CONVENCIÓN SOBRE EL COMERCIO INTERNACIONAL DE ESPECIES AMENAZADAS DE FAUNA Y FLORA SILVESTRES

_____

Trigésima tercera reunión del Comité de Fauna
Ginebra (Suiza), 12 – 19 de julio de 2024

Conservación y comercio de especies

Especies acuáticas

ANGUILAS (*ANGUILLA* SPP.)

1. El presente documento ha sido presentado por la copresidencia del Grupo de trabajo entre reuniones del Comité de Fauna sobre anguilas *(Anguilla* spp)*.*[*]

2. En su 19ª reunión (Ciudad de Panamá, 2022), la Conferencia de las Partes adoptó las Decisiones 19.218 a 19.221, sobre *Anguilas* (Anguilla *spp.*), como sigue:

Dirigida a los Estados del área de distribución de la anguila europea (Anguilla anguilla), a las Partes de tránsito y de importación

19.218 *Se alienta a los Estados del área de distribución de la anguila europea (Anguilla anguilla), a las Partes de tránsito y de importación a:*

a) reforzar la coordinación entre los Estados del área de distribución, las Partes de (re-) exportación e importación para mejorar la trazabilidad y las medidas efectivas de aplicación de la ley para el comercio de Anguilla *spp., en particular la anguila europea;*

b) presentar a la Secretaría para su inclusión en el sitio web de la CITES todos los estudios sobre dictámenes de extracción no perjudicial sobre la anguila europea que hayan realizado; examinar las diferentes metodologías que podrían adoptarse para elaborar dictámenes sobre anguilas europeas comercializadas como alevines (FIG) en comparación con las comercializadas como otras anguilas vivas (LIV); colaborar y compartir información con otras Partes en relación con dichos estudios y sus resultados, especialmente cuando las Partes compartan cuencas de captación o masas de agua; procurar el asesoramiento y la revisión de los dictámenes de extracción no perjudicial por parte del Comité de Fauna u otro órgano adecuado cuando proceda;

c) elaborar y/o aplicar planes de gestión adaptativa de la anguila o examinarlos y revisarlos periódicamente a escala nacional o subnacional (o de la cuenca), con metas definidas y plazos concretos, e incrementar la colaboración dentro de los países entre las autoridades y otros interesados responsables de la gestión de la anguila, y también entre los países que compartan masas de agua o cuencas;

d) aplicar las recomendaciones sobre la presentación de informes enunciadas en el documento SC75 Doc. 12 a fin de garantizar que, según proceda, el comercio de anguilas se declara a

[*] *Las denominaciones geográficas empleadas en este documento no implican juicio alguno por parte de la Secretaría CITES o del Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente sobre la condición jurídica de ninguno de los países, zonas o territorios citados, ni respecto de la delimitación de sus fronteras o límites. La responsabilidad sobre el contenido del documento incumbe exclusivamente a su autor.*

nivel de especie y se diferencia por su fase biológica (como se establece en las Directrices para la preparación y presentación de informes anuales CITES*);*

e) *compartir información sobre las evaluaciones de las poblaciones, las extracciones, los resultados del seguimiento y otros datos pertinentes con el Grupo de trabajo conjunto sobre anguilas (WGEEL) de la Comisión Asesora Europea sobre Pesca Continental y Acuicultura, el Consejo Internacional para la Exploración del Mar y la Comisión General de Pesca del Mediterráneo (EIFAAC/ICES/GFCM), con el fin de obtener una imagen completa del estado de la población de anguila europea;*

f) *elaborar medidas o aplicar las medidas existentes con mayor eficacia, para mejorar la trazabilidad o la evaluación de la adquisición legal de las anguilas en el comercio (tanto vivas como muertas) y en la acuacultura y compartirlas con la Secretaría;*

g) *facilitar a la Secretaría información sobre cualquier cambio en las medidas que hayan adoptado para restringir el comercio de angulas o jaramugos de anguila europea vivos;*

h) *compartir con la Secretaría, en su caso, protocolos y directrices para la reintroducción de anguilas europeas decomisadas vivas en el medio silvestre; y*

i) *proporcionar información a la Secretaría sobre la aplicación de la presente decisión o sobre posibles actualizaciones de la información presentada anteriormente en respuesta a la Notificación a las Partes No. 2021/018 sobre las anguilas, para que pueda informar al Comité de Fauna y al Comité Permanente, según proceda.*

Dirigida a la Secretaría

19.219 *La Secretaría deberá:*

a) *publicar una notificación invitando a los Estados del área de distribución de la anguila europea (Anguilla anguilla), las Partes de tránsito e importación a transmitir a la Secretaría información sobre la aplicación de la Decisión 19.218 toda la información solicitada en la Notificación a las Partes No. 2021/018 que aún no se haya proporcionado o cualquier actualización de la información previamente remitida en respuesta a la Notificación a las Partes No. 2021/018 sobre las anguilas, especialmente la información sobre los niveles actuales, o las tendencias emergentes, del comercio de especímenes de Anguilla spp.;*

b) *preparar y presentar un resumen de las respuestas a la Notificación a las Partes No. 2021/018 sobre las anguilas, incluyendo las posibles actualizaciones proporcionadas con arreglo a la Decisión 19.218, con proyectos de recomendación sobre la conservación y gestión de la anguila europea al Comité de Fauna y proyectos de recomendación para mejorar la aplicación de la Convención en relación con la anguila europea al Comité Permanente, para su consideración; y*

c) *presentar el estudio preparado en aplicación de la Decisión 18.199, párrafo b), sobre los niveles de comercio y las pautas comerciales, especialmente de anguilas vivas para la acuicultura, y las fuentes de suministro, e identificar cualquier diferencia entre estos, y proyectos de recomendaciones para una gestión futura más eficaz de las capturas y el comercio para que sean considerados por el Comité de Fauna y el Comité Permanente, según proceda.*

Dirigida al Comité de Fauna

19.220 *El Comité de Fauna deberá:*

a) *previa solicitud, examinar los informes presentados por las Partes sobre la formulación de dictámenes de extracción no perjudicial para el comercio de anguila europea y proporcionar asesoramiento y orientaciones, según sea necesario; y*

b) *considerar el estudio que se menciona en el párrafo c) de la Decisión 19.219 y el informe producido por la Secretaría con arreglo al párrafo b) de la Decisión 19.219 y formular recomendaciones a fin de mejorar la conservación y gestión de la anguila europea para que*

sean consideradas por el Comité Permanente y o la 20ª reunión de la Conferencia de las Partes, según proceda.

Dirigida al Comité Permanente

19.221 *El Comité Permanente deberá:*

a) *examinar el informe preparado por la Secretaría y cualquier otra información disponible sobre el comercio ilegal de la anguila europea y formular recomendaciones según proceda;*

b) *examinar cualquier asesoramiento y recomendaciones del Comité de Fauna en relación con la Decisión 19.220 y formular recomendaciones a fin de mejorar la aplicación de la Convención para la anguila europea y la viabilidad de preparar una resolución específica para las Partes o la Conferencia de las Partes, según proceda;*

c) *con la asistencia de la Secretaría, colaborar con la Organización Mundial de Aduanas para examinar la viabilidad de armonizar los códigos aduaneros pertinentes para el comercio de todas las especies de* Anguilla; *e*

d) *informar sobre la aplicación de esta decisión en la 20ª reunión de la Conferencia de las Partes.*

3. En su 32ª reunión (AC32; Ginebra, junio de 2023), el Comité de Fauna examinó el documento AC32 Doc. 36, preparado por la Secretaría, y acordó establecer un grupo de trabajo entre períodos de sesiones con el mandato que figura en el acta resumida AC32 SR:

4. Se acordó que el grupo de trabajo estuviera integrado por:

Copresidencia:	representante de América Central y del Sur y el Caribe (Sr. Gongora), representante de Europa (Sr. Benyr[1]), y representante suplente de Europa (Sr. Novitsky);
Partes:	Alemania, Australia, Austria, Brasil, Canadá, China, Estados Unidos de América, India, Indonesia, Japón, Malasia, Nueva Zelanda, Portugal, Reino Unido de Gran Bretaña e Irlanda del Norte, República de Corea, Unión Europea; y
OIG y ONG:	Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Alimentación y la Agricultura, Unión Internacional para la Conservación de la Naturaleza, Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center, Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Global Guardian Trust, IWMC-World Conservation Trust, Species Survival Network, Fondo Mundial para la Naturaleza, Zoological Society of London.

5. En su 77ª reunión (SC77; Ginebra, noviembre de 2023), el Comité Permanente examinó el documento SC77 Doc. 66 sobre *Anguilas* (Anguilla *spp*.) y acordó solicitar la opinión del Comité de Fauna sobre la posible elaboración de una resolución específica sobre las anguilas europeas o una resolución sobre el género *Anguilla* spp. Se creó un grupo de trabajo entre período de sesiones del Comité Permanente con el siguiente mandato:

a) examinar el resumen de las respuestas a las Notificaciones a las Partes No. 2021/018 y No. 2023/062 sobre las anguilas preparado por la Secretaría, incluyendo cualquier información actualizada comunicada con arreglo a la Decisión 19.218 y cualquier recomendación de la Secretaría a fin de mejorar la aplicación de la Convención para las anguilas europeas;

b) considerar las recomendaciones del Comité de Fauna;

c) estudiar la viabilidad de elaborar una resolución específica sobre la anguila europea; y

d) elaborar proyectos de recomendaciones destinados a mejorar la aplicación de la Convención para la anguila europea, que se someterán a la consideración del Comité Permanente en su 78ª reunión.

[1] *Tras la reunión AC32 la Sra. Zikova remplazó al Sr. Gerald Benyr como representante por Europa*

6. A solicitud de la Presidencia del Comité de Fauna, se acordó modificar el mandato del grupo de trabajo entre período de sesiones del Comité de Fauna sobre anguilas de la siguiente manera:

   a) examinar el resumen de las respuestas a la Notificación a las Partes No. 2021/018 y la Notificación a las Partes No. 2023/062 sobre anguilas, incluida cualquier información actualizada proporcionada con arreglo a la Decisión 19.218 y cualquier recomendación formulada por la Secretaría; y

   b) examinar el uso potencial del código fuente R (cría en granjas) para especímenes de anguila europea (*A. anguilla*) procedentes de sistemas de producción acuícola y los riesgos y beneficios potenciales de la reintroducción en el medio natural de anguilas europeas incautadas y vivas;

   c) a solicitud del Comité Permanente en su 77ª reunión (SC77, Ginebra, noviembre de 2023), considerar la posibilidad de elaborar una resolución específica sobre las anguilas europeas o una resolución sobre el género *Anguilla* spp.; y

   d) elaborar proyectos de recomendaciones sobre la conservación y la gestión de la anguila europea para que el Comité de Fauna los examine en su 33ª reunión.

7. El grupo de trabajo conjunto entre períodos de sesiones realizó su labor por medios electrónicos para dar cumplimiento a su mandato.

Párrafo a) del mandato

8. La Secretaría proporcionó un resumen consolidado de las respuestas a la Notificación a las Partes No. 2021/018 y a la Notificación a las Partes No. 2023/062 sobre anguilas, incluidas las informaciones actualizadas facilitadas en virtud de la Decisión 19.218 sobre *Anguilas (Anguilla* spp.*)*. Dicho resumen figura en el anexo del presente documento.

9. La Secretaría recomendó que el grupo de trabajo considerara en sus deliberaciones lo siguiente:

   a) Las categorías utilizadas por las Partes son subjetivas y lo que una Parte puede considerar restricciones estrictas puede no serlo para otra.

   b) En su 75ª reunión (SC75; Ciudad de Panamá, noviembre de 2022), el Comité Permanente alentó a las Partes que no habían respondido a la Notificación a las Partes No. 2020/018 y que habían sido identificadas en el anexo 4 del documento SC74 Doc. 64.1 como importantes en el comercio mundial de anguila europea, en particular China, Egipto y Türkiye, a proporcionar una respuesta a esta Notificación de seguimiento en la que se solicitaba información sobre el comercio de anguila (véase el acta resumida de la reunión SC75). Este texto se incluyó en la Notificación a las Partes No. 2023/062.

   c) No se recibieron respuestas de Egipto ni de Turquía, lo que representa una importante laguna de conocimiento.

   d) Si bien China proporcionó una respuesta, esta carecía de los detalles necesarios para tener una compresión clara del comercio.

10. El grupo de trabajo concluye que existen importantes lagunas en el conocimiento en el caso de determinados países y que sería útil adoptar decisiones destinadas a colmar estas lagunas, pero también señala que estas Partes todavía podrían facilitar información ahora, sin necesidad de una decisión específica.

Párrafo b) del mandato

11. En lo que respecta al posible uso del código de origen R (cría en granjas) para especímenes de anguila europea (*A. anguilla*) procedentes de sistemas de producción acuícola, el grupo de trabajo concluyó lo siguiente:

   a) En la Resolución Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP15) sobre *Cría en granjas y comercio de especímenes criados en granjas de especies transferidas del Apéndice I al Apéndice II*, la CoP decidió que la expresión "cría en granjas" significaba la cría en un medio controlado de animales capturados como huevos o juveniles del medio silvestre, donde de otro modo habrían tenido escasa probabilidad de sobrevivir hasta la edad adulta.

b) La Resolución Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP15) trata principalmente de las poblaciones transferidas del Apéndice I al Apéndice II. La situación de la transferencia del Apéndice I al Apéndice II no es aplicable a la cría en granjas de *Anguilla anguilla*, ya que la especie está incluida en el Apéndice II y no fue transferida del Apéndice I. Sin embargo, la resolución contiene un contexto útil al considerar las finalidades y el uso del código de origen de la cría en granjas.

c) En lo que respecta a los cocodrilos, la Resolución Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP15) recuerda que la cría en granjas basada en la recolección controlada de huevos o de especímenes recién eclosionados puede ser un instrumento de conservación útil y positivo, y que la recolección de animales adultos silvestres requiere controles más rigurosos. La Resolución también advierte que es peligroso otorgar más incentivos a la creación de establecimientos de cría en cautividad, que pueden socavar los esfuerzos de conservación de las poblaciones silvestres, que a la de establecimientos de cría en granjas que, en principio, resultan más benéficos para la conservación de los cocodrílidos.

d) La definición de cría en granjas de la Resolución Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP15) se basa en tres criterios:

   i) la cría en un medio controlado,

   ii) la extracción de los animales del medio silvestre como huevos o juveniles;

   iii) una escasa probabilidad de que los especímenes capturados sobrevivan hasta la edad adulta en su hábitat natural.

e) En la Resolución Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP15) también se recomienda que los programas de cría en granjas para transferir poblaciones del Apéndice I al Apéndice II satisfagan criterios generales, entre los que se incluyen:

   i) el programa debe beneficiar principalmente la conservación de la población nacional (es decir, contribuir, cuando sea posible, al aumento de su población en el medio silvestre o fomentar la protección del hábitat de la especie al tiempo que se mantiene una población estable);

   ii) todos los productos (incluso los especímenes vivos) de cada establecimiento deben identificarse y documentarse adecuadamente a fin de garantizar que pueden diferenciarse fácilmente de los productos de las poblaciones incluidas en el Apéndice I [*nota: aunque este criterio no es directamente aplicable a las anguilas del Apéndice II, puede seguir siendo conveniente establecer mecanismos de trazabilidad adecuados para distinguir fácilmente entre especímenes criados en granjas y otros especímenes*];

   iii) el programa debe contar con inventarios apropiados, controles del nivel de capturas y mecanismos para supervisar las poblaciones silvestres; y

   iv) el programa debe ofrecer garantías suficientes para velar por que el adecuado número de animales se devuelven al medio silvestre en caso necesario y cuando sea apropiado;

f) En la Resolución Conf. 10.16 (Rev.) se proporciona la siguiente definición de medio controlado: “medio controlado” significa un medio manipulado con el propósito de producir animales de una determinada especie, con límites diseñados para evitar que animales, huevos o gametos de esa especie entren o salgan de dicho medio, y cuyas características generales pueden comprender, sin limitarse a ello, el alojamiento artificial, la evacuación de desechos, la asistencia sanitaria, la protección contra depredadores y la alimentación suministrada artificialmente.

g) La acuicultura de anguilas basada en el confinamiento, el suministro de alimentos y el tratamiento del agua cumple la definición de medio controlado. Por el contrario, la translocación de anguilas jóvenes a otro biotopo donde viven de los recursos naturales no proporciona un entorno controlado y, por consiguiente, no puede considerarse cría en granjas. La cría de anguilas en estanques es una situación intermedia que debe evaluarse en función del grado de intervención humana. También hay que tener en cuenta que los estanques pueden ser naturales o creados por el hombre y difieren en su ecosistema y finalidad.

h) La acuicultura de *Anguilla anguilla* comienza con la cría de angulas o anguilas jóvenes silvestres de más de un año. Aunque no existe una definición específica de lo que es un "juvenil" para los anguílidos, en el contexto del ciclo vital de estas especies, es razonable considerar que las angulas y las anguilas

jóvenes lo son. En este sentido, la acuicultura de anguilas cumple el criterio de que la cría en granjas se base en la extracción de huevos o juveniles del medio natural.

i) No se dan márgenes ni ejemplos en ninguna Resolución de la CITES para diferenciar entre escasas y muchas probabilidades de sobrevivir hasta la edad adulta.

j) Es difícil establecer una base de referencia de la mortalidad natural porque solo unas pocas poblaciones de anguila europea viven en condiciones naturales prístinas. Incluso las poblaciones no explotadas suelen estar muy influidas por las instalaciones de hidroingeniería, la alteración del hábitat y la contaminación(Boulenger *et al.*, 2016[2]). La situación se complica aún más por factores biológicos como los depredadores locales, así como por la mortalidad en función de la densidad y la fase del ciclo vital.

k) Dekker (2000)[3] sugiere un valor medio para la mortalidad de las anguilas durante su fase de anguila joven y de anguila amarilla de M=0,1386 año^{-1}. Sin embargo, la edad a la que las anguilas experimentan la transformación a la fase plateada y emprenden su migración de desove depende de la latitud y la temperatura del medio en el que han crecido, la disponibilidad de alimentos, las barreras físicas que bloquean las rutas de migración, la tasa de crecimiento y las diferencias de sexo. Esta edad varía entre 2 a 15 años para los machos y 4 a 20 o 30 años para las hembras(Tesch, 2003[4]; Durif *et al.*, 2009[5]). La tasa de mortalidad acumulada es igualmente variable. Para especímenes con una masa corporal de 100 g, Bevacqua et al. (2011[6]) predijeron una variación de la mortalidad de entre 0,02 año^{-1} a 8 °C-baja densidad y 0,47 año^{-1} a 18 °C-alta densidad. Un estudio realizado en Lough Neagh indicó una mortalidad natural instantánea de las anguilas en función de la densidad, que oscilaba entre 0,02 año^{-1} en poblaciones de baja densidad (100-200 angulas por hectárea) y 0,12-0,14 año^{-1} en poblaciones de alta densidad (700 angulas por hectárea) (Aprahamian *et al.*, 2021[7]).

l) Estos datos indican que, en condiciones óptimas, la mortalidad natural de las anguilas europeas durante el crecimiento desde la fase de angula hasta la de anguila plateada puede ser muy baja, con hasta un 75% de los especímenes que sobreviven a las fases de la ontogenia que son pertinentes para las consideraciones sobre la aplicabilidad del código de origen R.

m) La mortalidad de las anguilas aumenta con la densidad de población(Eberhardt, 2002[8]) y el reclutamiento de angulas puede superar la capacidad de carga de los hábitats(Fleming *et al.*, 2023[9]). Sin embargo, el "excedente" puede seguir teniendo una función en el ecosistema.

n) El reclutamiento de angulas disminuyó de 1980 a 2011 en comparación con los datos de las dos décadas anteriores. En 2022, el reclutamiento de angulas en el área índice del "Mar del Norte" fue solo del 0,7% de la media geométrica de 1960 a 1979(ICES, 2023[10]). Por consiguiente, la mortalidad de las angulas en función de la densidad puede haber sido mayor antes de la disminución de la población.

o) En conclusión, el estadio de angula y anguila amarilla de *Anguilla anguilla* no tiene una tasa de mortalidad intrínseca elevada ni, en general, una probabilidad escasa de sobrevivir hasta la edad adulta, pero el reclutamiento por encima de la capacidad de carga de los hábitats puede provocar tasas de mortalidad que se ajusten al criterio de la definición de cría en granjas.

---

2 *Boulenger, C., Acou, A., Gimenez, O., Charrier, F., Tremblay, J. & Feunteun, E. (2016). Factors determining survival of European eels in two unexploited sub-populations. Freshw. Biol.* ***61****, 947–962.*

3 *Dekker, W. (2000). A Procrustean assessment of the European eel stock. ICES J. Mar. Sci.* ***57****, 938-947.*

4 *Tesch, F. w. (2003). The eel. Blackwell Sci. Oxf. Engl.* ***2993****, 408*

5 *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. Springer.*

6 *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. Oecologia* ***165****, 333–339*

7 *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. . J. Fish Biol.* ***99****, 1201–1221*

8 *Eberhardt, L.L. (2002). A paradigm for population analysis of long-lived vertebrates. Ecology 83, 2841–2854.*

9 *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), JNCC Report.*

10 *ICES. (2023). European eel (Anguilla anguilla) throughout its natural range. ICES Advice: Recurrent Advice.*

p) Se sabe que tanto la pesca como las centrales hidroeléctricas y de bombeo provocan la mortalidad de las anguilas(Dekker, 2000; Pedersen *et al.*, 2012[11]). Estas causas antropogénicas de mortalidad no se excluyen al considerar si los huevos o juveniles capturados en el medio silvestre hubieran tenido una escasa probabilidad de sobrevivir hasta la edad adulta, pero deben tenerse en cuenta principalmente al formular un DENP para la sostenibilidad de la cría de anguilas.

q) La supervivencia de las angulas capturadas para la acuicultura se ve afectada por las artes y prácticas de pesca, el transporte y la alimentación inicial. Kirkegaard et al. (2010)[12] asumen que la mortalidad de las muestras recogidas con redes de mano o desde una escala de captura puede ser casi nula, que la mortalidad durante el transporte es inferior al 0,5% y que entre el 10 y el 20% de los especímenes mueren durante la transición crítica al alimento seco. Además, informan que la mortalidad sigue siendo mayor hasta que las anguilas alcanzan una talla aproximada de 5 g y a partir de entonces desciende a menos del 1 %. Se asume que la supervivencia global hasta el tamaño de mercado para el consumo humano es del 75-80 %.

r) Las tasas de supervivencia comunicadas para *Anguilla bicolor* por unos establecimientos de cría en Indonesia son de alrededor del 65% para la primera de las crías intermedias (de 0,17 g a 2 g por anguila) y de alrededor del 71% para la segunda etapa de cría (de 2 g a 30 g por anguila) (Iskandar *et al.*, 2021[13]).

s) Por consiguiente, la supervivencia en la acuicultura coincide con la probabilidad de que las angulas sobrevivan hasta la edad adulta en condiciones naturales favorables.

t) Teniendo en cuenta la amplia variación en la capacidad de supervivencia, parece imposible generalizar si la mortalidad de las anguilas extraídas en la fase de angula o anguila joven para su cría antes de ser comercializadas se ajusta a los criterios establecidos en la Resolución Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP15) de tener una escasa probabilidad de sobrevivir hasta la edad adulta. Solo se pueden tomar decisiones precisas atendiendo a las particularidades de cada caso y en función de las evaluaciones regionales como en Fleming et al. (2023).

u) Otras consideraciones sobre las consecuencias de aprobar el código de origen R para situaciones específicas podrían ser:

   i) El hecho de que la cría de *Anguilla anguilla* comience con angulas o anguilas jóvenes silvestres y termine con el comercio de especímenes de mayor tamaño proporciona unas condiciones comerciales bien definidas.

   ii) Es probable que la captura de angulas tenga un impacto menor en la población reproductora que la extracción del mismo número de anguilas amarillas o plateadas y, si se considera que el comercio es sostenible, puede utilizarse el código de origen R para especímenes criados a fin de expresar esta diferencia en el impacto ecológico, algo similar a las consideraciones reconocidas en el preámbulo de la Resolución Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP15) en relación con los cocodrílidos. En este caso, el código de origen R sería un indicador útil de que los especímenes se extrajeron para su cría y no se comercializaron como resultado de una extracción directa del medio silvestre.

   iii) La utilidad teórica del código de origen R para el comercio de anguilas se ve reducida por la dificultad práctica para distinguir los especímenes adultos extraídos del medio silvestre y los criados, lo que supone una oportunidad para el blanqueo.

   iv) En la actualidad, algunas anguilas criadas se comercializan con el código de origen R y otras con el código W, y la utilización de estos códigos de origen para las anguilas según criterios acordados probablemente ayudaría a mejorar la presentación de informes.

v) La eventual utilidad del código de origen R para el comercio de *Anguilla anguilla* no permite ninguna predicción sobre la sostenibilidad general de la extracción de anguilas de un biotopo específico. El

---

[11] *Pedersen, M.I., Jepsen, N., Aarestrup, K., Koed, A., Pedersen, S. & Økland, F. (2012). Loss of European silver eel passing a hydropower station. J. Appl. Ichthyol. 28, 189–193.*

[12] *Kirkegaard, E. & et al. (2010). European eel and aquaculture (No. DTU Aqua-rapport No. 229-2010). DTU Aqua.*

[13] *skandar, A., Mulya, M.A., Belina, M. & Inoue, M. (2021). PELABUHANRATU, SUKABUMI DI PT. JAWA SUISAN INDAH SUKABUMI, JAWA BARAT 2.*

Consejo Internacional para la Exploración del Mar formuló las siguientes recomendaciones para evaluar la sostenibilidad del comercio de anguilas europeas (ICES, 2015[14]): "Para los impactos antropogénicos, si la estimación de los impactos antropogénicos a lo largo de la vida para el área considerada está por debajo del umbral de ∑A = 0,92 (correspondiente a una supervivencia media hasta la fase de anguila plateada de al menos el 40%, en comparación con una situación sin impactos antropogénicos), se puede considerar que los impactos antropogénicos están en un nivel sostenible". Además, podría ser necesario evaluar el equilibrio entre los sexos y la aptitud de las anguilas plateadas huidas (Belpaire *et al.*, 2009)[15].

w) Si la cría de juveniles de anguila tiene menos impacto en las poblaciones que la captura de adultos, y en qué medida, solo puede determinarse comparando la capacidad de supervivencia en un biotopo natural específico y en los establecimientos de cría que utilizan juveniles de este biotopo. Estos datos no están disponibles actualmente y probablemente variarán considerablemente. Por consiguiente, algunas Partes han considerado que la acuicultura de anguilas no cumple los criterios de cría en granjas.

x) La formulación de DENP positivos a nivel regional se complica por el hecho de que *Anguilla anguilla* es una especie en peligro crítico de extinción (Pike *et al.*, 2018[16]) con una tendencia decreciente de la población que se da en una única población mundial y por factores biológicos como la determinación del sexo y la capacidad de supervivencia en función de la densidad. En este sentido, el dictamen del CIEM (ICES, 2023) puede ser pertinente: "el CIEM dictaminó que, cuando se aplique el criterio de precaución, no debe producirse ninguna captura en todos los hábitats en 2024. Esto se refiere tanto a las capturas recreativas como a las comerciales, e incluye las capturas de angula para repoblación y acuicultura" y "Habida cuenta de que las anguilas criadas siempre se capturan en el medio silvestre y se extraen permanentemente de la población (para consumo) o se utilizan para repoblación (y, por lo tanto, no para fines de conservación según la definición anterior), no debe permitirse ninguna captura con fines de acuicultura".

12. En lo que respecta a los posibles riesgos y beneficios de la reintroducción en el medio natural de anguilas europeas vivas decomisadas, el grupo de trabajo no pudo cumplir esa parte del mandato, por falta de tiempo y debido a la complejidad del análisis de la cría en granjas. Se sugiere que el Comité de Fauna proponga un proyecto de decisión para realizar esta labor después de la CoP20. Se propone el siguiente proyecto de decisión:

Dirigida al Comité de Fauna

20.AA *El Comité de Fauna deberá:*

a) examinar los posibles riesgos y beneficios de la reintroducción de anguilas europeas vivas decomisadas en el medio natural; y

b) formular recomendaciones para su examen por el Comité Permanente o la 21ª reunión de la Conferencia de las Partes, según proceda.

<u>Párrafo c) del mandato</u>

13. En lo que respecta a la posible elaboración de una resolución específica sobre las anguilas europeas o de una resolución sobre el género *Anguilla* spp, el grupo de trabajo llegó a la conclusión de que, independientemente de que una futura Conferencia de las Partes decida o no incluir otras especies de *Anguilla* en los Apéndices, el mandato de la resolución debería abarcar todo el género, ya que no es posible separar los problemas relacionados con la aplicación de la inclusión de *Anguilla anguilla* de cuestiones más generales.

---

[14] *ICES. (2015). Report of the Workshop on Eel and CITES (WKEELCITES). ICES Expert Group reports.*

[15] *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? Ecol. Freshw. Fish **18**, 197–214.*

[16] *Pike, C., Crook, V. & Gollock, M. (2018). Anguilla anguilla (The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2020).*

14. El grupo de trabajo recopiló una lista de temas (acompañados por algunos comentarios) que podrían ser considerados para su inclusión en una posible resolución sobre las anguilas. Esta lista deberá afinarse en la próxima fase de los debates.

- *Lagunas en el conocimiento*

    - Asia oriental: China es el mayor productor de anguílidos en granja del mundo, la provincia china de Taiwán también es un importante criador de anguilas y la Región Administrativa Especial de Hong Kong (China) es el principal punto de entrada/tránsito de las angulas que llegan a la región. La falta de información por parte de estos importantes actores hace que sea muy difícil poner en contexto las respuestas de otras Partes. Es indispensable una contribución directa de las autoridades competentes.
    - Américas: Haití y la República Dominicana se han convertido en exportadores clave de angulas de anguila americana en los últimos años, y sería útil saber más sobre su extracción y exportación.
    - África septentrional: Los datos indican que Egipto y Turquía han capturado y exportado anguila europea en años recientes; sería útil disponer de más información sobre el uso y el comercio en estos países.
    - Además, sería útil disponer de más información sobre el comercio de anguilas con la República de Corea.

- *Códigos aduaneros/arancelarios y otros requisitos de presentación de informes sobre el comercio*

    - Se debería alentar a las Partes a modificar sus sistemas nacionales de códigos aduaneros para desglosar los juveniles y las anguilas vivas de mayor tamaño y, cuando sea posible/pertinente, perfeccionarlos hasta el nivel de especie.
    - Es necesario mejorar la regulación y/o la supervisión en los países/territorios de tránsito/reexportación para hacer frente a las notificaciones erróneas y al comercio ilegal.

- *Extracción/comercio ilegal y problemas de observancia*

    - Es importante que la gestión nacional de la pesca esté en consonancia con las posibilidades de satisfacer legalmente la demanda, ya se trate de la cría, la repoblación o el consumo.
    - Para contribuir a que los países importadores conozcan la legislación de los países exportadores, y viceversa, podría crearse un portal de información sobre legislación.
    - Para aprovechar los éxitos de las operaciones de aplicación de la ley y los decomisos, es importante mantener, ampliar y seguir reforzando la cooperación subnacional, bilateral y multilateral dentro de los países implicados en el comercio de la anguila y entre ellos.
    - Sería muy valioso que las Partes compartieran las mejores prácticas para superar los problemas de gestión y aplicación de la normativa específicos a la captura y el comercio de la anguila.

- *Trazabilidad de las angulas a lo largo de la cadena de suministro*

    - Sería beneficioso para las Partes intercambiar experiencias sobre los retos y las soluciones en materia de trazabilidad, especialmente en relación con la cadena de suministro internacional de la anguila, posiblemente mediante talleres/seminarios web.
    - Se podrían aplicar y/o modificar para la anguila los mecanismos de trazabilidad actualmente en uso/en desarrollo para otras especies/pesquerías.
    - Cuando ya existan marcos/legislaciones nacionales de trazabilidad, pero que aún no se apliquen a *Anguilla* spp., los países podrían considerar la posibilidad de modificarlos.

- *En los casos en que se hayan elaborado planes de gestión o evaluaciones de las poblaciones, sería útil compartir las enseñanzas extraídas para sustentar los planes y evaluaciones de otros Estados del área de distribución y de otras especies, Se debe abarcar específicamente información detallada sobre lo siguiente:*

    - ¿Son monoespecíficos o incluyen varias especies?
    - ¿Incluyen medidas para hacer frente a amenazas distintas de las extracciones y/o el comercio, y cómo se coordinan todas ellas?
    - ¿En qué datos/conocimientos se basa ese plan de gestión y con qué frecuencia se actualiza?
    - ¿Qué investigaciones se están llevando a cabo a escala nacional para fundamentar la gestión adaptable?

- ¿Se coordinan con otros Estados del área de distribución y/o países que comparten cursos de agua transfronterizos?
- ¿Participan todos los órganos y organismos nacionales pertinentes en la elaboración de los planes de gestión?

- *En los casos en que se hayan desarrollado programas de supervisión, sería útil compartir las enseñanzas extraídas para sustentar los programas de supervisión de otros Estados del área de distribución y de otras especies, Se debe abarcar específicamente información detallada sobre lo siguiente:*

  Pesquerías

  - ¿En qué parte de la cadena de suministro se realiza la supervisión y con qué método?
  - ¿Es nacional y/o internacional?
  - ¿Qué etapas del ciclo de vida se incluyen y se supervisan por separado?
  - ¿Se utiliza la supervisión independiente de la pesca para cotejar los datos pesqueros?
  - ¿Se coordina la supervisión con otros Estados del área de distribución y/o países que comparten cursos de agua transfronterizos?
  - En las cuencas con varias especies, ¿cómo se distinguen las capturas?
  - ¿Participan todos los órganos y organismos nacionales pertinentes en la elaboración de los programas de supervisión?

  Comercio

  - ¿En qué parte de la cadena de suministro se realiza la supervisión y con qué método?
  - ¿Es nacional y/o internacional?
  - ¿Qué etapas del ciclo de vida se incluyen y se supervisan por separado?
  - En los países con múltiples especies, ¿cómo se distingue y gestiona el comercio de las distintas especies?
  - ¿Se coordina la supervisión con otros Estados del área de distribución y/o países importadores/reexportadores?
  - ¿Participan todos los órganos y organismos nacionales pertinentes en la elaboración de los programas de supervisión?
  - ¿Se utilizan códigos específicos para cada especie y/o fase del ciclo de vida para proporcionar información detallada sobre las anguilas objeto de comercio?

- *En los casos en que se hayan desarrollado medidas para garantizar la trazabilidad, sería útil compartir las enseñanzas extraídas para sustentar las medidas de otros Estados del área de distribución y para otras especies. Se debe abarcar específicamente información detallada sobre lo siguiente:*

  - ¿A qué parte de la cadena de suministro se aplican las medidas?
  - ¿Cómo se abordan las lagunas en la trazabilidad?
  - ¿Se coordinan estas medidas con otros Estados del área de distribución y/o países importadores/reexportadores?
  - ¿Qué mecanismos existen para garantizar la eficacia de la trazabilidad?
  - ¿Participan todos los órganos y organismos nacionales pertinentes en la elaboración de medidas de trazabilidad?

- *En los casos en que se hayan elaborado DENP, sería útil compartir las enseñanzas extraídas para sustentar los de otros Estados del área de distribución y los de cualquier especie que se incluya en el futuro. Se debe abarcar específicamente información detallada sobre lo siguiente:*

  - ¿Qué datos se utilizan como base del DENP y cómo se validan y actualizan periódicamente?
  - ¿Qué etapas del ciclo de vida se incluyen?
  - ¿Cómo tiene en cuenta el DENP nuestra falta de comprensión de los impactos de las amenazas no pesqueras/comerciales y cómo interactúan?
  - ¿Cómo se coordina el DENP con otros Estados del área de distribución –tanto si han elaborado como si no han elaborado DENP– y/o países importadores/reexportadores?
  - ¿Participan todos los órganos y organismos nacionales pertinentes en la elaboración de los DENP?

- *¿En qué medida se basan las capturas y el comercio en los dictámenes científicos nacionales, internacionales y mundiales, y con qué frecuencia se actualizan?*

- *¿Cómo se elaboran los límites y/o prohibiciones de captura, insumos acuícolas y/o comercio? Se debe abarcar específicamente información detallada sobre lo siguiente:*

    - ¿En qué datos se basan?
    - ¿Se utilizan modelos y, en caso afirmativo, cómo se actualizan?
    - ¿Qué etapas del ciclo de vida se incluyen?
    - ¿Con qué frecuencia se revisan?
    - ¿Cómo se aplican?
    - ¿Cómo se supervisa su eficacia?

- *¿Las extracciones y/o la producción acuícola se basan en la demanda nacional/regional/internacional? Se debe abarcar específicamente información detallada sobre lo siguiente:*

    - ¿Cómo se supervisa y/o coordina con otros Estados del área de distribución, Estados del área de distribución de otras especies que son objeto de comercio y/o países importadores/reexportadores?
    - ¿Qué etapas del ciclo de vida se incluyen?
    - ¿Cómo se ajusta la oferta de forma sostenible y legal en respuesta a los cambios de la demanda para minimizar los excedentes?
    - ¿Cómo se evita que los excedentes legales de las extracciones "se filtren" al comercio ilegal?
    - ¿Se utiliza la producción acuícola para gestionar el suministro? En caso afirmativo, ¿cómo se coordina a escala nacional y/o internacional?

- *¿Qué mecanismos de intercambio/transparencia de datos existen? Por ejemplo, ¿son un requisito de los permisos de extracción/comercio?*

- *De las medidas expuestas, ¿cuáles son voluntarias y cuáles obligatorias?*

- *¿Hay disciplinas en las que el intercambio de conocimientos/capacidades sería útil para las Partes?*

- *¿Cómo se alinean las medidas nacionales con las regionales/internacionales?*

- *Si la repoblación forma parte de alguna medida de extracción/comercio, ¿se controla su eficacia?*

Otras consideraciones

15. Si bien se reconoció que las medidas nacionales a menudo quedan fuera de las competencias de la CITES, debido a la naturaleza panmíctica de la especie, también se consideró esencial que las estrategias nacionales de gestión estén coordinadas para garantizar la sostenibilidad, la trazabilidad y la legalidad del comercio de las anguilas de la familia de los anguílidos.

Recomendaciones

16. Se invita al Comité de Fauna a:

    a) pedir a China, Egipto y Türkiye que presenten información detallada sobre el comercio de anguilas para su consideración en la 78ª reunión del Comité Permanente, e invitar al Comité Permanente a proponer un proyecto de decisión específico dirigido a las Partes que no respondan, solicitando dicha información;

    b) tomar nota de la información del párrafo 11 relativa al posible uso del código de origen R (cría en granjas) para especímenes de anguila europea (*A. anguilla*) procedentes de sistemas de producción acuícola y formular recomendaciones, según proceda;

    c) acordar proponer a la 20ª reunión de la Conferencia de las Partes el proyecto de decisión que figura en el párrafo 12 para renovar la tarea inconclusa de debatir los posibles riesgos y beneficios de la reintroducción en el medio natural de anguilas europeas vivas decomisadas; y

d) transmitir el contenido de los párrafos 13 y 14 al Comité Permanente para su consideración, a través de su grupo de trabajo entre períodos de sesiones sobre anguilas.

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.[17]

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

[17] *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 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, 19[18] Parties reported that they have strict measures to restrict the harvest and/or trade of glass eels (Algeria, Belgium, Czech Republic, France, Greece, Ireland, Japan[19], 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.

	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. • *Anguilla anguilla*	

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

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

Australia	Yes. • *Anguilla australis* • *Anguilla bicolor* • *Anguilla marmorata* • *Anguilla obscura* • *Anguilla reinhardtii*	
Austria		Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*
Belgium		Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*
Canada	Yes. • *Anguilla rostrata*	
China		Yes. • *Anguilla bicolor* • *Anguilla japonica* • *Anguilla luzonensis* • *Anguilla marmorata*
Croatia	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*
Cuba	Yes. • *Anguilla rostrata*	
Czech Republic	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*
Denmark	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*	
Dominican Republic	Yes. • *Anguilla rostrata*	Yes. • *Anguilla rostrata*
Estonia	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*	
Finland	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*
France	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla* (metropolitan France) • *Anguilla australis* (New Caledonia) • *Anguilla bengalensis* (la Réunion) • *Anguilla bicolor* (la Réunion and Mayotte) • *Anguilla marmorata* (la Réunion and Mayotte) • *Anguilla megastoma* (French Polynesia – Tahiti) • *Anguilla mossambica* (la Réunion and Mayotte)	

	• *Anguilla obscura* (French Polynesia – Rurutu and Tubuai • *Anguilla reinhardtii* (New Caledonia) • *Anguilla rostrata* (Martinique, Guadeloupe, Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon)	
Germany		Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*
Greece	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*
Indonesia		Yes. • *Anguilla bengalensis* • *Anguilla bicolor* • *Anguilla borneensis* • *Anguilla celebesensis* • *Anguilla interioris* • *Anguilla marmorata* • *Anguilla megastoma* • *Anguilla obscura*
Ireland	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*	
Italy		Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*
Japan	Yes. • *Anguilla japonica* • *Anguilla marmorata*	
Malaysia	Yes. • *Anguilla bicolor* • *Anguilla borneensis* • *Anguilla celebesensis*	
Mexico	Yes. • *Anguilla rostrata*	
Morocco	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*	
The Netherlands	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*	Yes • *Anguilla anguilla*
New Zealand	Yes. • *Anguilla australis* • *Anguilla dieffenbachii* • *Anguilla reinhardtii*	
Norway	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*	

Republic of Korea	Yes. • *Anguilla japonica* • *Anguilla marmorata*	Yes. • *Anguilla japonica* • *Anguilla marmorata*
Slovakia	No. *Anguilla anguilla* considered as introduced in Slovakia.	No. *Anguilla anguilla* is considered introduced in Slovakia
Slovenia		Yes • *Anguilla anguilla*
Spain	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*
Sweden	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*
Switzerland		Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*
Tunisia	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*
Ukraine	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla*	
United Kingdom	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla* • *Anguilla rostrata* *A. rostrata* 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 *A. Anguilla.*	Yes. • *Anguilla anguilla* • *Anguilla rostrata* *A. rostrata* 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 *A. anguilla.*
United States of America	Yes. • *Anguilla australis* • *Anguilla bicolor* • *Anguilla celebesensis* • *Anguilla marmorata* • *Anguilla rostrata*	Yes. • *Anguilla australis* (American Samoa) • *Anguilla bicolor* (Northern Mariana Islands, Guam) • *Anguilla celebesensis* (American Samoa) • *Anguilla marmorata* (American Samoa, Northern Mariana Islands, Hawaiian Islands) • *Anguilla rostrata*
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 • Preparation of a research project on the evaluation of the biomass of the European eel in Algeria.	
Australia	Partially or under development	

	• Management of two species of Anguillid eel (*A. australii and A.reinhardtii*) 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: - 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. • 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 Joint Declaration for strengthening the recovery for European eel.
Belgium		Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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 *adjusted tidal barrage management* (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	Yes. • Management of American Eel in Canada is multi-jurisdictional involving five administrative regions of Fisheries and Oceans Canada (Ontario and Prairie, Gulf, Maritimes, Newfoundland and Labrador, and Quebec) and the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Commercial Fisheries for Yellow and Silver American Eel - 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. Commercial Fisheries for Elvers • 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. Aquaculture and Experimental Elver Fishery • 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. Recreational Fisheries • There is currently an authorized recreational fishery for American Eel in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland and Labrador. • 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. Food, Social and Ceremonial Fisheries • 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. Bycatch • 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		Yes. • 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: - 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 America, Malaysia, Thailand, Canada, Australia, etc. - 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	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • Eel fishing in Croatia is regulated by way of Ordinance on commercial fishing with gillnets, pots, hook and line gears spears	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • At its 45th annual meeting in 2022, the General Fisheries Commission

	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.	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 Joint Declaration for strengthening the recovery for European eel. • 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 criteria for determining compensation for damages caused to fish and other marine organisms (OG 64/23). • 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	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • Czech National Action Plan for the Management of European eel *(Anguilla*	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States.

	anguilla), 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.	• In December 2022, the Czech Republic was among 16 Member States who, together with the European Commission, committed to a partnership under the renewed Joint Declaration for strengthening the recovery for European eel. • The Czech Republic is currently preparing an update of its National Action Plan for the Management of European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*).
Denmark	Yes. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.	
Dominican Republic	No.	No.
Estonia	Yes. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.	• 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 fising ban for eel at sea.
European Union Member States[20]	Yes. • Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/2007 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 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. • 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 Commission report on the evaluation of the Eel Regulation, published in February 2020. • In accordance with Article 1(2) of the Eel Regulation and based on scientific	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. • 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.

[20] *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.*

	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. • Also relevant is the Joint (European Commission and EU Member States) Declaration on strengthening the recovery for European eel, 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.	• At the request of the European Commission, the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) assessed 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 Joint Declaration for strengthening the recovery for European eel. • In February 2023, the European Commission adopted the Marine Action Plan for sustainable and resilient fisheries, 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 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.

	• 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.	
Finland	Yes. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • In December 2022, Finland was among 16 Member States who, together with the European Commission, committed to a partnership under the renewed Joint Declaration for strengthening the recovery for European eel. • 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		Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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 *A. bicolor, A. marmorata,* and *A. mossambica*.
Germany		Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • In December 2022, Germany was among 16 Member States who, together with the European Commission, committed to a partnership under the renewed Joint Declaration for strengthening the recovery for European eel. • 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 river system can migrate to sea, Germany introduced their management plans (approved in 2010) for its 9 relevant river basin districts (namely Rhine, Meuse, Ems, Weser, Elbe, Eider, Schlei/Trave, Wanow/Peene and Oder). • Germany publishes key figures and indicators in triennial implementation reports, 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	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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.	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • In December 2022, Greece was among 16 Member States who, together with the European Commission, committed to a partnership under the renewed Joint Declaration for strengthening the recovery for European eel. • 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		Yes. • 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 (Anguilla spp.) in 2022-2024 through the Decree of the minister of Marine Affairs and Fisheries 73/2022. • Other related national regulations: - The Regulation of the Minister of Marine Affairs and Fisheries 19/2012 on the Prohibition of Eel (*Anguilla* spp.) Seeds Export - 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 (*Anguilla* 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: - 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 (*Anguilla* spp.) based on size and harvest time: - Harvest prohibition for glass eels on the 27th and 28th days of each lunar month - Harvest prohibition for adult *A. bicolor* and *A. interioris* above 2 kg - Harvest prohibition for adult *A. marmorata* and *A. celebesensis* above 5 kg - Export prohibition for eel seeds ≤150 gr
Ireland	Yes.	

	See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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		Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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 Anguilla Anguilla (CÈCA), 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	Yes. • 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 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. • 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; - 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	Yes. • Permits are issued for imports/exports (not up to species level for anguillid)	
Morocco	Yes • 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 - 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. - 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	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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: - 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).	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • The Netherlands reiterates the measures implemented under its Eel Management Plan.
New Zealand	Yes. • 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. • 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	Partially or under development. • 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	Yes. • 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.	Yes. • 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	No. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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	No. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • In December 2022, Slovakia was among 16 Member States who, together with the European Commission, committed to a partnership under the renewed Joint Declaration for strengthening the recovery for European eel.
Slovenia		Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • In the Republic of Slovenia, the European eel (*Anguilla anguilla)* 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	Yes. • 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 • 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.	Yes. • 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 Mediterranean implemented by the recommendations GFCM/42/2018/1 and bCGPM/45/2021/1.
Sweden	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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.	Yes. See also common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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)

	• 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.	and reported on the implementation of their Eel Management Plans and the progress achieved in protection and restoration to the EU-Commission.
Switzerland		Yes. • 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) • 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 (IBKF – Internationale Bevollmächtigtenkonferenz für die Bodenseefischerei 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	Yes. • DGPA. 2010. Eel Management Plan of Tunisia. Technical report of the General Directorate of Fisheries and Aquaculture. Ministry of Agriculture, Tunisia. 108p.	Yes. • 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	Yes. • The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (Commission) has coordinated interstate management of American eel (*Anguilla rostrata*) 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.	Yes. • The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (Commission) has coordinated interstate management of American eel (Anguilla rostrata) 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.
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 • Implementation of the GFCM research program on the European eel *Anguilla Anguilla.*	
Australia	Partially or under development • 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. • All details on the monitoring of Eel in Belgium can be found in the Country Report of Belgium of the ICES Working Group on Eels.
Canada	Yes. • 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. • 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	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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.	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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.	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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. • 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	Yes. • Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/2017 contains general requirements for EU Member States for the monitoring of the European eel.	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

States [21]	• 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 and, where appropriate, recreational fisheries in and outside EU waters, including eels. • 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.	or updated information provided in response to Notification 2023/062 is summarized here. • 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 WGEEL reports in support of ICES annual advice on European eel. Of relevance is also ICES Report from the Workshop on the future of eel advice.
Finland	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • An index for the silver eels migrating from Finland is obtained from two sites. There is an eel trap in the river Vääkynjoki 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.

[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.*

	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.	
France		Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • France's Eel Management Plan summarizes the monitoring plans, which are broken sown by territory. European eel is subject to studies, in particular on the monitoring of glass eel recruitment through passes and trap passes installed on watercourses. The glass eel recruitment index is in line with the index defined by WGEEL. • The Conservation Master Plan for Anguillidae on Réunion Island (2018-2027) includes monitoring programmes for *A. bicolor, A. marmorata,* and *A. mossambica*.
Germany		Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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 North Rhine-Westphalia. • In the context of the EU Fisheries Data Collection Framework mentioned above, Germany collects data on eel growth and maturation in its inland waters, 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 *Anguillicola crassus* 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.	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • The following monitoring programmes exist for *Anguilla anguilla* in Greece: - 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		Yes. • 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): - 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 *A. borneensis* 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 - 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: - 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	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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		Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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 carried out by the FAO's General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean and the Black Sea. • 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": - 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	Yes. See A4.	
Malaysia	Yes. • Landing data is collected throughout the year (not up to species level)	
Morocco	Partially or under development • 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	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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: - 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.	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • The Netherlands reiterates the activities undertaken as part of its monitoring programme, including the monitoring of glass eels.
New Zealand	Yes. • 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	Yes • Institute of Marine Research has established at sea listening buoys recording migration • 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 Ims • 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 (*Anguillicola crassus*).	
Republic of Korea	Yes. • 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	Partially or under development • Every year at the Northeast Asia Informal Consultation on the Conservation of Anguilla japonica, exchange of statistical data on catch, harvest, input amount by countries and consultation on resource management is carried out.
Slovakia	No.	No.
Slovenia		Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • Data on European eel in Slovenia is gathered within the monitoring if 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	Yes. • European eel fisheries in Spain take place in waters under the jurisdiction of the Autonomous Communities (CC.AA.), in estuaries, estuaries, lagoons, river mouths...so it is the CC.AA. that apply the control and surveillance measures based on their planning. • 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.	Yes. • 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 Service of the Civil Guard on the other. This cooperation is based on the provisions of the law 40/2015. • 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	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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).	Yes. See also common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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

	• Sweden also participate in ICES/EIFAAC WGeel.	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 • A survey of mortality rates in migrating eels in the river Rhine is carried out. No additional monitoring programs are known.
Tunisia	Yes • 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".	Yes. • 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".
Ukraine	No.	
United Kingdom	Partially or under development. • 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.	Partially or under development • 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	Yes. Fishery Independent Data Collection: • 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	Yes. 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: • Yellow eel and silver eel survey requirements, as outlined in Addendum III, vary by state. • Descriptions of state monitoring programs can be found in the

	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 Anguillicoloides crassus (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. • 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. Fishery Dependent Data Collection: • 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.	2022 Benchmark Stock Assessment Report, Section 5.

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. • This is a single stock of *Anguilla anguilla*.	
Australia	Yes. • Stocks of the two harvested species, *A. australis* and *A. reinhardtii*, (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: - 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 the common response provided by European Union Member States
Belgium		Yes. See the common response provided by European Union Member States
Canada	Partially or under development • 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	No. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • Assessment of the status of the eel stock is done under the framework of ICES, STECF and SAC	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States • 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	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • Based on the national legislation the Czech Republic there is annually monitored stock assessment recording restocking and harvest data on Eels.	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States • Based on the national legislation of the Czech Republic there is annually monitored stock assessment recording restocking and harvest data on Eels.
Denmark	Yes. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.	
Dominican Republic	No.	Partially or under development.
Estonia	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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). • 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 States [22]	Yes. • 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: - ICES Advice on fishing opportunities, catch, and effort, European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) throughout its natural range - Expert Group Report 2020 - EU request on temporal migration patterns of European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*)	Yes. • 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 Joint EIFAAC/ICES/GFCM Working Group on Eel (WGEEL) provides the stock assessment and other analysis in support of ICES scientific advice. For example: - ICES Advice on fishing opportunities, catch, and effort, European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) throughout its natural range – most recent advice published in November 2022 can be found here. - WGEEL Report 2022 - EU request on temporal migration patterns of European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) - Stock Annex: Eel (Anguilla anguilla) throughout its natural range (figshare.com)
Finland	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • See also A3.	Yes. See the common response provided by European Union Member States
France		Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States

[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.*

		• 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 *A. bicolor, A. marmorata* and *A. mossambica*.
Germany		Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States • 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 lates version "GEM III" calculates cohort development sex-specifically) and a schematic overview can be found in ICES (2022).
Greece	No. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.	Yes. See the common response provided by European Union Member States
Indonesia		Yes. • 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: - 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 (Anguilla 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 (Anguilla 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	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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		Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States

		• 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 *Anguilla anguilla* (PNRDA).
Japan	Partially or under development. • 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	No. • No stock assessments been conducted yet on anguillid. The focus is more to other species.	
Mexico	Partially or under development	
Morocco	Partially or under development • 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 - 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	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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.	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States • 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: - 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	Yes. • Attempted to conduct stock assessments for eels in each catchment area for both of the main species (*A. australis* (shortfin	

	eels) and *A. 58nguilla58chia* (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 *A. 58nguilla58chia*) 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. • *A. australis* was evaluated as "Not Threatened / increasing" in 2017 using the New Zealand Threat Classification System. • *A. 58nguilla58chia* was evaluated as "At Risk / declining". • Three points need to be noted to put this evaluation into context: - 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 data that indicate otherwise". This was the primary reason for recent reductions in Total Allowable Commercial Catches that were not informed by scientific analyses. - 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	Partiallly or under development • See under A.3	
Republic of Korea	No.	No.
Slovakia	No. • *Anguilla anguilla* is introduced in Slovakia	No. • *Anguilla anguilla* is introduced in Slovakia
Slovenia		Yes. See the common response provided by European Union Member States
Spain	Yes. • 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).	Yes. • 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. • 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. • 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 • Summary set out in NDF document attached below.	Partially or under development • 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. • most recent stock assessment update was finalized in October 2017. • Next benchmark stock assessment is scheduled to be peer reviewed in 2022.	Yes. • The most recent American eel (*Anguilla rostrata*) 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. • 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	Yes. • 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		Yes. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.
Belgium		Yes. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.
Canada	Yes. • 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. • 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		Yes. • 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	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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.	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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	Yes. • 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	Yes. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.	Yes. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.
Denmark	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • Aquaculture businesses, according to Danish law, are obliged to keep written records of purchased and sold eels to ensure traceability.	
Dominican Republic	Partially or under development • Export statistics of the General Customs Directorate	Partially or under development.
Estonia	Partially or under development. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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 Member States[23]	Yes. • 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. • 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.	Yes. • 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. • 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

[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.

		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 Commission report on the evaluation of the Eel Regulation.
Finland	Yes. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.	Yes. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.
France		Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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		Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • Regarding Greece the Ministerial Decision No. 643/39462 / 01-04-2013 established the issue of an attestation by	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • Greece reiterates the existence of Ministerial Decision No. 643/39462/01-04-2013.

	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 *Anguilla anguilla* 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 *Anguilla anguilla* between EU Member States.	
Indonesia		Yes. • 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: - 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. • 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	Partially or under development See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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		Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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	Partially or under development. • 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	Yes. • Landing data is collected throughout the year (not up to species level)	
Mexico	• No assessment of the population densities of the species throughout its range. No known natural breeding populations of any *Anguilla* spp. in the eastern Pacific region (Miller et al. 2009). • Breeding populations of any *Anguilla* 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. Taxonomy • Hypothesised that the European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) and the American eel (*Anguilla rostrata*) 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). Biology • 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. • 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 (Ogilbia pearsei) and blind eel (Ophisternon infernale) in the open cenotes of Quintana Roo (Schmitter-Soto 2006). Distribution • 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. • 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. • 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 • 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. • 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. • 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 • 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. • Holder of live fish (including *Anguilla anguilla*) 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 *Anguilla anguilla*), 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. National legislation on aquaculture • 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.	Yes Slovakia reiterates the relevant provisions of its National CITES legislation and National legislation on aquaculture.

Slovenia		Yes. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.
Spain	Yes. • Traceability regulations and the existing national traceability control program are the same as for other fishery and aquaculture products.	Yes. • 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 prom legal, declared and regulated fisheries and aquaculture, in accordance with European Union regulations (Regulation (EC) No. 1224/2009 of the Councilof 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 *in situ* control of such economic operators was completed.
Sweden	Yes. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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	Yes. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.

	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 the county administrative boards to supervise compliance with the law regarding eels.	
Switzerland		Yes. • 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. • Catch certificates(?)	Yes. • 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. • ASMFC does not have any coastwide measures outside of requiring dealer and harvester reporting which is explained above.	No. • The 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	• 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: - 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 (*Anguilla anguilla*)

B1: Have you made a non-detriment finding (NDF) for trade in European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*)?

If "No", please explain why this is the case.

If "Yes",

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)
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)?

Algeria	No. • Data in progress as part of a stock assessment.	

Australia	No. • Australia is not a range state for European eel and do not make our own non-detriment finding for imported species.	
Austria		No. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.
Belgium		No. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.
Canada	No. • Not a range state.	
Croatia	No. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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.	No. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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	No. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.	No. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.
Denmark	No. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.	
Dominican		No. • Not a range State

Republic		
Estonia	No. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.	
European Union Member States [24]	No. • EU Scientific Review Group (SRG) has confirmed its negative opinion on imports from all range States, as well as the zero-export quota for *Anguilla anguilla* 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.	No. • 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	No. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.	No. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.
France		No. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.
Germany		No. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.
Greece	No. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.	No. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.
Ireland	No. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • The commercial fishery is closed in Ireland and no stocking takes place	

[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.*

	requiring the purchase of eels from another range state	
Italy		No. See also the common response provided by European Union Member States. • At the regional/national level: - 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 Anguilla anguilla (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 (Anguilla anguilla 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	No. • Japan is not a range state of the European eel.	
Malaysia	No. • Malaysia is not a range state.	
Morocco	No. • Studies to issue a non-detriment finding are underway	
The Netherlands	No. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.	No. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.

New Zealand	No. • No catch, export or import this species. • Records of imports of *Anguilla* spp. with the species name not being reported – including imports from countries that may be involved in the illegal trafficking of *Anguilla anguilla*. • 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 *Anguilla* 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	No. • A general NDF has not been made due to the lack of exports from Norway.	
Republic of Korea	No. • When the exporting country is not a party to CITES, the relevant data cannot be checked.	No. • Because European eels are not allowed for domestic implant, import of European eels is prohibited.
Slovakia	No See the common response provided by European Union Member States.	No. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.
Slovenia		No. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.
Spain	No. • Scientific Authorities of the SRG consider that its preparation for export is not possible.	No. • In line with the negative opinion of the European Union Scientific Review Group that bans exports of European eel.
Sweden	No. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.	No. See the common response provided by European Union Member States.
Switzerland		No. • 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	No • The quantity exported has never exceeded the annual quota	Yes. • 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	Yes. • Information source(s) used: - 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	Yes. • Information source(s) used: - 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	No. • 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	Strict measures to limit harvest and / or trade • 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		See also common response provided by European Union Member States. • In Belgium all fishing of glass eels (recreational and commercial) is strictly forbidden in inland, coastal and sea waters.
Croatia	Limited restrictions on harvest and/or trade. See also common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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.	Limited restrictions on harvest and/or trade See also common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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	Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade See also common response provided by European Union Member States. • In the Czech Republic the fishing of glass eels is not permitted.	Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade See also common response provided by European Union Member States. • In the Czech Republic the fishing of glass eels is not permitted.
Denmark	No restrictions on harvest and/or trade See also common response provided by European Union Member States. • Denmark has no veterinary restrictions; hence eels are not susceptible to any notable fish diseases.	
Dominican Republic	Limited restrictions on harvest and / or trade • Export quota system per company from the season October 2020 to March 2021, and closure of capture from March to October.	Limited restrictions on harvest and/or trade • There is a closed season that prohibits the capture of all stages of eel, including adults, from 1 April to 1 October.
Estonia	No restrictions on harvest and/or trade See also common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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	• 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.	• 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

States [25]	• WKEELMIGRATION report provides some information on the fishing closures. • MS have various measures on restricting fishing set.	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 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	Limited restrictions on harvest and/or trade. See also common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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.	See also common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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		Strict measures to limit harvest and/or trade See also common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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

[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.*

		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		Limited restrictions on harvest and/or trade See also common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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	Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade	See also common response provided by European Union Member States.

	See also common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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.	• 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	Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade See also common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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 See also common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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	No restrictions on harvest and/or trade. • No study been conducted yet on eels in general, including the identification and distribution of eel species in Sabah water.	
Morocco	Strict measures to limit harvest and / or trade	

	• 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	Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade See also common response provided by European Union Member States. • In the Netherlands no glass eel fisheries are allowed. • 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 *Anguilla anguilla*	Strictly enforced measures to restrict harves and/or trade See also common response provided by European Union Member States. • The Netherlands reiterates the prohibitions in place on glass eel fisheries
New Zealand	Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade • 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	Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade • Ban on catching of glass eels. This product has never been of interest for Norwegian fisheries	
Republic of Korea	Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade. • 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	Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade • 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 - one who has exported, imported, taken out or brought in an

	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 to2 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 product therefrom that has been captured, harvested, purchased, received, assigned or displayed without authorization is subject to confiscation.	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 - 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, transfered, mediated a transfer, own, occupy or displayed an internationally endangered species and its products • Article 71(Confiscation) of the Wildlife Protection and Management Act - 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, transfered, mediated for transfer or displayed without authorization
Slovakia	No restrictions on harvest and/or trade. • Only obligations in relation to trade in glass eel (intra EU trade) (See A.5)	See also common response provided by European Union Member States. • Only obligations in relation to trade in glass eel (intra EU trade) (see A.5)
Slovenia		Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade See also common response provided by European Union Member States. • European eel is a protected species in Slovenia, therefore harvesting of the species is prohibited.
Spain	Some restrictions on catching or trade.	Limited restrictions on harvest and/or trade

	• 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.	• 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 also common response provided by European Union Member States. • 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.	See the response provided by European Union Members States.
Switzerland		• 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	Strict measures to limit harvest and / or trade • 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.	Strict measures to limit harvest and/or trade • 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	Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade • 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 Dada 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	Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade • Fishing authorisations and fishing season • Catch certificates	Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade • 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 mixture of measures was used across rivers. In 2023, the season was shortened in all rivers. • 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	Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade • 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.	