced their <u>management plans</u> (approved in 2010) for its 9 relevant river basin districts (namely Rhine, Meuse, Ems, Weser, Elbe, Eider, Schlei/Trave, Wanow/Peene and Oder).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Germany publishes key figures and indicators in triennial <u>implementation reports</u>, in accordance with Article 9 of Regulation (EC) No. 1100/2007. Key points of these reports are a comparison between planned and so-far realized measures withing the implementation of the management plans as well as a resulting forecast on the development of silver eel escapement.
Greece	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regarding Greece there is the Hellenic Eel Management Plan (HEMP) in the framework of Council Regulation (EC) no 1100/2007, establishing measure for the recovery of the stock of European eel. 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In December 2022, Greece was among 16 Member States who, together with the European Commission, committed to a partnership under the renewed <u>Joint Declaration for strengthening the recovery for European eel</u>. Greece has adopted the Hellenic Eel Management Plan (HEMP), E(2010)8218/30.11.2010, European Commission, in the framework of Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/2007, establishing measures for the recovery of the stock of European eel.
Indonesia		<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indonesia has established an Eels Management Plan through the Decree of the Minister of Marine Affairs and Fisheries 118/2021 as well as the National Plan of Action for the Conservation of Eels (<i>Anguilla</i> spp.) in 2022-2024 through the Decree of the minister of Marine Affairs and Fisheries 73/2022. Other related national regulations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Regulation of the Minister of Marine Affairs and Fisheries 19/2012 on the Prohibition of Eel (<i>Anguilla</i> spp.) Seeds Export

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Regulation of the Minister of Trade 44/2012 on Goods Prohibited for Export - The Regulation of the Minister of Marine Affairs and Fisheries 61/2018 on the Use of Protected and/or CITES-listed Fish Species - The Regulation of the Minister of Marine Affairs and Fisheries 18/2021 on the Placement of Fishing Equipment in the Fisheries Management Areas of the Republic of Indonesia and the High Seas and the Management of Migratory Fishing - The Decree of the Minister of Marine Affairs and Fisheries 80/2020 on the Partial Protection of Eels (<i>Anguilla</i> spp.) - The Decree of the Director General for Capture Fisheries 7/2022 on the Technical Guideline for the Restocking of Eels - The Decree of the Director General for Capture Fisheries 8/2022 on the Technical Guideline for the Capture and Handling of Glass Eels - The Decree of the Director General for Marine Spatial Management 66/2022 on the Technical Guideline for the Restocking of the Protected and/or CITES-listed Species - The Decree of the Director General for Marine Spatial Management 67/2022 on the Technical Guideline for the Monitoring of the Protected and/or CITES-listed Species - The Decree of the Director General for Marine Spatial Management 2/2023 on the Harvest Quota for the Partially Protected and/or CITES-listed Species. • There are also local regulations related to eel management, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Regulation of the Regent of Poso 26/2017 on Eel Management - The Regulation of the Regent of Sukabumi 25/2018 on the Management and Protection of Eels - The Decree of the Regent of Sukabumi 523/2018 on the Restocking of Eel Broodstocks - The Regulation of Sukabumi 2023 on the Management of Freshwater Fisheries. • Indonesia set partial protection for eels (<i>Anguilla</i> spp.) based on size and harvest time: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Harvest prohibition for glass eels on the 27th and 28th days of each lunar month
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Harvest prohibition for adult <i>A. bicolor</i> and <i>A. interioris</i> above 2 kg - Harvest prohibition for adult <i>A. marmorata</i> and <i>A. celebesensis</i> above 5 kg - Export prohibition for eel seeds ≤ 150 gr
Ireland	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Ireland there is a National Eel Management Plan submitted to EU in 2009, reported on as required under Eel Regulation 1100/2007. • There is a transboundary agreement for the Erne catchment with Northern Ireland. 	
Italy		<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Italy has developed its European eel national management plan (drafted under EU Reg 1100/2007), which was approved by the European Commission in 2011. • European eel management plan of Sardinia Region (Decree of the Councilor for agriculture and agro-pastoral reform n. 3186/DecA/158 of 29.12.2009 Financing of the Regional Eel Management Plan (Reg CE 1100/2007 of 18 september 2007) • Emilia-Romagna Region D.M. 12/01/ 2011 (Regulation of fishing and marketing of juvenile eels of the species <i>Anguilla Anguilla</i> (C��CA), Regional regulation n. 1/2018, D. M. n. 403 del 25/7/ 2019, D.M. n. 152580 del 13/3/ 2023. • Friuli Venezia Giulia Region: Regional management plan approved by regional Decree n. 1848 of 7 October 2011 • Umbria Region has its own management plan and it is a part of a national management plan. In Italy 9 Regions are involved in the national management plan.

Japan	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive measures including population management and habitat restoration. • Called upon the People's Republic of China and Chinese Taipei to engage in an international discussion, "the Informal Consultation on International Cooperation for Conservation and Management of Japanese Eel Stock and Other Relevant Eel Species" held in September 2012. The Republic of Korea joined from the fourth meeting in September 2013 • In 2014, China, Japan, Korea, and Chinese Taipei released Joint Statement at the seventh meeting, restricting input of eel seeds into aquaculture ponds: the amount of input of eel seeds for the 2014-2015 input season would be no more than 80% of the 2013-2014 input season. • Upper limit of pond input in Japan was set at 21.7 tons. Thereafter, the upper limit of input in the next fishing season has been discussed every year through informal consultations. • Limit has remained the same since 2014-2015 season because no scientific evidence has been provided to change it. • To implement the upper limit, Japan introduced a licensing system to eel aquaculture under the Inland Water Fishery Promotion Act established in June 2015. • The amount of initial input of glass eels is restricted by eel species and is allocated for each eel farmer under this Act, requiring farmers to report their input amount of glass eels and production amount of adult eels to the central government every month. • The catch of glass eels is subject to fishing permits to be issued by prefectural governments. • Duration of fishing season is limited. • Catches of adult eels using certain fishing gear is subject to fishing permits to be issued by prefectural governments. Each prefecture is implementing various additional measures such as gear restriction, upper limits of harvest for individuals, and time closure has been introduced and implemented for catches of both glass and adult eels, considering the different situations in each prefecture. • Prohibition of catching silver eels contributing to spawn has been introduced in almost all prefectures where wild adult eels are distributed. • In accordance with the amendment of the Fishery Act in December 2020, the government of Japan considerably strengthened the penal 	
-------	--	--

	<p>provisions in order to effectively give disadvantage to offenders and prevent poaching. After December 2023, the penalty for catching glass eels without a fishing permit will be an imprisonment of up to 3 years or a fine of not more than 30 million yen.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuous efforts have been made for the creation and conservation of a favourable riverine environment. Because of the growing and spawning grounds that rivers intrinsically have, the environmental policy concept of "nature-oriented river works" was adopted, representing conservation and regeneration of the environment as habitat. • The Fisheries Agency of Japan instructs prefectural governments of fisheries policy to promote resource management aiming for sustainable use of Japanese eels every fishing year. The Policy notified in October 2020 is as follows; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to instruct fishers appropriately report the weight of glass eels catch; - to supervise and inspect the catch of glass eels thoroughly; - to fully understand the catch, distribution, export of glass eels without any non-transparency; and - to instruct Fisheries Cooperative which are obliged to promote eel resources to properly implement stocking and conserve and regenerate eels' habitat efficiently. 	
Malaysia	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permits are issued for imports/exports (not up to species level for anguillid) 	
Morocco	<p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morocco has a fairly solid legal arsenal that allows it to properly frame the implementation of its eel management plan. • In accordance with the provisions of Law n°130-12 on continental fishing and aquaculture as amended and completed in 2015 and Law 29-05 on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora and the control of their trade, a certain number of regulatory mechanisms make it possible to guarantee an adaptive and coordinated management of this species, notably through <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eel exploitation based on specific specifications that define the rights and obligations of operators, including the principle of fishing quotas, the prohibition of trade in glass eels, the obligation to aquaculture the glass eels caught and the contribution to restocking operations. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The annual meeting of the Fisheries Committee, which is a consultative body created by the Law on Inland Fisheries and Aquaculture, and in which all the stakeholders involved in this activity, including eel exploitation, are represented (public administrations, fisheries operators, aquaculture operators, universities and research institutes, NGOs, etc.). At the end of this meeting, an annual fishing order is established, setting the annual fishing regulations for the fishing season. 	
The Netherlands	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the Netherlands the temporary eel fishing closure is set from 1 September till 1st December. This is also the period that silver eel migrates toward the sea. • The Netherlands adopted an Eel Management plan and has implemented the following measures to reach the 40% escapement objective of the Regulation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduction of eel mortality at pumping stations and other water works. - Reduction of eel mortality at hydro-electric stations with at least 35%. - The establishment of fishery-free zones in areas that are important for eel migration. - Release of eel caught at sea and at inland waters by anglers. - Ban on recreational fishery in coastal areas using professional gear for targeting eel. - Annual closed season from 1 September to 1 December in marine, coastal and inland waters. - Stop the issue of licenses for eel snigglers by the minister of LNV in state owned waters. - Restocking of glass eel and pre-grown eel (elvers) from aquaculture. - Research into the artificial propagation of eel. - Closure of eel fishery in contaminated (PCBs, dioxins). 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Netherlands reiterates the measures implemented under its Eel Management Plan.
New Zealand	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shortfin and longfin eel fisheries are managed under an Individual Transferable Quota (ITQ) system. • The New Zealand Fisheries Act 1996 requires that Total Allowable Commercial Catches (TACCs) and Total Allowable Catches (TACs, which include the TACC along with allowances for recreational and customary catches and other sources of mortality) are set to provide for utilisation while ensuring sustainability. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eels smaller than 220 grams may not be kept, nor eels larger than 4 kg. Except for one catchment in the South Island, fishers voluntarily avoid adult migrant (silver) eels. Recreational use is also regulated with a bag limit of 6 eels per day. Māori customary use is regulated by Māori guardians and is only for local consumption. Farming does not occur due to these restrictions. 	
Norway	<p>Partially or under development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of ICES call for information the catch ban was lifted in 2017 with quotas for research catch. Only professional fishermen can apply. Catch per vessel is set at a maximum of 700kgs, and there is a need to apply for taking part in the research fishery. The Institute of marine research decides with fishermen may participate and the fishermen must report the information required by the Institute of marine research. It is not allowed to fish for eels in freshwater 	
Republic of Korea	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A harvest closure period (from 1 October until 31 March of the following year) and minimum size requirements (15-45cm) are enforced according to the enforcement ordinance of the Inland Water Fisheries Act. 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A fishing closure (Oct. 1 - March 31) and size restriction (15 - 45cm) for eels is stipulated in the Inland Water Fisheries Act Article 21bis (Prohibition of catch and take) and Enforcement Decree of the Inland Water Fisheries Act Article 17(Prohibition of catch and take) Authorization procedures are stipulated in accordance with the Aquaculture Industry Development Act. Installation of eel-only fishways (3 locations) and monitoring (installation effect, maintenance of the eel-only fishway, etc.)
Slovakia	<p>No.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slovakia is exempted from preparing Eel Management Plan in 2009, pursuant to Article 3 of the Eel Regulation, as their river basins or maritime waters concerned cannot be identified and defined as constituting natural habitats for the European eel 	<p>No.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In December 2022, Slovakia was among 16 Member States who, together with the European Commission, committed to a partnership under the renewed <u>Joint</u>

		<u>Declaration for strengthening the recovery for European eel.</u>
Slovenia		<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the Republic of Slovenia, the European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) is protected by the Decree on protected wild animal species (OJ RS, No. 46/04, 109/01, 84/05, 115/07, 32/08 – odl. US, 96/08, 36/09, 102/11, 15/14, 64/16 in 62/19). It is prohibited to intentionally harm, poison, kill, take from nature, hunt, catch or disturb the species. • The enforcement of these prohibitions and the fishing of eel is performed by the nature conservation inspectors. The control over the implementation of leisure fishing on inland waters is also performed by fishing guards. In case of unintentional catches in inland waters, where fishing is performed only by leisure fishing by line, all catches must be returned to water unharmed. The same approach must be followed by recreational fishers at sea. Accidental catches by commercial sea fisheries in nets, that cannot be returned to the sea, are recorded and reported to fisheries authorities.
Spain	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on Council Regulation (EC) 1100/2007, establishing measures for the recovery of the European eel stock, the management plans for the European eel in Spain were drawn up (one national plan, plus 12 plans of the Autonomous Communities) approved by Commission Decision dated 1 October 2010. • For the international stretch of the Miño river, a joint management plan between Spain and Portugal was prepared, approved by Commission Decision dated May 21, 2012. • Some measures have been updated by the Autonomous Communities 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spain reiterates the existence of a national eel management plan and the 12 eel management plans of the Autonomous Communities, as well as the joint management plan between Spain and Portugal for the international stretch of the Miño river. • There has been a management plan for adult eel and glass eel in Catalonia since 1983. Currently the management is framed in the European Eel Management Plan of the European Commission approved by decision of the Commission on 1.10.2010 and by the Management Plan of the General Fisheries Commission for the

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the framework of the GFCM, Recommendation GFCM/42/2018/1 was adopted, regarding a multi-annual management plan for the European eel in the Mediterranean. • Regarding closures, these measures are adopted in EU regulations through the annual fishing opportunities regulations, both for Atlantic and Mediterranean waters. 	Mediterranean implemented by the recommendations GFCM/42/2018/1 and bCGPM/45/2021/1.
Sweden	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Swedish Eel Management Plan, approved by the EU-Commission in 2009 includes protective actions in four main areas: stocking, up- and downstream migration, fishery regulation. • The plan is evaluated every third year, according to article 9, EU regulation (1100/2007). • During the last years, Sweden have arranged three workshops within the framework of Helcom and Baltfish focusing primarily on to share information and discuss improved methods of data collection and Baltic stock status assessment, control of trade and fishery. • In order to increase data and knowledge, Sweden participate in an initiated monitoring program on eel migration from the Baltic Sea using a fishing-independent technology, acoustic telemetry. An infrastructure of receivers is placed at strategic locations such as outlets from lakes and in narrow straits. • System is under construction, but eels have been marked and in 2021 the first ones are expected results. 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Swedish eel management plan was approved by the EU-Commission in 2009 • Sweden has outlined the monitoring, effectiveness and outcome of the plan every third year (2021, 2018, 2015 and 2012) and reported on the implementation of their Eel Management Plans and the progress achieved in protection and restoration to the EU-Commission.
Switzerland		<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Switzerland has relatively small responsibility toward eel conservation (National prioritäre Arten (BAFU 2019). Switzerland is at the head of basin and natural population depends on upstream migration barriers mainly present outside the Swiss territory. The fact remains that several waterways historically hosted important eel stocks (Lake Maggiore and Lake Lugano, the Rhine/Aare river system) and this is not the case anymore. Switzerland is working closely with its neighbouring countries and is coordinating measures with the EU action plan for the conservation of eel in the Rhine catchment area (18.5206 Hat der Aal noch eine Chance zu überleben? Geschäft Das Schweizer Parlament)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since 1 January 2021 the protection status of the eel was updated from “Vulnerable” to “Critically endangered” (Annexe 1, Bundesgesetz über die Fischerei BGF; SR 923.1), consequently the species is protected on a federal level and no fishing is allowed. • The only exception is Lake Constance (<u>IBKF – Internationale Bevollmächtigtenkonferenz für die Bodenseefischerei</u> for more information), where the international commission for fishery (IBKF) still allows fishing. • At the current state of knowledge, European eel is present in Lake Constance and along the Rhine principally because of restocking carried out in Germany, whereas in Lake Maggiore and Lake Lugano the population size decreased massively compared to the past.
Tunisia	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DGPA. 2010. Eel Management Plan of Tunisia. Technical report of the General Directorate of Fisheries and Aquaculture. Ministry of Agriculture, Tunisia. 108p. 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DGPA. 2010. Eel Management Plan of Tunisia. Technical report of the General Directorate of Fisheries and Aquaculture. Ministry of Agriculture, Tunisia. 108p.
Ukraine	No.	
United Kingdom	Yes.	Yes.
United States of America	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (Commission) has coordinated interstate management of American eel (<i>Anguilla rostrata</i>) from 0-3 miles offshore since 2000. • American eel is currently managed under the Interstate Fishery Management Plan (FMP) and Addenda I-V to the FMP. • Management authority in the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) from 3-200 miles from shore lies with NOAA Fisheries. • The management unit is defined as the portion of the American eel population occurring in the territorial seas and inland waters along the Atlantic coast from Maine to Florida. 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (Commission) has coordinated interstate management of American eel (<i>Anguilla rostrata</i>) from 0-3 miles offshore since 2000. • American eel is currently managed under the <u>Interstate Fishery Management Plan (FMP) and Addenda I-V to the FMP</u>. • Management authority in the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) from 3-200 miles from shore lies with NOAA Fisheries. • The management unit is defined as the portion of the American eel population occurring in the territorial seas and inland waters along the Atlantic coast from Maine to Florida.

A3: Do monitoring programmes exist for some, or all of, the anguillid species in your country? Please explain your answer and where possible provide details including collaborations with other Parties, relevant link(s), reference(s) or additional information, personal experience and/or communications, etc.		
Algeria	Partially or under development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of the GFCM research program on the European eel <i>Anguilla Anguilla</i>. 	
Australia	Partially or under development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All fisheries provide annual catch and effort reports. Monitoring programs/arrangements can be found in assessment reports published on the department's website: See links in A.2 	
Austria		Yes. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.
Belgium		Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All details on the monitoring of Eel in Belgium can be found in the <u>Country Report of Belgium of the ICES Working Group on Eels</u>.
Canada	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> American Eels reared in Atlantic drainages of Canada and the United States are part of a common genetic stock, although the American Eel has not been confirmed to be panmictic because genetic samples are unavailable for the remainder of the species' range. Recent evaluation of 38 American Eel abundance series in Canada identified 35 as either valid or could be considered valid after standardization. The 12 most robust fisheries were used in an examination of abundance trends. The longest data series began in 1952, with most series using data collected through 2018. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trends analysis indicated that American Eel abundance were stable (6 surveys), declining (4 surveys) or increasing (2 surveys) (Cornic et al. in press). • Because of inter-index variability, it is difficult to postulate a single index that fully reflects trends in American Eel in Canada. • Status of the available indices in Canada currently appears to be stable. 	
China		Yes. No details provided.
Croatia	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data collection in Croatia in 2020 was implemented as a pilot study to establish methodology and survey areas for regular monitoring as from 2022 according to Regulation (EU) No 2017/1004. 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Starting from 2022, permanent monitoring of fishing activities on Neretva Delta was established and is conducted by scientific observers of national Institute of oceanography and fisheries. • In early 2023, Ministry of Agriculture has carried out a public procurement regarding the Monitoring of European eel in inland waters as part of the National Data Collection Plan in Fisheries of the Republic of Croatia, in accordance with the obligations prescribed in Council Regulation (EC) 1100/2007 and Regulation (EU) 2017/1004. The monitoring will last until end of 2026, with the aim of providing data and knowledge about the state of the European eel population in the river basins of the Republic of Croatia, which include marine and transnational waters as well as to establish a plan for stock restoration.
Cuba	No.	
Czech Republic	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Until now there have been carried 2 national monitoring projects on catadromous Eel migration in the Czech Republic, third (a 2-years) project is planned to be released soon. 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • So far, two national monitoring projects on catadromous Eel migration in the Czech Republic have been completed.

		Currently, the third monitoring of catadromous migration is in progress.
Denmark	Yes. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.	
Dominican Republic	No.	No.
Estonia	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Estonia, there is dedicated continuous monitoring (with yearly reports) on Narva river basin district (stock based solely on restocking). • Eel in West-Estonian basin district is being monitored alongside other coastal fish under EU Data Collection Framework. 	
European Union Member States²²	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/2017 contains general requirements for EU Member States for the monitoring of the European eel. • This includes a monitoring under EMPs with the purpose of achieving the escapement target, a system related to glass eel restocking, monitoring and reporting of various biological data, as well as control and catch monitoring systems. • EU Member States have an obligation to collect data related to the European eel under the EU Data Collection Framework. • Regulation (EU) 2017/1004 of the European Parliament and of the Council establishes an EU framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector and support for scientific advice regarding the CFP. • EU data collection framework (DCF) is applicable to eels and covers inland waters, specifically establishing a programme for the collection of biological data on all stocks caught or by-caught in EU commercial 	Yes. The common response provided by European Union Member States reiterates much of the information already provided in response to Notification 2021/018. Only new or updated information provided in response to Notification 2023/062 is summarized here. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More recent information on the monitoring of European eels by EU Member States can be found in ICES advice and its supporting report on the technical evaluation of the Member States progress in implementing their EMPs. Certain information is also part of regularly established country reports to <u>WGEEL reports in support of ICES annual advice on European eel</u>. Of relevance is also ICES Report from the <u>Workshop on the future of eel advice</u>.

²² NB: The European Union did not provide a separate response to the Notifications, however, in the interest of brevity, the common elements of the responses provided by EU Member States are summarized as such in this table, to avoid repetition.

	<p>and, where appropriate, recreational fisheries in and outside EU waters, including eels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EU Member States coordinate their data collection activities in regional coordination groups. • Issues related to diadromous species are subject to pan-European coordination in a dedicated subgroup. 	
Finland	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An index for the abundance of yellow eels and silver eels along the Finnish coast is obtained from fisheries statistics. • Both yellow and silver eels are caught as bycatch in professional and recreational fisheries. • Eel has been included in the EU Data Collection Programme in Finland since 2017. Since then samples are collected along the Finnish coast to estimate the share of yellow/silver eels and restocked/wild eels (on the basis of strontium chloride label, only for individuals from year-class 2009 and later). • Samples are collected in two locations in inland waters as well: lake Kulovesi (Kokemäenjoki watershed) and lake Vesijärvi (Kymijoki watershed), where all eels are supposed to be of restocked origin due to migration barriers. • An index for the silver eels migrating from Finland is obtained from two sites. There is an eel trap in the river Vääksynjoki and an echosounder (DIDSON) in Kokemäenjoki under the lowest hydro-power dam. Eels caught in Vääksynjoki are tagged and released into the sea at Kymijoki estuary (below hydropower dams). All eels are originally restocked in the lake Vesijärvi. • During 2014-2020, 1942 eels have been caught and transported to the sea. In total more than 3,0 tn of eels have been transported over the hydroelectric power plants. 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An index for the silver eels migrating from Finland is obtained from two sites. There is an eel trap in the river Vääksynjoki and an echosounder in Kokemäenjoki. Vääksynjoki flows from Lake Vesijärvi in the upper reaches of the Kymijoki watercourse, 150 km from the sea. The eels caught in this trap are tagged and released into the sea at Kymijoki estuary (bypassing all hydropower dams). All eels are originally restocked in the lake Vesijärvi. • During 2014-2022, 3032 eels have been caught and transported to the sea.
France		<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • France's Eel Management Plan summarizes the monitoring plans, which are broken down by territory. European eel is subject to studies, in particular on the monitoring of glass eel recruitment through passes and

		<p>trap passes installed on watercourses. The glass eel recruitment index is in line with the index defined by WGEEL.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Conservation Master Plan for Anguillidae on Réunion Island (2018-2027) includes monitoring programmes for <i>A. bicolor</i>, <i>A. marmorata</i>, and <i>A. mossambica</i>.
Germany		<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various monitoring programmes exist for anguillid species in Germany. As Germany's federal structure determines that inland fisheries are a matter of the Federal States, the responsibility for implementing Regulation (EC) No. 1100/2007 lies with the Federal States and regional differences may apply. • Eels are among the target species in the water framework directive (WFD) and are recorded in associated electrofishing surveys. Besides this, different monitoring programmes, including glass-eel recruitment time-series, elver traps, yellow eel abundance as well as designated silver eel escapement monitoring programmes exist. Regular screening of diseases and general health status of eels and stocking material is also undertaken, for example in the state of <u>North Rhine-Westphalia</u>. • In the context of the EU Fisheries Data Collection Framework mentioned above, <u>Germany collects data on eel growth and maturation in its inland waters</u>, in order to provide system-specific metrics and allow for the evaluation and optimization of current management measures. For this, biological data from yellow and silver eels are sampled from commercial fisheries in German river basin districts. In addition to the mandatory data on length, weight, age and sex, Germany also investigates infestation of the swim bladder with the Nematode <i>Anguillicola crassus</i> and contamination with pollutants, such as heavy metals and PCBs. These data allow for the identification of differences in habitat quality and can

		eventually result in recommendations concerning management measures.
Greece	No.	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following monitoring programmes exist for <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> in Greece: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pilot study: Anadromous and catadromous species data collection in fresh water, section biological data, Fisheries Research institute (F.R.I.)-HAO Demeter - Sub-project: Biological data collection of eel population in specific areas of Greek territory (Areas A), University of Patras - Sub-project: Biological data collection of eel population in specific areas of Greek territory (Areas B), University of Ioannina, Data Collection Framework, Reg. (EU) 2017/1004 of 17 May 2017.
Indonesia		<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring programs are among the mandated activities in the National Plan of Action for the Conservation of Eels 2022-2024 (however, these activities are not yet evaluated): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capacity building for eel enumerators - Glass eel population monitoring - Study of the habitat distribution in West Sumatra, West Java, Central Sulawesi, and North Sulawesi - Study of the endemic <i>A. borneensis</i> in East Kalimantan - Monitoring, assessment, and study on the sociocultural and economic aspects - Data and information integration - Workshops - Mapping of the potential distribution of eels

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regulation implementation in the utilization of eels based on Standard Operational Procedures (SOP) - Technical assistance to local communities in eel conservation - Surveillance and its optimization. • Finished and on-going activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Glass eel monitoring in Sukabumi, West Java by WWF-ID - Silver and yellow eel monitoring in Sukabumi, West Java by WWF-ID and Indonesian Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN) - Catch composition study in Sukabumi, West Java, by WWF-ID, BRIN, and IPB University (Agricultural Institute of Bogor) - Population survey in East Kalimantan in January-September 2021 by the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (MMAF) - Population survey in Bengkulu in 2023 by MMAF - Participative monitoring of the population of all life stages and harvest locations in Sukabumi and Cilacap, West Java, by IFish FAO
Ireland	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A national monitoring programme is carried out by Inland Fisheries Ireland on the European Eel. • Additional information is supplied by the Electricity Supply Board (ESB), Marine Institute and National University of Ireland Galway. • The activities are coordinated under a Technical Expert Group on Eel commissioned by IFI. 	
Italy		<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring programs are carried out under Reg. (EC) 1100/2007 and Regulation (EU) 2017/1004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 May 2017. Also, Italy actively participates in research programmes

		<p>carried out by the FAO's General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean and the Black Sea.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring on adult eels (collaboration with Agency LAORE Sardinia and professional fishermen); monitoring on glass eels (collaboration with University of Cagliari, LAORE and professional fishermen). • Emilia-Romagna Region: "Operational Program EMFF "European Fund for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries 2014-2020" – Misura 1.44 par. 6 "Fishing in inland waters and fauna and flora in inland waters": <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Study for recording the presence of migrating eels along the branch of the PO river and the Lamone river. Years 2020-2021. - Study for recording the presence of migrating eels along the branch of the Po and Savio rivers. Years 2022-2023. • LIFEEL Project 2021-2024 (LIFE19 NAT/IT/000851) https://lifeel.eu/ • Umbria: in the last years the monitoring mainly consists in the amount of yellow and silver eels caught in Trasimeno Lake.
Japan	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See A4.</p>	
Malaysia	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landing data is collected throughout the year (not up to species level) 	
Morocco	<p>Partially or under development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On 24/02/2020, the Department of Water and Forests launched a study on the evaluation of eel stocks. • The objective of this study is to develop a standardized methodology for monitoring the population dynamics of eel adapted to Moroccan continental waters and to apply it to the main eel fisheries. • The completion of the study is scheduled for February 2022. 	

The Netherlands	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the Netherlands Wageningen Marine Research is involved in a monitoring programme regarding the Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/2017 and for the EU Data Collection Framework. • The monitoring programme for European eel involves: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Market sampling: representative samples (usually 150-200 eels) are taken from retained catches from commercial fishers each year. - Monitoring of glass eel at major entry points (also in cooperation with RAVON); - Monitoring and sampling of European eel in designated water bodies (main rivers; lakes and even ditches). • The outcomes of the monitoring is also input for the stock assessment as described in A.4 • Part of this data is also input for the ICES advise on the European Eel as, for example the data for the glass eel monitoring of the locations Den Oever Spuisluis, IJmuiden, Katwijk, Stellendam and Lauwersoog are used for the ICES glass eel recruitment indices. 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Netherlands reiterates the activities undertaken as part of its monitoring programme, including the <u>monitoring of glass eels</u>.
New Zealand	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The same monitoring programmes are used for all QMS fish stocks. • These involve compulsory commercial logbook programmes, electronic reporting, and requirements for processing firms (all of which must be licensed fish receivers) to provide data on vessel and area-specific fishing effort and landings by species, as well as destinations of all processed fish. • New Zealand does not need to collaborate with other countries to achieve this. • We also monitor elver recruitment at hydro dams to provide indices of recruitment strength. • Other forms of monitoring that assist with assessments of stock status are detailed in the Freshwater eels section of the following link: https://www.mpi.govt.nz/dmsdocument/40781 	
Norway	<p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institute of Marine Research has established at sea listening buoys recording migration 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various monitoring schemes from last 100 years have been established, with most related to sea areas. • Upstream in watercourses only one monitoring program is of any length: Norwegian Institute for Nature Research and their research station at lms • IMR monitors eels through the research fishery data. Fishers are required to record the number of small (under 300 g) and large eels, total weight of small and large eels, the number of fyke nets per fishing trip. • IMR also carries out an annual mark-recapture survey on the western coast of Norway. This survey provides biomass and density estimates for this part of Norway, which are reported to ICES. • Samples are also regularly taken to obtain data on age structure and presence of the swimbladder parasite (<i>Anguillicola crassus</i>). 	
Republic of Korea	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exchange of statistical data on eel capture, harvest and stocking and discussions on resource conservation between Members of the Informal Consultation on International Cooperation for the Conservation and Management of Japanese Eel Stock and Other Relevant Eel Species held annually 	<p>Partially or under development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every year at the Northeast Asia Informal Consultation on the Conservation of <i>Anguilla japonica</i>, exchange of statistical data on catch, harvest, input amount by countries and consultation on resource management is carried out.
Slovakia	No.	No.
Slovenia		<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data on European eel in Slovenia is gathered within the monitoring of fish species as one of the biological quality elements for the evaluation of the ecological status of waters in accordance with the EU Water Framework Directive
Spain	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • European eel fisheries in Spain take place in waters under the jurisdiction of the Autonomous Communities (CC.AA.), in estuaries, lagoons, river mouths...so it is the CC.AA. that apply the control and surveillance measures based on their planning. 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from the actions carried out directly by the fishing administration, there is collaboration between the latter and the Department of the Interior of the Government of Catalonia (Corps of Police Officers and Corps of Rural Agents) on the one hand, and the Nature Protection

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Control and surveillance measures are applied from the capture phase to the first sale and commercialization. In the case of the international stretch of the Miño river, the Naval Command in Tuy (Ministry of Defense) oversees the control and surveillance tasks. 	<p>Service of the Civil Guard on the other. This cooperation is based on the provisions of the law 40/2015.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A preparatory meeting is held prior to the start of the fishery and another at the end, to compare the results and analyse the nature of detected infractions. In this sense, there has been collaboration on several occasions with specific operations of the Civil Guard on poaching and illegal trafficking of elvers and eels. The Environmental Guard of the Government of Navarre carries out monitoring to ensure that the species is not fished in the rivers of the Autonomous Community of Navarre, since the species is banned.
Sweden	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Every third year the Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management (SwAM) commission a scientific report and assessment of the eel stock in Sweden. Latest assessment is from 2018. A new report will be published in July 2021. Sweden collect on the basis of a national program within the EU Data Collection Framework, manage and make available a wide range of fisheries data needed for scientific advice. Annual reports on the implementation of the national data collection programmes to the EU Commission. Sweden provides yearly requested information on stock assessment and data on harvest, trap-and-transport, glass eel releases, etc. to ICES (Ices datacall). Sweden also participate in ICES/EIFAAC WGeel. 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sweden collects on the basis of a national program within the EU Data Collection Framework, manage and make available a wide range of fisheries data needed for scientific advice. Sweden reports annually on the implementation of the national data collection programmes to the EU Commission. Sweden also has fishery independent monitoring program on eel on silver eel and glass eel. We provide yearly requested information on stock assessment and data on harvest, trap-and-transport, glass eel releases, etc. to ICES. Sweden also participates in ICES/EIFAAC WGeel. In order to increase data and knowledge, Sweden participate in an initiated monitoring program on eel migration from the The Baltic Sea using a fishing-independent technology, acoustic telemetry. An infrastructure of receivers is placed at strategic locations such as outlets from lakes and in narrow straits. Eels have been marked every year since 2019. Sweden have arranged regional workshops focusing primarily on to share information and discuss improved methods of data collection and Baltic stock status assessment, control of trade and fishery
Switzerland		Partially or under development

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A survey of mortality rates in migrating eels in the river Rhine is carried out. No additional monitoring programs are known.
Tunisia	<p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GFCM Research programme on European eel: towards coordination of European eel stock management and recovery in the Mediterranean. Research program over 2 years (2021-2022) which includes 4 components or working packages, 1 of which is entitled “Establishment of a common framework for the long-term biological monitoring of eel in the Mediterranean”. 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>GFCM Research programme on European eel</u>: towards coordination of European eel stock management and recovery in the Mediterranean. Research program over 2 years (2021-2022) which includes 4 components or working packages, 1 of which is entitled “Establishment of a common framework for the long-term biological monitoring of eel in the Mediterranean”.
Ukraine	No.	
United Kingdom	<p>Partially or under development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under the eel reg (as retained in GB) and the related Eel Management Plans in place, monitoring is carried out to assess progress towards the 40% silver eel escapement target. 	<p>Partially or under development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under the eel reg (as retained in GB) and the related Eel Management Plans in place, monitoring is carried out to assess progress towards the 40% silver eel escapement target.
United States of America	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Fishery Independent Data Collection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any state or jurisdiction with a commercial glass eel fishery must implement a fishery-independent life cycle survey covering glass/elver, yellow, and silver eels within at least one river system. If possible and appropriate, the survey should be implemented in the river system where the glass eel survey (as required under Addendum III) is being conducted to take advantage of the long-term glass eel survey data collection. At a minimum the survey must collect the following information: fishery-independent index of abundance, age of entry into the fishery/survey, biomass and mortality of glass and yellow eels, sex composition, age structure, prevalence of <i>Anguillicoloides crassus</i> (invasive nematode), and average length and weight of eels in the fishery/survey. Survey proposals will be subject to Technical Committee (TC) review and Board approval. 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The United States of America reiterates the monitoring programmes in place as noted in its response to Notification 2021/018. In relation to Fishery Independent Data Collection, the following additional information is provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yellow eel and silver eel survey requirements, as outlined in <u>Addendum III</u>, vary by state. Descriptions of state monitoring programs can be found in the 2022 Benchmark Stock Assessment Report, Section 5.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States or jurisdictions commercially harvesting less than 750 pounds of glass eels are exempt from this requirement. • Yellow eel and silver eel survey requirements can be found in Addendum III. <p>Fishery Dependent Data Collection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To increase accuracy of reporting, states and jurisdictions with a commercial yellow eel fishery will be required to implement a trip level reporting system for both dealer and harvester reporting. • Dealer and harvester landing catches must submit reports to the state of landing monthly or more frequently, if possible. • This includes reporting on directed commercial harvest, by trip, (pounds landed by life stage, gear type, and catch per unit effort (CPUE)). • Cross referencing between dealer and fishery trip level reporting should be conducted to ensure accuracy. States with more conservative reporting requirements in place will be required to maintain them. • States must continue collect biological data, per Section 3.4.1 of the FMP, from a representative sub-sample of the commercial catch, if available, to evaluate sex and age structure (for yellow/silver eels), length and weight. • States must also continue report on the estimated percent of harvest going to food versus bait. • States and jurisdictions may continue to petition the Board for de minimis status (met if commercial landings are less than 1% of the coastwide total), which exempts them from additional fishery dependent monitoring requirements, per Section 4.4.2 of the FMP. 	
A4: Have stock assessments been developed for some, or all of, the anguillid species in your country? Please explain your answer and where possible provide details including collaborations with other Parties, relevant link(s), reference(s) or additional information, personal experience and/or communications, etc.		
Algeria	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a single stock of <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>. 	
Australia	Yes.	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stocks of the two harvested species, <i>A. australis</i> and <i>A. reinhardtii</i>, (assessed as 'freshwater eels' or 'river eels') are regularly assessed by the state jurisdictions that harvest them, and these stocks are considered to be stable. There is no assessment undertaken for the population status of the remaining three species across their Australian range. Details of stock assessments can be found in Assessment reports for the four target eel fisheries are published on the Department's website: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Queensland: http://www.environment.gov.au/marine/fisheries/qld/eel-fishery New South Wales: http://www.environment.gov.au/marine/fisheries/nsw/estuary Victoria: http://www.environment.gov.au/marine/fisheries/vic/eel Tasmania: http://www.environment.gov.au/marine/fisheries/tas/freshwater-eel 	
Austria		<p>Yes.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States</p>
Belgium		<p>Yes.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States</p>
Canada	<p>Partially or under development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Canadian-wide modelling was unable to define biological reference points for the stock status of American Eel in Canada. Further data and analysis are needed to reach this long-term goal. Trends in relative abundance are similar to the last assessment in 2012 and recovery plan in 2014. Commercial landings and fisheries-independent surveys indicated that American Eel abundance are stable since 2000 but at low abundance. Section 2.4 (Stock Assessment and Stock Scenarios) of the Elver Integrated Fisheries Management Plan describes work that has been completed to develop a stock assessment for the Canadian Elver fishery. 	

China		Yes. No details provided
Croatia	<p>No.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of the status of the eel stock is done under the framework of ICES, STECF and SAC 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the moment there is no sufficient data on eel stock/population size to conduct a proper NDF. Based on ICES recommendation from 2015, IUCN criteria for population assessment should be applied to sexually mature individuals (silver eels) since they represent maximum stock biomass.
Cuba	No.	
Czech Republic	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the national legislation the Czech Republic there is annually monitored stock assessment recording restocking and harvest data on Eels. 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the national legislation of the Czech Republic there is annually monitored stock assessment recording restocking and harvest data on Eels.
Denmark	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>	
Dominican Republic	No.	Partially or under development.
Estonia	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Estonia, calculations based on commercial and fishery independent observed data are used to estimate the escaping silver eel biomass from Narva River Basin District eel management unit (EMU). 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No stock assessment exists for West-Estonian EMU however an annual monitoring fyke net survey exists from the beginning of the 1990s covering 6 different sampling spots in the coastal areas. Results of monitoring are given as CPUE (N/per fyke day). 	
European Union Member States²³	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Commission is monitoring the state of European eel stock on a regular basis. This is done through recurrent and ad-hoc requests to the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) which provides scientific advice on the state of the stock and other specific matters related to eels. The Joint EIFAAC/ICES/GFCM Working Group on Eel (WGEEL) provides the stock assessment and other analysis in support of ICES scientific advices. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ICES Advice on fishing opportunities, catch, and effort, European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) throughout its natural range Expert Group Report 2020 EU request on temporal migration patterns of European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The European Commission monitors the state of European eel stock on a regular basis through recurrent and ad-hoc requests to the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES), which provides scientific advice on the state of the stock and other specific matters related to eels. The <u>Joint EIFAAC/ICES/GFCM Working Group on Eel (WGEEL)</u> provides the stock assessment and other analysis in support of ICES scientific advice. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ICES Advice on fishing opportunities, catch, and effort, European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) throughout its natural range – most recent advice published in November 2022 can be found <u>here</u>. WGEEL Report 2022 <u>EU request on temporal migration patterns of European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>)</u> <u>Stock Annex: Eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) throughout its natural range (figshare.com)</u>
Finland	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See also A3. 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States</p>
France		<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States</p>

²³ NB: The European Union did not provide a separate response to the Notifications, however, in the interest of brevity, the common elements of the responses provided by EU Member States are summarized as such in this table, to avoid repetition.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • France's Eel Management Plan summarizes the monitoring programmes on its territory, which includes monitoring of glass eel recruitment, electrofishing sampling of yellow eel, and monitoring of the estimated downstream migration of silver eel. Furthermore, Eel Density Analysis modelling is undertaken to quantify the evolution of stocks. • France also participates in the GFCM research programme on eel in the Mediterranean Sea. • Reference is made to the Conservation Master Plan for Anguillidae on Reunion Island (2018-2027) for more information on stock assessments of <i>A. bicolor</i>, <i>A. marmorata</i> and <i>A. mossambica</i>.
Germany		<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Germany employs age-structured demographic model ("German Eel Model"; GEM) to generate Eel Management Unit-(EMU)-specific estimates of the actual silver eel escapement biomass, and the potential biomass in absence of anthropogenic mortalities at current and pristine recruitment levels. The model structure of GEM and its data requirements are described in Oeberst and Fladung (2012; but note that the latest version "GEM III" calculates cohort development sex-specifically) and a schematic overview can be found in ICES (2022).
Greece	<p>No.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States</p>
Indonesia		<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Indonesian government has issued harvest quota for eels based on stock assessments through the Decree of the Director General for Marine Spatial Management 2/2023. • Studies:

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fahmi, Z., Supriyadi, F., Suryati, NK. & Muthmainnah, D. 2021. Special Report: Hydroacoustic Monitoring of Anguillid Eels: a preliminary study. SEAFDEC Newsletter Vol. 44 No. 4. October-December 2021. p. 16-17. (http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12066/6914) - Krismono & Kartamihardja, E. S. 2015. Optimal Utilisation and Conservation of Eel (<i>Anguilla</i> spp.) Stock in Poso Watershed, Central Sulawesi. J. Kebijak. Perikan. Ind. Vol. 4 No. 1. P. 9-16. http://dx.doi.org/10.15578/jkpi.4.1.2012.9-16 - Triyanto, Afandi, R., Kamal, M. M., Haryani, G. S. 2020. Stock assessment and potency of sustainable yield of glass eel (<i>Anguilla</i> spp.) in Cimandiri River Estuary, West Java. IOP Conf. Ser.: Earth Environ. Sci. 535 012049. doi:10.1088/1755-1315/535/1/012049 (https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1755-1315/535/1/012049/meta)
Ireland	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A simple Eel Model was created under the Eel Management Plan. • French EDA model has been applied to the Irish data on eel to confirm results with the Irish model. • The data available for eel makes it difficult to create a stock assessment model that captures all life stages and all habitats inhabited. 	
Italy		<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National stock assessment has been developed using ESAM demographic model, an approach evaluated positively in ICES working groups and several research projects (WGEEL and POSE). • Fishing statistics data collection, cooperation with fishermen, Agency LAORE Sardinia, University of Cagliari; description of resident and migrant subpopulations in different fishing sites. • Emilia-Romagna Region Professional fishing data collection of <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> (PNRDA).
Japan	<p>Partially or under development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2019, the Fisheries Agency of Japan launched a research project with the goal of developing a comprehensive assessment of Japanese eel populations. In this research project, 34 research institutes are cooperating to understand trends and size of the Japanese eel resources and implement risk assessment for those resources. The project is multidisciplinary, utilising data/information from various sources (eg. Fish catch records, population genetics, satellite tag of migration surveys, and monitoring of glass-eel recruitment patterns). This will provide essential information for mathematical and statistical assessment models that aim to evaluate the sustainability of eel harvest and input of glass eels into aquaculture ponds. • An estimation of yearly effective population size from genomic data expects to provide a fishery-independent indicator of population trends. • Since 2012, Japan has regularly exchange various data/information of both adult eels and glass eels with China, Korea, and Chinese Taipei under the framework of “the Informal Consultation on International Cooperation for Conservation and Management of Japanese Eel Stock and Other Relevant Eel Species”. • In September 2018, a Regional Workshop on Japanese Eel took place in Tokyo, during which Japan reviewed existing scientific data and information related to Japanese eel, and discussed what kind of scientific research should be conducted in the future from a scientific point of view with participants from Korea and Chinese Taipei. • In March 2020, Japan intended to hold a scientific meeting inviting eel experts from the International Council for the Exploration of the Seas (ICES) and Zoological Society of London (ZSL), with 	

	attendance of China, Korea, and Chinese Taipei, but cancelled it due to COVID-19 pandemic.	
Malaysia	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No stock assessments been conducted yet on anguillid. The focus is more to other species. 	
Mexico	Partially or under development	
Morocco	<p>Partially or under development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The terms of reference of the study mentioned in point A3 provide for the development of a permanent monitoring program related to the management of the species. This program will be built around a battery of indicators relating, among others, to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The determination of the elver recruitment rates, in particular through Recruitment rate Estimation of the elver stock Index of abundance Evaluation of silver eel flows downstream to the sea, by estimating the escapement rate of silver eels. 	
The Netherlands	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In order to monitor the progress achieved via the implementation of the EMP of the Netherlands, every three year an evaluation is submitted to the European Commission. The stock assessment is explained in detail in these reports. 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In order to monitor the progress achieved via the implementation of the Eel management plan of the Netherlands, every three year an evaluation is submitted to the European Commission. The stock assessment is explained in detail in these reports. The two latest reports are available at the following links: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation of the Dutch Eel Management Plan 2018: status of the eel population in 2005-2016 — Research@WUR European Eel (Anguilla anguilla) stock size, anthropogenic mortality and silver eel escapement in the Netherlands 2006-2020 - WUR

New Zealand	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempted to conduct stock assessments for eels in each catchment area for both of the main species (<i>A. australis</i> (shortfin eels) and <i>A. 60nguilla60chia</i> (longfin eels)). • Given each species is considered biologically to come from the same New Zealand-wide population, it is difficult to come up with reference points by catchment area, but the stock status for <i>A. 60nguilla60chia</i> has been determined based on the fact that only a small proportion of the area of occupation is open to fishing or accessible to fishing. • Currently undertaking research into recent developments in spatial stock assessments to assess New Zealand longfin eel. • Fisheries New Zealand also analyses standardised Catch-Per-Unit-of-Effort (CPUE) trends for the fished areas of each catchment, indicating that subpopulations in most catchments are either stable or increasing for both species, with a few notable exceptions in highly populated regions. • The status of both species is meeting management performance measures, including being near or above maximum sustainable yield (MSY) related management targets and well above biomass limits. • Recruitment indices based on elver counts at hydro dams have fluctuated without trend for about 30 years, suggesting that recruitment has remained at healthy levels. • The Department of Conservation also produces a periodic Threat Classification Report for freshwater species (and other groups of species) that includes both species of eels. • <i>A. australis</i> was evaluated as “Not Threatened / increasing” in 2017 using the New Zealand Threat Classification System. • <i>A. 60nguilla60chia</i> was evaluated as “At Risk / declining”. • Three points need to be noted to put this evaluation into context: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the Department of Conservation evaluation was based on projected future status, not current or recent status. The criterion used was a projected 10-70% decline over the next 3 generations. A generation time for this species is about 40 years, so this criterion only requires a projected decrease of 10% over about 120 years. - current trends, however, indicate that the status in each catchment is either stable or increasing. The Department of Conservation report states that (p8): “The panel also notes that public discourse on the longfin eel portrays the species as being severely threatened despite 	
-------------	---	--

	<p>data that indicate otherwise". This was the primary reason for recent reductions in Total Allowable Commercial Catches that were not informed by scientific analyses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - recent stock assessments (2020) by Fisheries New Zealand, reductions in Total Allowable Catches and subsequent increases in abundance, along with information indicating that a substantial proportion of their habitat is either inaccessible or is in designated conservation land (far exceeding 50% in many catchments and 58% overall for the whole country), indicates that they are meeting management targets and are well above biomass limits. 	
Norway	<p>Partially or under development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See under A.3 	
Republic of Korea	No.	No.
Slovakia	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> is introduced in Slovakia 	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> is introduced in Slovakia
Slovenia		<p>Yes.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States</p>
Spain	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the framework of the Eel Management Plans and the annual and post-assessment reports required every three years by EU regulations (see baseline reports on European eel assessment, and by country, in ICES). 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Andalucia, limited monitoring is carried out to estimate populations and escapement levels. • In Catalonia, a number of studies have been ongoing since 2018, including monitoring the status of the European eel population and its recruitment in the Ter River, monitoring elver in the Ebro basin, and monitoring of the recovery of silver eel in the lagoons of the Ebro delta. • In Navarre, annual electrofishing sampling of European eel is carried out in 11 localities in the Bidasoa basin, the only basin which has natural populations of this species, to calculate estimated densities of the species and the production of silver eel. Furthermore, the presence of the species in other basins, where it was repopulated in the

		past, is noted during electrofishing sampling of trout and cyprinids.
Sweden	Yes. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.	Yes. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.
Switzerland		No.
Tunisia	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GFCM Research programme on European eel: towards coordination of European eel stock management and recovery in the Mediterranean. A 2-year research programme (2021-2022) comprising 4 work packages, 1 of which is entitled "Establishment of a common framework for eel stock assessment". 	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GFCM Research programme on European eel: towards coordination of European eel stock management and recovery in the Mediterranean. A 2-year research programme (2021-2022) comprising 4 work packages, 1 of which is entitled "Establishment of a common framework for eel stock assessment".
Ukraine	Partially or under development	
United Kingdom	Partially or under development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary set out in NDF document attached below. 	Partially or under development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The UK is currently finalising a review of its NDF document following review by the Animals Committee and others, and will happily share the final draft once ready.
United States of America	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> most recent stock assessment update was finalized in October 2017. Next benchmark stock assessment is scheduled to be peer reviewed in 2022. 	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The most recent American eel (<i>Anguilla rostrata</i>) Benchmark Stock Assessment was finalized in October 2022 and underwent a peer-review process in November 28-30, 2022, and December 1 and 5, 2022. The benchmark assessment explored several new approaches for American eel, including a delay-difference model and some trend analyses, and developed an egg-per-recruit model. Additionally, the U.S. Geological Survey conducted a pilot assessment of the ability to use a GIS-based habitat analysis to inform eel stock assessments. The Stock Assessment Subcommittee also explored several index-based methods for determining stock status and providing catch advice.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The American eel continues to be at or near historically low levels of abundance due to a combination of stressors (historical overfishing, habitat loss, food web alterations, predation, turbine mortality, environmental changes, toxins and contaminants, and disease). While progress was made with the current assessment (i.e., more robust, better defined abundance indices), challenges remain for assessing the status of this panmictic species and setting catch limits in commercial fisheries for management purposes. • The 2022 American eel Benchmark Stock Assessment is available on the ASMFC website.
A5: Do mechanisms exist to ensure national/international traceability for some, or all of, the anguillid species harvested and traded in your country? Please explain your answer and where possible provide details		
Algeria	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerning national trade, a system for collecting statistical information on commercial catches has been put in place. • For international trade, all trade data are recorded at the level of the customs services. 	
Australia	No.	
Austria		<p>Yes.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>
Belgium		<p>Yes.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>
Canada	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Government and Licence holders have been working together to enhance the traceability of elvers caught in the Maritimes Region. • Under licence conditions, a paper trail must be maintained from the river until the point of sale. • Logbooks are used to document catches at the river, and track transport of elvers from the river to the holding facility. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logbooks also record a running total of elvers kept at holding facilities, as well as information on sales. • Dockside Monitoring Companies independently maintain hail-out and hail-in records, monitor some instances of elvers arriving from the rivers to the holding facility to be weighed, and monitor all elver sales. • Fisheries and Oceans Canada, stakeholders, the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and the Canadian Food Inspection Agency have been working together to develop stricter traceability protocols from the point of sale onwards. • Sales made in Canada should be reported to the Provinces through regular Buyer Reports. • Improving and streamlining reporting procedures from the river to the ultimate destination in eel farms will be an ongoing priority for fisheries stakeholders. 	
China		<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Fisheries Administration of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs and the Endangered Species Import and Export Management Office jointly issued the “Interim Measures for the Traceability Management of European Eel” on December 27, 2016, which converted the imported European eel seedlings into export quotas according to the actual cultivation ratio and allocated them to related breeding enterprises, implemented tracking management, and realized the traceability management of the import and export trade and production and processing of European eel.
Croatia	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The GFCM framework foresees the obligation for establishing a traceability system for landings, sales and exports allowing the catches to be traced from the authorised landing point to the final destination, whether the specimen is sold alive, dead or transformed. • There is a general traceability system in Croatia as there is an obligation to report the entire quantity of fish caught via logbook or catch report, fill the transport document for those catches that are transported as well as an obligation to register first sales via sales note. • A system for traceability of eel, although planned, is not yet in place. 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The GFCM framework mentioned in response to question A2 foresees the obligation for establishing a traceability system for landings, sales and exports allowing the catches to be traced from the authorised landing point to the final destination, whether the specimens are sold alive, dead, or transformed. • The planned traceability system specifically for eel referred to in Croatia’s response to Notification 2021/018

		is not yet in place, and the general traceability system remains in effect.
Cuba	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a system of fishing licenses for each company, all state-owned, and there is a control system for the entire process that includes reports and reports (daily, monthly, and annual) on fisheries, transportation, shipping, and international trade. System is monitored at the national level by the Ministerio de la Industria Alimentaria. Only one company is authorized to export. 	
Czech Republic	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>
Denmark	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquaculture businesses, according to Danish law, are obliged to keep written records of purchased and sold eels to ensure traceability. 	
Dominican Republic	<p>Partially or under development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Export statistics of the General Customs Directorate 	Partially or under development.
Estonia	<p>Partially or under development.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Estonia, there are no special mechanisms for eel, but there are all the usual rules in force stemming from EU legislation set to guarantee traceability of all fresh or processed fish. 	
European Union	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under EU legislation (the Control Regulation), all lots of fisheries and aquaculture products (including eel) shall be traceable at all stages of production, processing and distribution, from catching or harvesting to retail stage. 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under EU regulation (the “Control Regulation”, Council Regulation (EC) No 1224/2009), all lots of fisheries and aquaculture products (including eel) shall be traceable at all stages of production, processing and distribution, from catching or harvesting to retail stage.

Member States²⁴	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fisheries and aquaculture products placed on the market or likely to be placed on the market in the Community shall be adequately labelled to ensure the traceability of each lot. • In the event of import / export of eels (currently not authorised)), the catch certification scheme implemented by the IUU Regulation would apply. • Details on the traceability systems and related issues in the EU context can be found in the Commission report on the evaluation of the Eel Regulation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fisheries and aquaculture products placed on the market or likely to be placed on the market in the EU shall be adequately labelled to ensure the traceability of each lot. • In the event of import / export of eels (currently not authorised), the catch certification scheme implemented by the IUU Regulation (Council Regulation (EC) No 10005/2008) would apply, as well as the specific provisions of Article 12 of the Eel Regulation to identify the origin and ensure the traceability of imported and exported live eels. • Details on the traceability systems and related issues in the EU context can be found in the <u>Commission report on the evaluation of the Eel Regulation</u>.
Finland	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>
France		<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In France, traceability is assured by fishing sheets that enable the identification of the primary producer of eels. The fishing sheet has to be mandatorily filled out by both freshwater and marine professional fisherfolk after fishing, as soon as fish is landed and before it is transported. The information required in Article 58 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1224/2009 of 20 November 2009, establishing a Union control system to ensure compliance with the rules of the common fisheries policy, must be systematically transmitted.
Germany		<p>Yes.</p>

²⁴ NB: The European Union did not provide a separate response to the Notifications, however, in the interest of brevity, the common elements of the responses provided by EU Member States are summarized as such in this table, to avoid repetition.

		<p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Germany, during the implementation of the Eel Regulation and the establishment of the Eel Management Plans, each eel fisher had to be registered and received a unique identification number. In theory, these numbers have to be provided on the invoices when eel is traded. Implementation and control of these rules are the responsibility of the Federal States.
Greece	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regarding Greece the Ministerial Decision No. 643/39462 / 01-04-2013 established the issue of an attestation by the Regional Fisheries Authorities, called “Attestation of Legal Production” for the intra-community movement and trade of eel between member states, stating that the quantity <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> for intra-Community movement between Member States, has been fished or produced from farming in accordance with national and Community legislation and in accordance with the approved National Eel Management Plan (HEMP) in the framework of Regulation 1100/2007. Only with these attestations the CITES Regional Authorities allow the intra-Community movement of the eel issuing the called “simple permits” in order to succeed the traceability requirements for the traded specimens of <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> between EU Member States. 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greece reiterates the existence of Ministerial Decision No. 643/39462/01-04-2013.
Indonesia		<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To utilize eels, it is mandatory to have a Fish Species Utilization Permit (SIPJI) based on the Regulation of the Minister of Marine Affairs and Fisheries 61/2018. There are several types of SIPJI that must be obtained, depending on the scope of activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SIPJI for aquaculture/ranching SIPJI for domestic trade SIPJI for international trade Harvest quota are set annually. In 2023, the quota was published through the Decree of the Director General for Marine Spatial Management 2/2023.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In regards to traceability, the domestic and international transport of eels requires a Domestic Fish Transport Permit (SAJI-DN) and International Fish Transport Permit (SAJI-LN), respectively. The permits allow the government to trace the ranchers, traders, transport destinations, products, and volumes. The request for the permits is submitted through an online application called e-SAJI, in which the transport data are recorded.
Ireland	<p>Partially or under development</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no eels harvested in Ireland as the fishery has been closed and recreational fishery is catch and release. The import of eels is captured by Customs code and volumes monitored by the Trade Department of the Central Statistics Office. 	
Italy		<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specifically for glass eel fisheries, according to Ministerial Decree 12th January 2011. Adult eels follow the national laws for living animal products. Sardinia Region: After the closure of each fishing period, for the following 15 to 20 days (depending on the season) fishermen may retain and sell eels that had been caught by the last day of fishing. The number and weight of individuals retained and sold must be recorded and reported to the Regional Administration, together with tracking and sales documents. Reference regulation: Sardinia Region: Decree Department of Agriculture and agro-pastoral reform N. 1166/DecA/18 del 31/3/ 2023 and Annexes 2, 3, and 4
Japan	<p>Partially or under development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The national government requires each eel farmer to report the input amount of glass eels and production amount of adult eels according to the Inland Water Fishery Promotion Act. 100% traceability for adult eels is being implemented by industry voluntary measures. 	

Malaysia	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landing data is collected throughout the year (not up to species level) 	
Mexico	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No assessment of the population densities of the species throughout its range. No known natural breeding populations of any <i>Anguilla</i> spp. in the eastern Pacific region (Miller et al. 2009). Breeding populations of any <i>Anguilla</i> spp. in the eastern Pacific region are also unknown (Miller et al. 2009). It appears to have been generally common in streams and irrigation ditches until the last century. In the Rio Grande, the species is extirpated in the "Falcón" and "Marte R. Gómez" Reservoirs. Gómez", its last records in this region were in 1963 and 1967 downstream of the "Marte R. Gómez" Dam and in the "Las Lajas" stream (Contreras-Balderas 1996). Information on its biology, distribution and taxonomy is provided. <p>Taxonomy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hypothesised that the European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) and the American eel (<i>Anguilla rostrata</i>) are the same species but are geographic races that differ in the number of species. Geographical races that differ in the number of vertebrae (103 to 111 in the American eel and 110 to 119 in the European eel) (Castro-Aguirre et al. 1999). <p>Biology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> McEachran and Fechhelm (1998) report that this species remains in the larval stage (leptocephali) for at least one year. Metamorphosis into the glass eel stage occurs near the edge of the continental shelf and lasts until individuals reach their freshwater or coastal habitat. Glass eels transform into coloured adult eels, continue in freshwater for years until growth is complete. At the end of this stage they stop feeding and begin to mature, which is when they begin their migration to the sea to reproduce. They spawn in the sea, but growth occurs in estuaries or freshwater. Adults die after spawning. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Migration takes place at unknown depths. It is believed that spawning grounds are thought to be between 20°N and 30°N and 60°W and 75°W. • Females are generally larger than males and migrate much further upstream. Maximum known size is 150 cm total length (TL); adult males at around 30 to 35 cm TL; females mature above 40 cm TL. • The length at which they reach sexual maturity is not known but is assumed to be between 37 cm and 100 cm TL. • Maximum reported age is 43 years (Jessop 1987). • In Mexico, the American eel is a potential predator of the blind white lady (<i>Ogilbia pearsei</i>) and blind eel (<i>Ophisternon infernale</i>) in the open cenotes of Quintana Roo (Schmitter-Soto 2006). <p>Distribution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An anadromous, demersal, subtropical species, found between 0 m and 464 m, in temperatures between 4 °C and 25 °C3. • It is distributed in the western North Atlantic, south to Greenland, along the Atlantic coast from Canada and the United States to Panama, and throughout much of the West Indies south of Trinidad, and the Gulf of Trinidad, including Bermuda and the Gulf of Mexico (McEachran and Fechhelm 1998). • In Mexico, its distribution includes the states of Tamaulipas, Veracruz, Tabasco, Campeche, Yucatan, and Quintana Roo (Flores-Villela and Fernandez 1994). • Not many records of the species in National Collections. In the CNPE (Colección Nacional de Peces, Instituto de Biología, UNAM), there are three records, one from a Cenote in Yucatán, another from the coasts of Tamaulipas and the last from open waters off Tabasco (Espinosa 2012). • Collection record of five specimens in the Colección de Ictiofauna Arrecifal del Sur de Quintana Roo, México (ECOSUR-CH) in the states of Quintana Roo (Tulum and Xel-Ha) and four specimens from the Rio Bravo in Mexico in the Ichthyological Collection of the Faculty of Biological Sciences (UANL) in Tamaulipas and Nuevo León (REMIB). • In the Biosphere Reserve of Los Tuxtlas Biosphere Reserve, Veracruz, Vázquez-Hurtado et al. (2002) report its capture. The specimens collected in this work are deposited in the Mexican Fish Collection (COPEMEX). • In sampling carried out between 1984 and 1986 in the Laguna Madre de Tamaulipas, according to its abundance, it was determined to be 	
--	---	--

	a rare species at the site. This record corresponds to a specimen captured on the bottom (probably sandy) with a depth of 2 m, salinity 11.451 and water temperature 27 °C (Gómez-Soto 1988).	
Morocco	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the national level, a traceability system for fishery products has been put in place with the companies that own the fishing rights. At the international level, traceability is ensured through CITES export permits. 	
The Netherlands	Yes. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.	Yes. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.
New Zealand	Partially or under development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Such mechanisms have been fully developed domestically (see A3) In terms of international trade, our Statistics Department only records the first receiving port and does not differentiate between species. 	
Norway	Yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All landings of marine resources are controlled by Norges Råfisklag. They also ensure traceability and resource control according to quotas and register of fishermen. Packaged and sealed products for domestic trade is marked with 'origin Norway' in Norwegian. 	
Republic of Korea	No. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Korea collects import and export data on eels and follows CITES regulations as appropriate but does not yet have a mechanism dedicated to eel traceability, e.g. catch documents. 	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distribution record management to 21 imported fish species including eel in accordance with Article 27 of the Fishery Products Distribution Management and Support Act.
Slovakia	Partially or under development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Export and import currently not authorised National CITES legislation - in accordance with the Act. No 15/2005 Coll. on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade therein and on the amendment to certain acts. 	Yes Slovakia reiterates the relevant provisions of its National CITES legislation and National legislation on aquaculture.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holder of live fish (including <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) shall the keep “breeding book”, containing specimen holder name, registered office, dates of acquired specimens, species status, quantity, source, and breeding data. • Holder of a live animal specimen (including <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>), are obliged to prove the way of specimen acquisition to the government authority (on request) by a written statement of the way of acquisition. • During each change of the holder of a live animal specimen, the specimen holder shall be obliged to hand over to the new specimen holder along with the specimen the written statement pursuant to letter b) and to keep a copy of it for a period of ten years. <p>National legislation on aquaculture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special national Act on aquaculture is in competence of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development of the Slovak Republic and is under development. • In accordance with Article 19a of the Act No 194/1998 Coll. on the breeding and breeding of livestock Ministry of Agriculture issues fish farming certificates, based on the application. • Fish farming certificates are voluntary. 	
Slovenia		<p>Yes.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>
Spain	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traceability regulations and the existing national traceability control program are the same as for other fishery and aquaculture products. 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Andalusia, capture of eels is prohibited by regional legislation, and there is no (legal) trade in eels originating from Andalusia. • Catalonia has an official control program for fishing traceability and the transmission of information to the consumer regarding fishing and aquaculture products, approved by the General Directorate of Maritime Policy and Sustainable Fishing of the Department of Climate Action, Food and Rural Agenda, on November 18, 2020. The objective of the Catalan Fisheries Traceability Control Program, which is in its third year, is to guarantee that fishing and aquaculture products come from legal, declared and regulated fisheries and aquaculture, in

		<p>accordance with European Union regulations (Regulation (EC) No. 1224/2009 of the Council of 20 November 2009). The Catalan Fisheries Traceability Control Program specifically establishes that, among other things, facilities for the first sale of products from inland fishing (elvers and eel) will be subject to control. However, due to a shortage of technical personnel with exclusive dedication to these tasks, only one <i>in situ</i> control of such economic operators was completed.</p>
Sweden	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2020 the Swedish national fishery control regulation was tightened. • A notification must be made to the Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management (SwAM) at least two hours before arrival at port and eel fishermen must report their positions of in-water holding cages prior their fishing. This gives better possibilities to control trade and IUU-fishing. • Sweden has developed a central IT-system for traceability of fish according to the EU Control regulation (EG 1224/2009) that will be mandatory for the fish receivers and wholesalers. The system is force since January 2019 and will include legally caught eels from the ocean. • SwAM participate in a 3-year Nordic project, where the European eel are one of seven themes, funded by the Nordic Council of Ministers via North Atlantic Fisheries Intelligence Group (NA-FIG). • The project will formalise methods for coordination and cooperation between and within the Nordic countries by following the value chain of eel fishing and trade and will take action against eel-related crime such as illegal fishing and trade. • SwAM participate in EMPACT ENVICRIME OA 2.3 “Raise awareness & lessons learned about illegal trade of glass eels”, which is prioritised by the MS within the framework of the collaboration within the EUROPOL. The project is running for four years (2017-2021) and aims to strengthen and enhance multidisciplinary cooperation from a wide perspective to tackle organised crime groups in their activities. • National authorities and the country administrative boards have worked to use the tools supervision and information to promote the conservation status of eels. The purpose is also to make it easier for 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>

	the county administrative boards to supervise compliance with the law regarding eels.	
Switzerland		Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional fisherfolk have to declare their catch to cantonal authorities and are not allowed to sell this protected species.
Tunisia		No
Ukraine	No.	
United Kingdom	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catch certificates(?) 	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catch returns and declarations are required by law from eel fishers (all life stages), buyers/traders (juvenile eel <12 cm only) and exporters (live eels). Returns and traceability is monitored by the Environment Agency.
United States of America	No. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ASMFC does not have any coastwide measures outside of requiring dealer and harvester reporting which is explained above. No specific traceability program via the ASMFC's FMP but individual states may have programs for traceability such as Maine's glass eel fishery 	No. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ASMFC does not have any coastwide measures outside of requiring dealer and harvester reporting which is explained above. There is not a specific traceability program via the ASMFC's FMP but individual states may have programs for traceability such as Maine's glass eel fishery: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maine elver dealers must report price per unit of measure on a transaction level basis. DMR-provided reporting software must be synchronized for updates to the reporting system prior to the purchase of elvers on each fishing day as defined in Chapter 32.01(4) Maine elver fishery regulations: https://www.maine.gov/dmr/sites/maine.gov/dmr/files/inline-files/Chapter32_03182023_0.pdf In 2019, Maine DMR added regulatory language to monitor elver export events in order to add another layer of assurance. Under this program, an elver export license holder must notify the Maine Marine Patrol of their intention to prepare a shipment of elvers for export 48 hours in advance. The elver export license holder must make arrangements for Maine Marine Patrol to be present when they are preparing the elvers for shipment, including

		the weighing and packing of the elvers for export. Upon completion of the packaging, Maine Marine Patrol seal the shipment of elvers and mark the package of elvers with the weight of elvers contained. The absence of a seal, a broken seal, or the absence of the weight marked on the package are prima facie evidence that the elvers are illegal and subject to seizure. Maine Marine Patrol are required to swipe their card to complete an export transaction.
B. FOR RANGE STATES OF EUROPEAN EEL (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>)		
<p>B1: Have you made a non-detriment finding (NDF) for trade in European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>)?</p> <p>If “No”, please explain why this is the case.</p> <p>If “Yes”,</p> <p>a) what information source(s) was used? If possible, please provide NDFs and any relevant reports, links and/or analyses related to sources and uses for the NDF (Please indicate if you are happy to share the NDF on the CITES website)</p> <p>b) Was the NDF carried out at a local, national or regional level (i.e. together with other range States, therefore incorporating a large proportion of, or the entire population)?</p>		
Algeria	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data in progress as part of a stock assessment. 	
Australia	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Australia is not a range state for European eel and do not make our own non-detriment finding for imported species. 	
Austria		<p>No.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>
Belgium		<p>No.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>
Canada	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not a range state. 	

Croatia	<p>No.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No sufficient data on eel stock/population size to conduct proper NDF. • Based on ICES recommendation from 2015, IUCN criteria for population assessment should be applied to sexually mature individuals (silver eels) since they represent maximum stock biomass. • Review of the IUCN assessment for Croatia was done, and species was categorized as “Data Deficient” on national level. • Historical data on distribution and population size of European eel in Croatia are very scarce and doesn't differentiate between different life stages of eels (glass, yellow or silver). • More recent and available data refers mostly to glass and yellow eel; however, these data are insufficient to provide for the NDF or assessment on recent stock. • Strong implications that there are serious population declines in all-natural habitats. • Lack of recent, as well as historical data on population size and life stages are main reason why there is no stock assessment or NDF for eels in Croatia. 	<p>No.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Croatia reiterates that the lack of recent, as well as historical data on population size and life stages are the main reason why there is no stock assessment or NDF for eels in Croatia.
Czech Republic	<p>No.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>
Denmark	<p>No.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>	
Dominican Republic		<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a range State
Estonia	<p>No.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>	

European Union Member States²⁵	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EU Scientific Review Group (SRG) has confirmed its negative opinion on imports from all range States, as well as the zero-export quota for <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> for all Member States, in 2021. • This opinion reflects the critical status of the stock of European eel as well as the scientific advice by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) that, "when the precautionary approach is applied for European eel, all anthropogenic impacts (e.g. recreational and commercial fishing on all stages, hydropower, pumping stations, and pollution) decreasing production and escapement of silver eels should be reduced to – or kept as close to – zero as possible". • SRG is of the opinion that it is currently not possible to make a non-detriment finding for trade in European eels. 	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Export from and import into the EU of European eels are not authorised since the negative opinion formed by the EU Scientific Review Group on 3 December 2010, considering that it was not possible for the CITES scientific authorities in the EU to deliver a non-detriment finding for any export from or import into the EU of European eels. • The above remains valid until at least the end of 2023 following the decision made by the Scientific Review Group on 17 December 2022. • This opinion reflects the critical status of the stock of European eel as well as the scientific advice by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES).
Finland	<p>No.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>
France		<p>No.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>
Germany		<p>No.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>
Greece	<p>No.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>
Ireland	<p>No.</p>	

²⁵ NB: The European Union did not provide a separate response to the Notifications, however, in the interest of brevity, the common elements of the responses provided by EU Member States are summarized as such in this table, to avoid repetition.

	<p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The commercial fishery is closed in Ireland and no stocking takes place requiring the purchase of eels from another range state 	
Italy		<p>No.</p> <p>See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the regional/national level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lanzoni M., Gavioli A., Castaldelli G., Aschonitis V., Milardi M. (2022). Swoon over the moon: The influence of environmental factors on glass eels entering Mediterranean coastal lagoons. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science, vol. 264, p. 107668, ISSN: 0272-7714, doi: 10.1016/j.ecss.2021.107668 Mattia Lanzoni, Vassilis Aschonitis, Marco Milardi, Elisa Anna Fano, Giuseppe Castaldelli (2018). A method to identify bimodal weight-length relations: Possible ontogenetic diet and/or metabolism shift effects in <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> (actinopterygii: Anguilliformes: Anguillidae). Acta Ichthyologica Et Piscatoria, vol. 48, p. 163-171, ISSN: 0137-1592, doi: 10.3750/AIEP/02400; Aschonitis Vasileios, Castaldelli Giuseppe, Lanzoni Mattia, Rossi Remigio, Kennedy Clive, Fano Elisa Anna (2017). Long-term records (1781- 2013) of European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i> L.) production in the Comacchio Lagoon (Italy): Evaluation of local and global factors as causes of the population collapse. Aquatic Conservation-Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems, vol. 27, p. 502-520, ISSN: 1052-7613, doi: 10.1002/aqc.2701.
Japan	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Japan is not a range state of the European eel. 	
Malaysia	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Malaysia is not a range state. 	
Morocco	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Studies to issue a non-detriment finding are underway 	

The Netherlands	<p>No.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>
New Zealand	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No catch, export or import this species. • Records of imports of <i>Anguilla</i> spp. with the species name not being reported – including imports from countries that may be involved in the illegal trafficking of <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>. • Information reported in the 2018 questionnaire has turned out to be inaccurate – for reasons unknown. There it was indicated that trivial amounts of imports of <i>Anguilla</i> spp. of 1,020 kg in total from 2009-2014, with no records of imports from 2015-2017; however, the revised information (same source but a different, more complete extract) provides much higher levels of imports (25-30 tonnes in recent years). • By regulation, all eels imported to New Zealand must be pre-cooked. 	
Norway	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A general NDF has not been made due to the lack of exports from Norway. 	
Republic of Korea	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When the exporting country is not a party to CITES, the relevant data cannot be checked. 	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because European eels are not allowed for domestic implant, import of European eels is prohibited.
Slovakia	<p>No</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>
Slovenia		<p>No.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>
Spain	<p>No.</p>	<p>No.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scientific Authorities of the SRG consider that its preparation for export is not possible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In line with the negative opinion of the European Union Scientific Review Group that bans exports of European eel.
Sweden	<p>No.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>See the common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>
Switzerland		<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no international trade in this species and catches are only used locally. However, at the level of the IBKF (Internationale Bevollmächtigtenkonferenz für die Bodenseefischerei), there is a management plan according to which catches may be made in Lake Constance.
Tunisia	<p>No</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The quantity exported has never exceeded the annual quota 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eel NDF report, October 2021, developed at the national level, based on analysis of trade/customs data and fisheries dependent data.
Ukraine	No.	
United Kingdom	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information source(s) used: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Species-specific stock assessment Fisheries dependent data Ecosystem modelling Fisheries models Copy of NDF was provided NDF was carried out at local/sub-national and national levels 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information source(s) used: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Species-specific stock assessment Customs/trade data analysis Fisheries dependent data Ecosystem modelling Fisheries models NDF was carried out at local/sub-national and national levels
United States of America	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> U.S.A is not a range state for European Eel 	

B2: What, if any, restrictions apply to the harvest and/or trade in **glass eels** in your country? Please explain your answer and where possible provide details on the measures in place, when they came into force, penalties, etc.

Algeria	<p>Strict measures to limit harvest and / or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prohibition of capture of individuals (glass eels, eels) not having the minimum market size except those intended for breeding, the capture of which is subject to the authorization provided by the administration in accordance with the provisions of the executive decree. n ° 04-188 of July 7, 2004 fixing the methods of capture, transport, marketing and introduction into aquatic environments of broodstock, larvae, fry and spat as well as the methods of capture, transport, storage, importation and marketing of fishery and aquaculture products that have not reached the minimum regulatory size intended for breeding, cultivation or scientific research. Compliance with the minimum market size when capturing eels in accordance with the provisions of Executive Decree No. 04-86 of March 18, 2004 setting the minimum market sizes of biological resources, amended and supplemented. 	
Austria		See common response provided by European Union Member States.
Belgium		<p>See also common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Belgium all fishing of glass eels (recreational and commercial) is strictly forbidden in inland, coastal and sea waters.
Croatia	<p>Limited restrictions on harvest and/or trade.</p> <p>See also common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Croatia, this species is strictly protected in part of its range within two protected areas (National park "Krka" and Nature park "Vransko jezero"), while in other parts of its range fishing is allowed in compliance with fishery management plans. 	<p>Limited restrictions on harvest and/or trade</p> <p>See also common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Croatia reiterates the different levels of protection afforded to this species in different parts of its range (see response to Notification 2021/018).
Czech Republic	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p> <p>See also common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Czech Republic the fishing of glass eels is not permitted. 	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p> <p>See also common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Czech Republic the fishing of glass eels is not permitted.
Denmark	<p>No restrictions on harvest and/or trade</p> <p>See also common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Denmark has no veterinary restrictions; hence eels are not susceptible to any notable fish diseases. 	
Dominican Republic	<p>Limited restrictions on harvest and / or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Export quota system per company from the season October 2020 to March 2021, and closure of capture from March to October. 	<p>Limited restrictions on harvest and/or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a closed season that prohibits the capture of all stages of eel, including adults, from 1 April to 1 October.
Estonia	<p>No restrictions on harvest and/or trade</p> <p>See also common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Estonia, there are no restrictions because glass eels do not reach Estonian coast and there is no harvesting. Glass eels are bought (either from France or UK) and stocked to some of Estonian lakes yearly and these operations are monitored by the Environmental Board. There are also 2 eel farms in Estonia that buy glass eels or elvers, grow them and sell for consumption. 	
European Union Member States²⁶	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Temporary fishing closures apply at EU level (See A2). They also include the glass eel life stage in marine and transitional waters for commercial and recreational fishing. WKEELMIGRATION report provides some information on the fishing closures. MS have various measures on restricting fishing set. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under the Eel Regulation, EU Member States permitting fishing for eels of less than 12 cm in length are obliged to reserve at least 60% of their catches to be marketed for use in restocking for the purpose of increasing the escapement levels of silver eels. Temporary fishing closures apply at EU level. They include the glass eel life stage in marine and transnational waters for commercial and recreational fishing. More information on fishing closures is available in the WKEELMIGRATION report. EU MS have taken various measures on restricting fishing. For example, Ireland has introduced a full ban on eel fishing in its whole territory and all year round, while Spain allows for commercial and recreational fishing, including

²⁶ NB: The European Union did not provide a separate response to the Notifications, however, in the interest of brevity, the common elements of the responses provided by EU Member States are summarized as such in this table, to avoid repetition.

		glass eel, with temporary closures set. Some details are included in the country reports annexed to the WGEEL reports in support of annual ICES advice on European eel.
Finland	<p>Limited restrictions on harvest and/or trade.</p> <p>See also common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No wild glass eels migrate to Finnish coast. Earlier studies have shown that all naturally migrating eels have reached yellow-eel stage when arriving to Finnish waters. • Glass eels captured elsewhere in the EU are restocked to Finnish waters. • Import of glass eels from other EU countries requires a permission from Finnish Food Authority. 	<p>See also common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No wild glass eels migrate to the Finnish coast. Earlier studies have shown that all naturally migrating eels have reached yellow-eel stage when arriving to Finnish waters. Instead, glass eels captured elsewhere in the EU are restocked to Finnish waters following relevant international and EU legislation.
France		<p>Strict measures to limit harvest and/or trade</p> <p>See also common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In France, only professional fisherfolk (both marine and freshwater) are allowed to capture glass eels during 5 months of the year on the Atlantic coast (1 November to 25 May, from south to north). The glass eel fishing season is fixed by decree of 28 October 2013 concerning the fishing season for European eel of less than 12 cm. • Every take of glass eels must obtain a prior fishing permit and is subject to a system of quotas that are defined every year for the following fishing season. The rules foresee that fishing closures may be decreed when 80% of the quota is reached. The permitting system has enabled a faster and more accurate monitoring of quotas. • Taking glass eels from the Mediterranean is prohibited (article R.922-48 of the Rural and Maritime Fishing Code) • 60% of the take of glass eels must be reserved for restocking within the framework of the Eel Management Plan imposed by Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/2007. • Punishments for non-compliant fishing of European eel includes a prison sentence of 6 months and a fine of 50,000 EUR. The punishment for trafficking of protected species (including European eel) includes a prison sentence of 1 year and a fine of 150,000 EUR, which

		increases to 7 years imprisonment and 750,000 EUR fine in case the trafficking involves organised crime.
Germany		<p>Limited restrictions on harvest and/or trade</p> <p>See also common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Germany, the catch of European glass eels caught in national waters is prohibited through minimum landing sizes, as defined in the fisheries laws and regulations of the Federal States. Yet, due to low numbers of natural recruitment in national watersheds, the Federal Republic of Germany is a major recipient country for the import of live glass eels and fingerlings caught elsewhere. Germany engages in national trade especially for the rearing of juvenile eels in aquaculture facilities (so-called eel farms), as well as for releases into German water systems and river basins. Except for the general obligations on traceability and documentation resulting from the Eel Regulation (1100/2007; Art. 12) and from the listing in Annex II of CITES, no further restrictions apply.
Greece	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p> <p>See also common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regarding Greece according to the Royal Decree 142/1971, A 49, fishing for eel smaller than 30cm is totally prohibited for commercial exploitation in Greece. 	<p>See also common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Greece, a total ban on commercial exploitation of glass eel is implemented since 1971: According to the Royal Decree 142/1971, A' 49, fishing for any eel smaller than 30 cm is totally prohibited for commercial exploitation in Greece.
Ireland	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p> <p>See also common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ireland has introduced a full ban on eel fishing everywhere and all year round. In Ireland commercial eel fishing was suspended in 2009 with a byelaw prohibiting the issuing of fishing licences. Conservation of Eel Fishing (Prohibition on Issue of Licences) Bye-law No. 858, 2009. 	
Italy		Limited restrictions on harvest and/or trade

		<p>See also common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Glass eel fisheries are regulated by Ministerial Decree of 12th January 2011. In 2023, commercial eel fisheries are prohibited at all life stages from 1st January to 30th June. • In Sardinia Region, harvest of glass eels is not allowed (Decree N. 1166 /DECA/18 of 31/03/2023 of Sardinia Region, Department of Agriculture and agro-pastoral reform) • In Emilia-Romagna Region: Regional Regulation n. 1/2018. • In Umbria Region, like in the other Region involved in the eel management plan the commercial fishing has been recently closed from 1 April to 30 June 2023, while recreational fishing has been closed for the whole year (D.M. 15258015-13/03/2023). Since 2020 the commercial fishing is closed from 1 January to 31 March of each year (D.M. 403-25/07/2019).
Malaysia	<p>No restrictions on harvest and/or trade.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No study been conducted yet on eels in general, including the identification and distribution of eel species in Sabah water. 	
Morocco	<p>Strict measures to limit harvest and / or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eel fishing within the framework of a leasing of fishing rights is framed according to the specifications provided for by Law No. 130-12 on inland fishing and aquaculture. • The latter has set several restrictive measures to ensure responsible fishing, including a fishing quota for glass eels set at 2,000 kg and a ban on the trade and export of glass eels and eels not exceeding 12 cm. • All the quantities of glass eels caught must be intended exclusively for fattening in a breeding facility that the company must dispose of. 	
The Netherlands	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p> <p>See also common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the Netherlands no glass eel fisheries are allowed. 	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvests and/or trade</p> <p>See also common response provided by European Union Member States.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum landing size of eel in the Netherlands is 28 centimetres (see: article 5.b of the Uitvoeringsregeling visserij). • Only in case of scientific research, are glass eels harvested in very limited numbers, when appropriate documentations and licenses are issued. • No commercial harvest of glass eels. • Note: EU measures in place for international trade: 0-exportquotum en import ban (negative opinion EU SRG) for <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Netherlands reiterates the prohibitions in place on glass eel fisheries
New Zealand	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not permissible to catch or retain eels less than 220 grams; however, the regulated size of escape holes in eel nets ensures that few individuals less than 300 grams are caught. • No glass eels are harvested or exported. 	
Norway	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ban on catching of glass eels. This product has never been of interest for Norwegian fisheries 	
Republic of Korea	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article 68 (Penalty) of the Wildlife Protection and Management Act provides that a person who has exported, imported, transferred or introduced an internationally endangered species or product therefrom or a person who has failed to register or falsely registered a husbandry facility for an internationally endangered species is subject to imprisonment of up to 3 years or criminal fine of up to KRW 30 million. • Article 69 (Penalty) of the Wildlife Protection and Management Act provides that a person who has used an internationally endangered species or product therefrom for the purposes of import or introduction or a person who has captured, harvested, purchased, received, assigned, or mediated for receiving or assigning, owned, occupied or displayed an internationally endangered species is subject to imprisonment of up to 2 years or criminal fine of up to KRW 20 million. • Article 17 (Confiscation) of the Wildlife Protection and Management Act provides that an internationally endangered species or product therefrom that has been imported or introduced without authorization or that is used for purposes other than the original purposes for the import or introduction or an internationally endangered species or 	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum 3 years in prison or maximum 30 million KRW in fines in accordance with Article 68(Penalty) of the Wildlife Protection and Management Act <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - one who has exported, imported, taken out or brought in an internationally endangered species and products of it - one who has not registered or falsely registered a farming facility farming an internationally endangered species • Maximum 2 years in prison or maximum 20 million KRW in fines in accordance with Article 69(Penalty) of the Wildlife Protection and Management Act <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - one who has used an internationally endangered species and its products for purposes other than its initial purpose of bringing in - one who has caught, taken, purchased, received, transferred, mediated a transfer, own, occupy or displayed an internationally endangered species and its products

	product therefrom that has been captured, harvested, purchased, received, assigned or displayed without authorization is subject to confiscation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Article 71(Confiscation) of the Wildlife Protection and Management Act <ul style="list-style-type: none"> internationally endangered species and its products imported or brought in or used for purposes other than the purpose of bringing in without authorization internationally endangered species and its products caught, taken, purchased, received, transferred, mediated for transfer or displayed without authorization
Slovakia	<p>No restrictions on harvest and/or trade.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only obligations in relation to trade in glass eel (intra EU trade) (See A.5) 	<p>See also common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only obligations in relation to trade in glass eel (intra EU trade) (see A.5)
Slovenia		<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p> <p>See also common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> European eel is a protected species in Slovenia, therefore harvesting of the species is prohibited.
Spain	<p>Some restrictions on catching or trade.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The regulation regarding catches is established in each Autonomous Community by its management plan and regional reference regulations. In the case of the international section of the river Miño (TIRM), the regulations are included in its management plan and in the annual Fishing Edict approved within the Permanent Commission of the TIRM. The C.A. Andalusia has prohibited European eel fishing in all its phases since the start of the management plans in 2010. Regarding trade, the European eel is included in Annex II of CITES, and within the framework of the EU regulations, the import and export of European eel and its products with third countries is prohibited. 	<p>Limited restrictions on harvest and/or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each Autonomous Community has established its own regulations regarding the harvest and trade in glass eels. Some completely ban fishing of eels less than 12 cm in length (eg. Navarre, Murcia, Balearic Islands), while others only allow recreational fishing (eg. Basque Country). Still others impose limits on the fishing season (eg. Asturias, Cantabria). Decree 209/2020 of December 9, 2020, which establishes measures for the recovery of the European eel, prohibits harvest of eel in Andalusia. Exports via Andalusian ports and airports of specimens destined for countries outside the EU are prevented, and confiscated specimens are reintroduced into the natural environment. The first sentences of the Court of Algeciras against eel trafficking networks have recently been issued.
Sweden	Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade	See the response provided by European Union Members States.

	<p>See also common response provided by European Union Member States.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sweden has no glass eel fishery. • Glass eels are imported to one facility in Sweden for quarantine before release in nature and culture. • Handling is controlled by the County Administrative Board regarding national legislation. 	
Switzerland		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eel is protected in Switzerland with the exception of Lake Constance. Glass eels are protected but there is no (or very little) natural recruitment.
Tunisia	<p>Strict measures to limit harvest and / or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The decree of September 28, 1995 regulating the exercise of fishing is the main implementing text of law n ° 94-13 of January 31, 1994. It includes the conservation measures fixing the minimum catch size for the eel. at 30 cm. 	<p>Strict measures to limit harvest and/or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The decree of September 28, 1995 regulating the exercise of fishing is the main implementing text of law n ° 94-13 of January 31, 1994. It includes the conservation measures fixing the minimum catch size for the eel. at 30 cm.
Ukraine	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In accordance with the Order No 29 of 19 January 2021 of the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Ukraine European Eel is listed in the Red Data Book of Ukraine. • Pursuant to the Law of Ukraine "On the Red Data Book of Ukraine" taking Red Data Book species from the wild is prohibited except for scientific and conservation purposes under special permit issued by the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Ukraine based on a finding of the National Red Data Book Commission. 	
United Kingdom	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishing authorisations and fishing season • Catch certificates 	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The glass eel fisheries in England was updated following the change to zero catch ICES advice in 2021,. Each application for trade is also considered by authorities on a case-by-case basis. This allows for close monitoring of the markets that the eels are being sent to. • Authorisations are required to fish for glass eels, these are only available for rivers where control measures are in place and the fishing / trade of catch is in accordance with the UK NDF. Control measures involve either restocking or fishing restrictions (shortened season). In 2022, a

		<p>mixture of measures was used across rivers. In 2023, the season was shortened in all rivers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fishing authorisations are subject to conditions which restrict effort: hand-held net with maximum dimensions only; no boat fishing; fishing is prohibited near to migratory obstructions and in narrow streams / channels; season length.
United States of America	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regarding the American eel, only two states allow for the harvest of glass eel. Maine and South Carolina. FMP restricts the amount of harvest for Maine to 9,688 lbs. For any state or jurisdiction managed with a commercial glass/elver eel quota, if an overage occurs in a fishing year, that state or jurisdiction will be required to deduct their entire overage from their quota the following year, on a pound for pound basis. Any state or jurisdiction with a commercial glass eel fishery is required to implement daily trip-level reporting with daily electronic accounting to the 9 state for both harvesters and dealers to ensure accurate reporting of commercial glass eel harvest. State of Maine's swipe card system is used by the state as a dealer report. 	